Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held at 3335 South Crater Road in the Southside Regional Hospital (Crater Road location) on January 6, 2006 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Jack Apostolides, DR&PT; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Barbara Smith, Chesterfield; George Schanzenbacher, Colonial Heights; Mark Riblett, VDOT; Leon Hughes, Prince George; Unwanna Bellinger-Dabney, FHWA; Joe Vinsh, CPDC.

Members Absent: Mike Briddell, Petersburg; March Altman, Hopewell; Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Others Present: Laurie Henley, VDOT;

Vice-Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – November 4, 2005

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Schanzenbacher and carried, the minutes of the November 4, 2005 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

There were no citizens present for the meeting.

REVIEW OF CMAQ PROGRAM FOR TRI-CITIES AREA

Ms. Henley distributed and reviewed information summarizing emissions analysis on Tri-Cities Area CMAQ projects. Ms. Henley stated, with the exception of the Colonial Corners project in
Hopewell, all projects evaluated showed some air quality benefit. Ms. Henley further indicated FHWA requires all CMAQ projects to demonstrate some air quality benefit.

Ms. Henley indicated Hopewell will need to be contacted for discussion regarding the current scope of the Colonial Corners CMAQ project.

Mr. Vinsh commented on the Policy Committee concern that the CMAQ projects be completed in a timely manner.

Mr. Riblett indicated he was optimistic the 4 “at risk” Tri-Cites CMAQ projects would be reconciled by VDOT Central Office in the near future.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FROM THE NOVEMBER FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Ms. Bellinger-Dabney distributed updated information on preliminary findings of the Federal Review Committee and commented on 13 MPO planning areas covered by the review. Areas being considered for corrective action include the following: inclusion of a safety planning activity in the FY 2007 UTPWP; development of a 20-year regional transit plan; provision for evaluation of the effectiveness of adopted public involvement measures; and, documentation of compliance with Title VI requirements.

A copy of the preliminary findings has been attached to these minutes.

REVIEW OF SAFETEA-LU

Ms. Bellinger-Dabney distributed a handout containing information regarding metropolitan planning provisions from the new federal transportation legislation signed into law on August 10, 2005 by the President.

While the new bill contains a number of the same provisions of ISTEA and TEA-21, key changes include a provision that new MPO plans or TIPs adopted or amended after July 1, 2007 must meet SAFETEA-LU planning requirements. Security and environment are emphasized as planning factors. The long range plans and tips are updated every 4 years for maintenance and non-attainment areas. Intermodal connectors are to be included as transportation facilities. The MPO is required to consult with agencies responsible land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation. A human services transportation coordination plan will be a prerequisite to receiving formula funding under FTA programs.
Ms. Bellinger-Dabney indicated additional guidance will be coming from FTA and FHWA regarding the implementation of the new planning regulations.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Vinsh commented that the Crater staff and Colonial Heights staff recently processed an amendment to the FY 2005 – 2007 TIP regarding the I-95 & Temple Avenue NB ramp project to adjust funding for PE and CN as recommended by VDOT.

Mr. Vinsh mentioned that the Interagency Consultation Group will meet on January 19, 2006 at the Richmond PDC office to discuss provision for the conformity analysis of the FY 2006 – 2008 TIP.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m.
Regarding the Southeast High Speed Rail Project (SEHSR), Ms. Parker commented on need for consideration of an alternative to the Burgess Connector that would avoid further impact on nearby Civil War battlefields. Ms. Parker indicated the National Park Service has made an assessment for an alternative to the Burgess Connector and requested the MPO to provide a copy of this assessment.

STATUS REPORTS ON THE RICHMOND TO HAMPTON ROADS AND SEHSR

Mr. Vinsh stated the Tier I Environmental Impact Statement and alternative analysis for the Richmond to Hampton Road passenger rail study is scheduled for public review by the VDR&PT this spring. The environmental impacts and capital cost for provision of passenger service between Richmond and Collier Yard are going to be estimated by the SEHSR study effort being conducted by the NC DOT and VDR&PT.

The southern alternatives being considered for the Richmond to Hampton Roads study includes ridership forecast for traditional and higher speed passenger rail service from Main Street Station in Richmond to a station serving the Tri-Cities and then to Hampton Roads using the Norfolk/Southern rail facility that parallels U.S. Route 460.

The northern alternative under consideration in the Richmond to Hampton Roads study includes ridership forecast for traditional and higher speed passenger rail service from Main Street station to Newport News utilizing the CSX rail facility on the north side of the James River.

