

FAMPO Advisory Committee Meeting
I-95 Corridor Study – Phase 1
May 04, 2016

ATTENDANCE: Members:

Ed Petrovitch, County of Spotsylvania; Keith Dayton, County of Stafford; CTAG – Alternate, Rupert Farley; Tim Roseboom, DRPT; Elliott Moore, FHWA; & Annette Adams, VDOT

ATTENDANCE: Others: Paul Prideaux, Michael Baker International; and Stephen Haynes, Jake Herman, Marcie Parker & Michelle Shropshire, VDOT

ATTENDANCE: Staff: Paul Agnello, Marti Donley, Nick Quint, Daniel Reese & Lloyd Robinson, FAMPO; & JoAnna Roberson, GWRC

I. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Agnello thanked everyone for attending the fourth advisory committee meeting for Phase I of the I-95 Corridor Study and introductions were made from all who were in attendance.

II. ADVISORY COMMITTEE FEEDBACK RECEIVED ON ALTERNATIVES

Mr. Paul Prideaux with Baker Consultants advised that this is the fourth Advisory Committee meeting and that this meeting will update the committee on feedback received: on the original ten alternatives and the six alternatives (five alternatives plus the no-build alternative) that have been pursued based on the feedback.

Mr. Prideaux stated that slide three of the presentation, there is a matrix which includes all ten original alternatives. The bundled alternatives based on committee feedback, and the alternatives that are being advanced.

Mr. Prideaux stated that slides 4-9 show the original alternatives as previously described to include:

- Alternative 1 – No Build option**
- Alternative 3C – Bi-directional General Purpose Widening (Revised)**
- Alternative 4 – (no changes) – Northbound Rappahannock River Crossing**
- Alternative 7A – New Harrison and Courthouse Road Access**
- Alternative 9A – Reversible Express Lane Extension to Route 3 (revised)**
- Alternative 11 – Reversible Express Lane Extension to Route 17**

Mr. Prideaux advised that the initial study and data for Alternative 7A (the new access to Harrison Road and Courthouse Road in Spotsylvania County) shows that this alternative not be studied as separate projects. Mr. Farley asked why the projects should be combined. Mr. Prideaux stated that the preliminary data supports the projects as being combined and feedback that has been received from committee members also endorses this methodology.

III. PHASE 1 ALTERNATIVES FOR MODELING AND INVESTIGATION

Mr. Prideaux advised that preliminary data is included in today's agenda packet that shows the results of the six alternatives, should any of them be forwarded for additional study and/or ultimate construction.

IV. PRELIMINARY MODELING RESULTS FOR STUDY ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 3c – Mr. Prideaux stated that this alternative would widen the I-95 general purpose lanes in both directions, from Exit 143 (Garrisonville) to Exit 126 (US 1), except for section between US 17 and Route 3 where the Rappahannock River Crossing is assume. Mr. Prideaux state that a full depth inside shoulder exists between mileposts 138 and 145 in both the northbound and southbound directions, and this is reflected in segments two and three in the graphic.

Alternative 4 – Mr. Prideaux stated that this alternative is the northbound Rappahannock River Crossing project. This project will result in the construction of collector-distributor lanes in the northbound direction only from Exit 130 (Route 3) to Exit 133 (Route 17). The CD lanes will serve as companions to the southbound CD-lanes that are also part of the No-Build alternative. Mr. Prideaux advised that this alternative results in no new access points. This alternative will include implementation of a direct flyover to serve the Route 3 eastbound to I-95 northbound CD lane movement.

Alternative 7a - Mr. Prideaux stated that Alternative 7a is new access at Harrison Road and Courthouse Road in Spotsylvania County. This project allows for north-facing connections with Harrison and Courthouse; includes a southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp but no southbound on-ramp or northbound off-ramp. This alternative would require CD lanes in both directions between Route 3 (Exit 130) and the two new access points. The CD lanes would not extend further south of the Courthouse Road exit, but the southbound deceleration lane to Exit 126 at Massaponax will be lengthened. Alternative 7a includes all of the elements in Alternative 4. This alternative also includes widening Harrison Road to four lanes east of I-95 and possibly more than four lanes west of I-95. This alternative does not assume any significant widening of Courthouse Road.

