

**I-95/395 HOT Lanes PPTA**  
Advisory Panel Meeting Agenda  
July 26, 2005  
7:00 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

Attendees:

Mr. John A. Rollison III  
Mr. Charles Badger  
Ms. Julia A. Connally  
Ms. Katherine K Hanley  
Mr. Alfred H. Harf  
Mr. Malcolm T. Kerley, P.E  
Mr. Ron Kirby  
Mr. Dennis Morrison  
Mr. Zeanious "Zeke" Newcomb  
Mr. Dave Ogle  
Mr. Robert E. Sevila  
Mr. Brian Smith  
Mr. Dan Tangherlini

1. Approval of July 12, 2005 Minutes – Chair and discussion of the evening agenda

Minutes of July 12, 2005 approved. Responses from Clark-Shirley and Fluor-Transurban to Panel members are supplemental to the minutes.

Meeting time for the September 21 meeting has changed to begin at 6:00 p.m. at the Ferlazzo Building in Prince William. The change to the agenda is due to the addition of the financial presentation on the proposals.

2. Environmental Evaluation of Proposals - VDOT Chief of Policy, Planning and the Environment

Mr. Tom Hawthorne presented an evaluation of the environmental process proposed by the proposers as related to the federal regulations. Briefly discussed the elements of each proposal's environmental plan. Ultimately, FHWA will make a decision regarding the environmental process that will be used for the project. A copy of presentation included with the minutes of the 7/26/05 meeting.

Questions from the Panel members:

*How far can the project develop, such as preliminary engineering, prior to an environmental decision?*

Only as much related to the environmental process. Tier process is a variable that could speed up the process.

*Does VDOT have a sense of risk associated with the project?*

Both projects are similar in their investment in the corridor and cognizant of regulations such as the environmental review process. From a NEPA standpoint, we feel that there is minimal risk with either proposal.

*What is the public participation in the environmental process?*

Once the draft environmental impact study is completed, there is a public participation process to evaluate the study and impacts associated.

*What is it about the Clark-Shirley proposal requiring special consideration?*

SEP-15 proposed as an option requiring its own provisions.

*Are the plans for 495 and 95/395 coordinated?*

Yes

*With the concept of the Tier process being proposed, can some segments move forward?*

Under the Tier concept, yes. Under the Clark-Shirley proposal, segments would move forward, and others would be under review within the process.

*A brief discussion ensued regarding the term ‘independent utility’ for the environmental process and the role/decision of FHWA with the project.*

### 3. Maintenance and Operations Evaluation of Proposals – VDOT Chief of System Operations

Ms. Connie Sorrell began the presentation about some of the current issues in the corridor beginning with discussions with VDOT and FHWA regarding hybrids and HOV regulations in the corridor. The lack of traffic data limits the discussion regarding operations. She continued with an assessment of operations, maintenance and the provision of safety service responses to areas with design exceptions, ITS, technology and toll collections. A copy of presentation is included with the minutes of the 7/26/05 meeting.

Questions from the Panel members:

*With the lack of traffic data being provided, is there any information available regarding the various segments of the project?*

Not known, information not provided.

*No information was provided regarding the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge regarding existing condition.*

True

*Is the lack of information available considered a fatal flaw in moving these projects forward?*

No, it's just that the information was not provided.

*Was information provided regarding motorist's needs and communication in the corridor?*

It would certainly be part of the agreement that follows.

*Is there more enforcement capacity in the corridor that can be purchased?*

VDOT recently increased the enforcement level in the corridor. Manpower is an issue as is availability of areas where enforcement can take place. Photo enforcement will be an important part of the future corridor.

*What does VDOT do if they do not improve the corridor to increase the capacity and operations in the corridor?*

We are working everyday to improve the corridor.

*Do design exceptions exist in the corridor?*

There are situations that exist in the corridor that met design standards then, but are substandard today. Design exceptions to the current standards would require concurrence from the Chief Engineer and FHWA.

4. Engineering Evaluation of Proposals – VDOT Division Administrator, Innovative Project Delivery Division.

Mr. Tom Pelnik directed the Panel members to his presentation contained in the notebooks provided. A copy of the presentation is included with the minutes of the 7/26/05 meeting. Mr. Pelnik talked about commonalities between the proposals, and differences that exist.

Questions from the Panel members:

*Regarding the costs of the projects, are they within the expected range for this type of work?*

As discussed, they are slightly high, and high, but subject to finalization later in the stage at negotiation.

*What is the perception of risk?*

We have not done a risk assessment, and won't do so until we get to the contract development process.

*The two proposals differ south of Route 17, has anyone looked at the future value of these proposals in the corridor?*

Not specifically

*What confidence do you have that the proposed access points are part of the overall cost or "options"?*

I believe that the proposed access points are part of the proposed finance plan and cost. Refer to the presentation page 6.

*Looking at the differences between the proposals, do you see a challenge to maintain traffic during construction?*

We have not assessed this issue.

5. Break

6. Panel Discussion, Concerns, Questions – Chair

- Concerned that either of these proposals are the answer to the corridor however something needs to be done.
- Concerned how these proposals fit the needs of the corridor beyond 10 years.
- Still have concerns regarding maintenance, operations and policies.
- Believe both proposals add capacity to the corridor.
- Believe that the multi-modal aspect of the proposals are encouraging.
- Concerned about safety and enforcement and feel confident they will be addressed in the future.

- Would like additional information regarding how the proposers determined where the proposed entry/exit points are located. What criteria was used?
- Very concerned regarding enforcement and operations.
- Need to be sure we look at the corridor rather than geographic focus. Both teams have tried very hard to integrate their proposals into the corridor.
- Very concerned about the northern terminus of the proposals that serves the people coming into the city on their journey to work.
- Issues have surfaced tonight that need further analysis and look forward to upcoming discussions i.e. investments at the southern end, number of entry/exits, the issue of independent utility for the project.
- Would look forward to the discussion regarding transit operations and future investment of the revenue generated in the corridor.
- Would like additional information regarding the issue of safety and design exceptions.
- Need to be sure that there is maintenance of traffic plan during constructions.
- Looking forward to the financial presentation.
- With technology changing so rapidly, need to be sure that the systems work together.
- Looking forward to the upcoming review of the transit plan and revenue stream that supports it.
- Can't sit still, need to move forward in some direction – the 95 corridor is an incredible challenge.
- On page 4 of the environmental presentation, would like more information regarding noise abatement.
- On the same slide, need to be in both of the planning documents for the regional MPO's.
- Would like more information regarding the tiered process and risk associated.
- On page 6 of the entry/exit information, would like more information about the design detail and how they operate.

- Compliance with NEPA is required, and we will do that.
- Would like a brief presentation of how the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge will operate under the concepts of the proposals....general purpose lanes as well as HOV/HOT lanes.

7. Note: public comment was not received at this meeting.

#### Presentations/Handouts

- Policy, Planning and the Environment Presentation:



395 ppta (2).ppt

- Maintenance and Operations Presentation:



Systems Operations  
PPTA Presen...

- Engineering Presentation:



I-95\_AdvisoryPanel  
\_Meeting 2\_t...



95PP\_EngEvaluatio  
n\_combined\_tw...