Regarding the Southeast High Speed Rail (SEHSR) study, Mr. Vinsh stated federal authorization has been received by NC DOT and the VDR&PT to add the segment between Collier Yard in Petersburg to Main Street Station in Richmond to the on-going project to prepare a Tier II Environmental Impact Statement between Collier Yard in Petersburg, VA and Raleigh, NC.

Mr. Vinsh added previous communications between CPDC staff and passenger rail study sponsors have emphasized the need to use active rail lines and avoid use of inactive rail lines in the vicinity of the Tri-Cities Area, in order to avoid adverse impacts on Pamplin Park, Chaparral Steel and existing residential developments north of the Appomattox River.

REPORT ON THE RECONCILIATION OF MPO AND VDOT CMAQ ALLOCATION RECORDS

Mr. Vinsh indicated progress is being made on reconciling VDOT and MPO project allocation records going back to FY 1993. Mr. Vinsh made reference to worksheets regarding this
agenda item.

Mr. Svejkovsky stated the differences in allocations for RSTP projects were relatively minor and several items remain to be resolved on CMAQ.

Mr. Vinsh added reconciliation has been achieved for the 4 proposed CMAQ projects that have the oldest CMAQ allocations.

Mr. Riblett indicated VDOT Programming Division has offered assistance with reconciliation on a project specific basis if allocation discrepancies could potentially impact the completion schedule for a particular project.

Mr. Riblett also indicated the VDOT goal is to have all project allocations appear correctly in the final Six-Year Program.

Mr. Vinsh made reference to the file attached to the agenda packet listing project obligation information that will be used for the FY 2006 – 2008 TIP. Mr. Vinsh indicated updated cost estimates are needed for several of the projects.

REVIEW OF CMAQ AND RSTP REVENUE FORECAST

Mr. Vinsh commented the CMAQ and RSTP project cost estimates on the worksheets were from March 2005 and needed to be updated before consideration of further allocations.

Mr. Vinsh further commented that it is anticipated that updated project cost information would be available prior to the April 7 meeting.

Mr. stated he reviewed CMAQ and RSTP revenue information with the MPO – Policy Committee on March 9 and asked if there was any desire to update the listing of candidate projects and make new project ratings. Mr. Vinsh indicated that the Policy Committee did not indicate a desire to update the list of candidate projects or the project ratings.

Mr. Vinsh emphasized the importance of concentrating available resources on fewer projects and having project managers assigned and completion schedules developed in a timely manner.

Mr. Altman stated the indication he has gotten from the MPO - Policy Committee Chair is to focus on completing projects with previous allocations before moving on to new projects.
Mr. Altman also stated it was his understanding that local governments are not obligated to fund CMAQ or RSTP project cost. Mr. Altman suggested that the Technical Committee could discuss this item during its April meeting and consider a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

REVIEW OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION ON DRAFT FY 2006 – 2008 TIP

Mr. Vinsh commented on the file attached to the agenda packet provided by VDOT for highway projects to be included in the next Six-Year Program. Mr. Vinsh further commented these project sheets contain project obligation information and will be used for the highway element of the FY 2006 – 2008 TIP.

Mr. Vinsh also commented that input on the transit element is needed from PAT.

Ms. Henley and Mr. Ponticello briefly made reference to the summary findings of the conformity analysis of the projects for the FY 2006 – 2008 TIP in the Richmond Area and indicated the results were favorable.

Mr. Vinsh stated the draft FY 2006 – 2008 TIP and the conformity analysis would be advertised as soon as all of the TIP information could be assembled.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, a motion was adopted to authorize the CPDC staff to advertise the draft documents for public review.

Mr. Riblett added that new CMAQ and RSTP allocations are needed by the first week in May in order to be included in the final Six-Year Improvement Program.

REPORT ON SAFETY CONSCIOUS PLANNING EFFORTS

Mr. Vinsh introduced Mr. Josue Yambo of FHWA in Richmond and explained Mr. Yambo’s services have been made available to support MPO safety conscious planning efforts for a six-week period.

Mr. Yambo made reference to map the Tri-Cities Congestion Management System (CMS) and indicated efforts would be made to access accident records for interstate and primary facilities on the CMS network. Mr. Yambo further indicated local assistance may be needed to access accident records not available at VDOT.