Alternative 9a – Mr. Prideaux stated that Alternative 9a is the revised reversible express lane extension to Route 3. Mr. Prideaux advised that with Alternative 9a, the express lane access assumptions remain consistent with those included in FAMPO's current CLRP. Mr. Prideaux stated that this alternative is for an extension of the reversible express lanes from just south of Exit 143 (Garrisonville Road) to just south of Exit 130 (Route 3). This alternative includes the elements as described in Alternative 4 and will also include a north-facing direct connection from Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) to the existing I95 Express Lanes.

Alternative 11 – Mr. Prideaux advised that Alternative 11 is the reversible express lane extension to US Route 17. Mr. Prideaux stated that express lane access points are consistent with those that are included in FAMPO’s current CLRP. Mr. Prideaux advised that this alternative will result in an extension of reversible express lanes from the current terminus south of Exit 143 (Garrisville Road) to just south of Exit 133 (Route 17). This alternative includes the elements studied in Alternative 4 and would also include a north-facing direct connection from Route 610 to the I95 Express Lanes.

V. CONCEPTUAL LAYOUTS & POTENTIAL PHYSICAL IMPACTS OF STUDY ALTERNATIVES

With the modeling analysis that has been run to-date, Mr. Prideaux provided a summary of the pros and cons for each of the five alternatives. These preliminary results are as follows:

Alternative 3C (Bi-directional General Purpose Widening – Revised)

Mr. Prideaux stated that for the 2040 year, a new southbound PM lane would be filled with latent demand. The increase in I95 person throughput will be approximately 25%, and if a fourth lane component is included then there would be an expected increase of 33%. The southbound PM delay would significantly improve for all segments where the new lane is proposed. Also, there would be some movement of demand from Route 1 to I95 which will result in re-orientation, re-shuffling and ripple effects for travel in areas where I95 capacities are increased, and new decreased traffic capacities on the secondary roads. The data showed that there is not as much latent demand for the new northbound lane as was observed in the AM 2040 analysis.

Mr. Prideaux stated that the regional model is the best available tool to evaluate the relative difference between alternatives. Mr. Prideaux relayed that the regional model looks at delays from free-flow speed conditions.

Mr. Agnello what the free-flow person speed data assumption is. Mr. Prideaux relayed that the free flow speed is based on the posted speed limits. Mr. Robinson asked how much effort would be involved in having posted speeds included to be compared with the reality today and for future outcomes. Mr. Robinson stated that compiling data based on an outcome versus a reality shows a different perspective than having data based on a hypothetical assessment. Mr. Robinson advised that previous data has been gathered for the 2014 and 2015 years that was compiled twice a day (one in the AM peak period and one in the PM peak period) and the input from this data was based on the real traffic conditions of that particular day. Mr. Prideaux stated that the modeling data can also be re-run to reflect real day-to-day conditions and he did not see this request as being particularly time-consuming.

Alternative 4 (Northbound Rappahannock River Crossing) – this alternative did not change from the previous modeling data and studies. For the northbound Rappahannock River Crossing project, the northbound CD lanes will result in significant relief to the general purpose lanes in the area. The northbound CD lanes will result in a 23% increase in I95 northbound person throughput from the areas where they exist. The northbound segment just north of the CD lanes at Route 17 experiences a significant increase in delay due to the infusions of increased

volumes. However, virtually all northbound delays are removed from the area where the CD lanes exist and there is also some movement of the demand from Route 1 to I95 in the travel areas where I95 capacity is increased.

Alternative 7A (Harrison & Courthouse Road Access) – this alternative results in a significant reduction in delay in the areas where the new CD lanes are being proposed. There is an approximate 45% increase in total person movement in the areas where the new CD lanes are proposed. The new access points are expected to have a positive impact on the north-facing ramp operations at Route 1 (Exit 126 – Jackson Gateway).

Alternative 9A (Reversible Express Lane to Route 3 – Revised) – this was a very high performing alternative from a person movement and delay reduction standpoint. This alternative, unlike some of the others, did not create any new choke points. The data showed that the northbound segments between Route 3 and US 17 may be slightly overbuilt in regard to weekday demand; however, they are more likely to accommodate the Sunday demands.