REVIEW OF FY 2007 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh commented work on the next Transportation Plan update consistent with SAFETEA-LU requirements will be the focus of transportation planning efforts during FY 2007. Other
focus areas include incorporating financially constrained recommendations for Route 460 improvements that may emerge from the advertised solicitation and the participation in a human services transit plan for the Richmond Urbanized Area.

Upon a motion by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried, a recommendation was adopted that the MPO – Policy Committee

FORT LEE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

As another business item, Mr. Riblet reported authorization has been received from the VDOT Central Office to use an on-call consultant to make an assessment of improvement needs at Fort Lee gates resulting from BRAC recommendations for Fort Lee expansion. Mr. Riblet indicated a project scope of work is being prepared and the project would be coordinated with Fort Lee and the MPO.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:35 a.m.
the Crater Planning District Commission (CPDC) files regarding an alternative to the Burgess Connector developed by the U.S. National Park Service.

Mr. Vinsh stated CPDC’s files on SEHSR were reviewed and no correspondence regarding the item was found. Mr. Vinsh added that follow-up correspondence in response to the FOIA request was mailed.

REVIEW OF UPDATED INFORMATION ON CMAQ AND RSTP PROJECT COST ESTIMATES AND CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Vinsh made reference to increased CMAQ and RSTP future revenues estimates provided by VDOT under provision of SAFETEA-LU.

Mr. Vinsh also made reference to the worksheets and commented that updated CMAQ and RSTP project cost estimates had been provided by VDOT.

Mr. Vinsh commented that the estimated amounts of unallocated funds for both CMAQ and RSTP are subject to the continuing reconciliation efforts of MPO and VDOT records.

Mr. Riblett indicated cost estimates only for projects without a UPC number were recently provided by the Richmond District. Cost estimates for projects with UPC numbers were provided to CPDC staff earlier from the PCES system.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the cost estimates for projects with UPC numbers on the worksheets would need to be rechecked and/or updated before the MPO – Policy Committee meeting on April 13th.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, a motion was adopted to recommend to the MPO – Policy Committee that the list of candidate RSTP projects be updated and a rating be made during next calendar year for the updated list.

Following a period of discussion on the status of individual CMAQ projects, Mr. Schanzenbacher made a motion seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, for CMAQ allocation recommendations as follows:

CMAQ Project FY 2007 Allocations
Rt. 1 Boulevard
Sherwood – Temple 13,600
VSU Sidewalk 139,802
2000’ Prince George
Sidewalk 174,324

CMAQ Project FY 2008 Allocation
Rt. 156/Rt. 646
Turn Lane 639,000

CMAQ Project FY 2009 Allocation
Rt. 156/Rt. 646
Turn Lane 33,000

Southpark Boulevard (to be determined)
NB Turn Lane at Dimmock Parkway

Following a period of discussion on the status of individual RSTP projects, Mr. Briddell made a motion seconded by Mr. Schanzenbacher and carried, for RSTP allocation recommendations as follows:

RSTP Project FY 2007 Allocation

Rt. 1 & Rt. 460
Additional Traffic
Lane 173,000

STATUS REPORT ON SAFETY CONSCIOUS PLANNING ACTIVITY

Mr. Vinsh commented Josue Yambo of FHWA has obtained statewide crash data from VDOT for the interstate system and is working with VDOT to obtain the location information for the crashes.

STATUS REPORT ON ROUTE 460 IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Vinsh distributed copies of a handout used by VDOT representatives during a March 30th public meeting of the Prince George Board of Supervisors. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information on VDOT efforts to obtain proposals from the private sector to construct the southern alternative selected by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. VDOT representatives also responded to citizen questions about the status of properties located in the proposed alignment.

STATUS REPORT ON THE FORT LEE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Mr. Riblett reported authorization has been received from the VDOT Central Office to use an
on-call consultant to make an assessment of improvement needs in the Fort Lee vicinity, including the potential need to relocate a portion of Route 36, resulting from BRAC recommendations. Mr. Riblett indicated authorization from FHWA to proceed with the project is expected in the near future.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:35 a.m.
STATUS REPORT ON SOUTHEAST HIGH SPEED RAIL CORRIDOR STUDY

Mr. Vinsh stated Chaparral Steel, Pamplin Park, the National Park Service and Dinwiddie County are preparing a position paper regarding the potential alignment of high-speed rail service in Dinwiddie County. Mr. Vinsh further stated the position paper would be shared with the MPO.


Mr. Vinsh commented the reports are used as one of the inputs for the traffic model to help predict future trips in the transportation study area. Mr. Vinsh indicated the land use acreage portion of the spreadsheets had not been updated since 1987.

Mr. Vinsh also commented that the data for the 7 Fort Lee traffic analysis zones had been prepared by base personnel and will be used along with the balance of the reports by the consultant currently working on the Fort Lee Traffic Impact Study.

After a period of discussion, a motion made by Mr. Vinsh, seconded by Mr. Wrenn and carried, that the transportation data reports be endorsed.

REPORT ON STAFF LEVEL AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh stated that 5 amendments had recently been processed by CPDC staff regarding the current TIP. These projects were operational and maintenance in nature.

DISCUSSION OF THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE AND SAFETEA-LU COMPLIANCE

Mr. Vinsh indicated that based on recent discussions with Richmond MPO staff and VDOT it appears the horizon year for the next LRP update will be 2031. The SAFETEA-LU legislation requires the next update to be complete on July 1, 2007. Mr. Vinsh asked Technical Committee representatives to begin reviewing the list of projects in the 2026 Transportation Plan at the local level.

Mr. Vinsh distributed a handout from the VDOT – Central Office regarding SAFETEA-LU compliance. A discussion followed on the portion of the handout titled “MPO Gap Analysis Tool”. The discussion focused on several of the new requirements and the need to proceed
with the LRP update due the limited time available to complete the effort before July 1, 2007.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Upon a motion by Mr. Wrenn, seconded by Ms. McAdory and carried, the Chair and Vice-Chair were reelected.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:15 a.m.
REVIEWS OF FORT LEE EXPANSION TRAFFIC STUDY

Mr. Morris provided a handout summarizing expansion plans approved for Fort Lee and commented regarding a pending State grant application process for communities impacted by the U.S. BRAC findings. Mr. Morris also indicated amount of State funds anticipated to be applied for by the Crater Planning District Commission to the Virginia National Defense Industrial Authority would be approximately 1.5 million.

Ms. Dabney inquired about the status of funding from the Defense Access Road Program (DARP) for Fort Lee improvements.

Mr. Morris indicated additional background had been obtained on the DARP. Mr. Morris explained Fort Lee would need to initiate application for funding under this program and a suitable project(s) had not yet been identified. Mr. Morris added that no funds were earmarked for any Fort Lee road improvements at this time.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the MPO–Policy Committee would be meeting on November 9th and would be acting on recommendation(s) from the MPO–Technical Committee regarding project(s) selected for the pending State BRAC grant application due November 17th.

Mr. Curtis of Michael Baker, Inc. provided a handout and a presentation on the analysis of traffic deficiencies and alternatives for solving traffic deficiencies anticipated as a result of expansion plans for Fort Lee.

The focus of the Baker analysis was on the street network around the base, including the five gates. Improvement needs were grouped in the report document as short-term roadway & intersection (present-day needs, page 57), intermediate roadway & intersection (2015 deficiencies with BRAC growth, page 61) and long-term roadway and intersection improvements (2026 deficiencies with BRAC expansion and other growth, page 64). The groupings include Baker recommendations on priorities.

Mr. Constantine stated that under “force protection” requirements, Shop Gate would remain open to truck traffic after the construction period.

Mr. Curtis indicated future traffic information on Shop Gate is needed.

Mr. Svejkovsky indicated Fort Lee needs to provide this information to Baker.

Mr. Constantine stated a temporary signal at Shop Gate was not the answer and that Fort Lee would provide Baker future traffic information for this gate.
Mr. Varney commented that this information should be provided to the VDOT regional traffic engineer.

Mr. Hughes asked if future non-BRAC growth in the region was factored into the analysis.

Mr. Wagg stated BRAC related growth was added to the growth contained in the 2026 socio-economic forecast data and used for this analysis.

Mr. Curtis indicated an assessment of the potential rerouting of Route 36 north of the existing alignment was also evaluated at the request of Fort Lee. Mr. Curtis stated this assessment showed no justification from a traffic perspective.

Mr. Constantine stated a relocation of Route 36 would provide improved internal movement and security between the northern and southern portions of the base.

Mr. Constantine further stated no BRAC related Fort Lee funding for infrastructure improvement would be available for a vehicle overpass at Route 36, only a pedestrian overpass.

Mr. Morris asked if other funds could be used to fund a vehicle overpass.

Mr. Constantine indicated an overpass with approaches may require too much land needed for the deployment of troop activities.