Alternative 11 (Reversible Express Lane Extension to Route 17) – this alternative was very high-performing from a person movement and delay reduction standpoint, even though at the uppermost southern end there could be new issues. However, there are no new choke points that result from this alternative.

Mr. Prideaux advised that the overall alternative comparisons focusing on both the I-95 facility and a combination of I-95 and Route 1 showed the following:

I-95 only:

Alternatives 9A and 11 were the highest performing in person throughput and person delays for both AM and PM traffic. Alternative 3C is also effective, but due to the design, it will only provide one new lane of capacity in any peak direction. Mr. Agnello stated that this alternative is good for the week-day commuters but bad for the weekend travelers. Alternative 3C is also the only alternative that covers the entire corridor from Exit 143 at Garrisonville to Exit 126 at Massaponax. Mr. Prideaux stated that both Alternatives 4 & 7A are valuable within the segments where they exit; however, they are penalized by the fact that they do not include any improvements in other segments to the north resulting in them having built-in choke points.

Combination of I-95 & Route 1:

There is less differentiation between the alternatives from a person-movement standpoint but more differentiation from a delay reduction standpoint. Alternatives 9A & 11 continue to score the best. The pros and cons from Alternatives 3C, 4, & 7A that were described above still exist in the combination corridor context.

VI. NEXT STEPS

Obtain Advisory Committee feedback on today's meeting by May 12th
Obtain Advisory Committee agreement on two alternatives for additional study
Outreach to FAMPO committees (May 9th FAMPO Technical Committee; May 11th FAMPO CTAG Committee; & May 16th FAMPO Policy Committee)
Meetings with Local Jurisdictions (City of Fredericksburg; County of Spotsylvania; & County of Stafford – meeting dates to be determined)
Schedule 5th Advisory Committee meeting (to be determined – in either late May or early June)

MEMBER COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, ETC.

Marcie Parker – request that the modeling data be re-run to also include data for weekend traffic/travel.

Elliot Moore – better clarity on the disparities between express lane delays and general purpose lane delays per person movement.

Keith Dayton – as the alternatives being considered involve large regional projects with high price tags does the study price ourselves out of realistically getting projects approved.

Paul Prideaux – the committee's goal is to first establish the vision (in the form of a master plan) to determine what the region feels needs to be accomplished to resolve the traffic congestion areas within the region. Then it can be broken down into projects that are smaller in scale and cost. These projects would need to be evaluated to determine which is the most beneficial, which should be pursued first, etc.

Paul Agnello – the study should provide the committee with a master plan that can become more programmable into smaller project segments that could coincide with HB2 project application submissions.

Paul Agnello – the study, data, and ultimately the committee needs to determine if CD lanes, express lanes, etc. are the way to go, and it needs to determine how far south the projects need to go.

Marcie Parker – the study is designed to make recommendations as to what could possibly fix the entire I-95 corridor.

Keith Dayton – stated that he thought initially the committee was comprised for the purpose of marketing the long-range plan and then selecting projects that would be competitive within the HB2 process.

Rupert Farley – concurred with Mr. Dayton's comments about the intent of the committee as formed now focusing on new concepts.

Lloyd Robinson – stated that he respectively disagreed with these comments as the region has to have a valid I-95 analysis to base HB2 project prioritizations on.

Annette Adams – stated that at this stage in the process, it is hard to determine needed projects when a cost analysis has not been completed to determine whether an improvement outweighs the cost to implement.

Michele Shropshire – stated that the committee needs to be careful when large projects are recommended for submission that they do not compete with current HB2 slated projects.

Keith Dayton – stated that at this time in the process he does not feel the committee has enough data to make a recommendation as to whether the biggest bang for the buck is with general purpose lanes or express lanes.

Paul Agnello – stated that even though additional data is still required, the overall consensus from today's meeting appears that the committee feels the best two alternatives to consider moving forward would be the following: Option 1 – 3c & 7a; Option 2 – 7a & 11.