Mr. Royster stated Fort Lee is designing for a pedestrian bridge and asked Baker to provide approximate dimensions to Fort Lee.

Mr. Morris stated more time would be needed to discuss this item with the local communities and asked if the feasibility of a vehicular bridge could be evaluated by Baker.

Mr. Curtis summarized recommendations contained in the 3 tables and indicated Baker priorities were based on traffic considerations and the information provided by Fort Lee on the timing of facility construction on-base.

Mr. Altman indicated Hopewell wants to coordinate development of the Jefferson Park turn lane and Route 36 Computer Signalization CMAQ projects with recommendations of this study. Mr. Altman further indicated Hopewell desires to delay development of the CMAQ projects but does not want to risk loss of these funds because of time limits to obligate previously allocated funds.

Mr. Briddell asked several questions related to the need for relocation of Route 36 and indicated the City of Petersburg had not reviewed this potential project.
Mr. Constantine explained how the relocation could help Fort Lee with operations and security.

Ms. Rice expressed concern that rerouting Route 36 would cause some traffic westbound for Petersburg businesses to be diverted onto Temple Avenue and Puddledock Road industrial areas.

Mr. Royster stated that with the Route 36 relocation the Lee Gate and the existing entrance to the Petersburg National Battlefield Park would remain open. The portion of Route 36 from Jackson Circle to Sisisky Gate would be the portion that would not be open for thru traffic.

Ms. Rice asked if an overpass would allow free movement between the northern and southern portions of the base.

Mr. Royster stated currently Fort Lee is designing for a pedestrian overpass at Route 36. The BRAC Committee funding sources for Fort Lee infrastructure improvements will not fund a vehicular overpass for Route 36.

Mr. Morris asked if it was possible that a vehicular bridge crossing could satisfy base needs for connecting the northern and southern portions.

Mr. Constantine stated the footprint of a vehicular bridge would be larger than a pedestrian bridge and would have implications for space requirements for new facilities. Mr. Constantine indicated facility plans are in place.

Mr. Royster stated it would be likely the pedestrian bridge would be constructed before a project to relocate Route 36 could be developed.

Mr. Morris asked if funds were found to construct a vehicular bridge would this not disrupt construction plans.

Mr. Constantine asked for information on the dimensions for a vehicular bridge crossing in order to enter this change into the design process being used at Fort Lee for base expansion.

Mr. Svejkovsky indicated Baker could provide Fort Lee with estimates on the dimensions for a vehicular bridge.

Mr. Curtis reviewed project improvement recommendations contained in the 3 tables, including options for several improvement alternatives. Mr. Curtis indicated Baker recommended priorities were based on traffic considerations and information provided by Fort Lee on the timing of facility construction on-base.
Mr. Curtis indicated the Technical Committee may want to rearrange the priorities recommended by Baker.

Mr. Morris asked Fort Lee to provide a list of their transportation improvement priorities.

Mr. Constantine stated Fort Lee improvement priorities are as follows:
1. Shop Road Gate
2. 3rd Lane on Hickory Hill Road
3. Signal at River Road
4. A Avenue Gate
5. Phasing Signal at Lee Gate
6. Route 36 Realignment
7. Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) at Route 36 & Temple Avenue (Option 2)

Mr. Constantine indicated Fort Lee needs to know local priorities for these improvements and emphasized other military facilities are further along with development of requests to the Defense Road Access Program.

Mr. Curtis added VDOT is updating the preliminary project cost estimates currently listed in the report.

After a period of discussion regarding the need for signal improvement at Hickory Hill Road & Route 460 and improvements to Hickory Hill Road between Route 460 and Mahone Gate in relation to the amount of grant funds anticipated to be applied for under the current funding cycle administered by the Virginia National Defense Industrial Authority, Ms. Smith made a motion seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, that application be made for funding these projects by the Crater Planning District Commission using FY 2007 and FY 2008 RSTP funds shifted from the Route 1 project in Dinwiddie County as the required 50% matching funds.

Mr. Svejkovsky asked Fort Lee representatives to provide information on future traffic anticipated for Shop Gate Road and indicated the Technical Committee needs to consider the priority order of the improvements in the 3 tables.

Mr. Scheid stated he wanted it made clear that Dinwiddie was in agreement with the shifting of RSTP funds as long as the funds shifted to the Hickory Hill projects would be replaced with future RSTP allocations for the Route 1 project.

Mr. Varney stated it was important that PE work on the Route 1 project not be impacted.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:15 a.m.