Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission
Funding Strategies Advisory Committee

August 26, 2016
9:30 AM – 11:30 AM
The Regional Building Conference Room D/E, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia 23320

AGENDA

9:30 am
1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment Period
   Limit 5 minutes per individual
3. Minutes of the February 16, 2016 FSAC Meeting
   (Attachment 3)
   Recommended Action: Approval
4. Draft SEIS Alternatives - HRTAC Plan of Finance Scenarios
   Discussion/Workshop with Executive Director Page and PFM Consultant
   David Miller
   Recommended Action: Set Direction on Next Steps to HRTAC and Consultant Staff
5. New Business
6. Next Meeting:
   September 13, 2016 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
   The Regional Building Board Room B
   723 Woodlake Drive
   Chesapeake, VA 23320
6. Adjournment
The Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC) Funding Strategies Advisory Committee Meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m. in the HRTPO Regional Board Room B located at 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

**HRTAC Technical Advisory Committee Members in Attendance:**
Neal Crawford, Chair
Jody Wagner, Vice Chair
James Koch
Harry Lester
W. Sheppard Miller, III *
Alan Witt

**HRTAC Executive Director**
Kevin Page

**Other Participants:**
Tom Inglima
David Miller
Camelia Ravanbakht
James Utterback

**HRTAC Technical Advisory Committee Members Absent:**
Stacy Cummings
Alan Parrott
Joe Frank

* Denotes Late Arrival or Early Departure

**Others Recorded Attending:**
Dianna Howard, Frank Papcin, Donna Sayegh (Citizens); Lynn Allsbrook (HA); Jeffrey Raliski (NO); Scott Forehand, Don Quisenberry (eScribeSolutions); George Consolvo (Kaufman & Canoles); Karen McPherson (McPherson Consulting); Tony Gibson (VDOT); Jordan Pascale (Virginian-Pilot); Amber Randolph (Wilcox & Savage); Danetta Jankosky, Nancy Collins (HRPDC); Rob Case, Dale Stith, Chris Vaigneur (HRTPO)

**Call to Order**
Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission Funding Strategies Advisory Committee Chair Neal Crawford called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

**Public Comment Period (limit 5 minutes per individual)**
Mr. Frank Papcin stated his belief that tolls punish people for where they live and work. He added that tolls control people by forcing those less affluent to seek non-tolled routes. He contended that HOV lanes do not work, requested that alternatives be considered, and noted that the role of HRTAC is transportation—not control.
Ms. Donna Sayegh informed the body of her attendance at General Assembly sessions. She opined that the Port has influence on tolling and shared her concern regarding tax credits for big corporations and the federal government involvement in local issues.

**Minutes of the December 15, 2015 and January 19, 2016 FSAC Meetings**
Mr. James Koch **Moved** to approve the minutes of the December 15, 2015 and January 19, 2016 FSAC meetings; seconded by Mr. Alan Witt. **The Motion carried and the minutes were approved.**

**HRTAC Plan of Finance – Update /Discussion**
Executive Director Kevin Page reviewed important points regarding the status and progress of the FSAC and HRTAC along with close work with Dr. Camellia Ravanbakht and Robert Crum from TPO.

- HRTAC charged with developing a six year funding plan
- Is empowered to procure finance for road, bridge, and tunnel projects
- Six scenarios with variations of tolling examined
- Nine projects offered by TPO
- Funding sources identified by FSAC
- Transportation Improvement Programs maintained by CTB
- CTB authorized to select locally preferred alternatives

Mr. Page announced that the goal is to make a recommendation to the Commission and to conduct a public hearing on March 14, 2016. He proposed that Chair Crawford for the next meeting consider an agenda item to discuss findings and public comments. Mr. Page reported that the results of his discussions around the region show interest in continuing to develop project readiness and especially the High Rise Bridge. He did point out two unknowns: (1) the outcome of the SEIS for harbor crossings and (2) General Assembly legislation on tolls and gas taxes.

Mr. David Miller presented a six year funding program and pointed out that it includes no financing, but is a Pay/Go funding plan.

Mr. Shepperd Miller asked for assurance of his interpretation that the plan is for three projects and a study: I-64 widening, I-264 interchange, and the High Rise Bridge all together and leaving 266/267 million dollars for future projects. He also asked if HB2 was still undecided. Mr. David Miller indicated that he is correct on all points.

Mr. Shepperd Miller questioned VDOT funding, and Mr. James Utterback responded that 100 million dollars was in the plan. Mr. Shepperd Miller wondered whether it was a fair
statement that the FSAC is recommending to continue work on some projects with existing funds and figure out the rest later, and Mr. David Miller agreed.

Chair Crawford noted that the FSAC told HRTAC that a plan would be presented at their next meeting.

Mr. Shepperd Miller expressed his concern that the region should have a stronger voice in how the money is spent.

Dr. Koch questioned accuracy of estimates of regionally generated revenue and that if revenues decrease, which projects would be eliminated. Mr. David Miller suggested more than likely the last project started would be eliminated.

Mr. Page pointed out that HRTAC does have bonding capacity.

Mr. David Miller continued with the results of examination of projects which might be accomplished by 2040. He discussed harbor crossings, a bifurcated High Rise Bridge project, and other candidate projects. He spoke about bond issuance and HOT lane scenarios and noted the conclusion that it would take a long time to complete all nine projects.

Chair Crawford asked if there would be tolling in the six year plan and why there was a bifurcation of the High Rise Bridge project. Mr. Utterback explained that without assurance of the ability to do a harbor crossing, it was felt that the High Rise Bridge project could be accomplished in phases. Mr. David Miller pointed out the High Rise Bridge project could be developed as HOT or not.

Mr. Shepperd Miller asked if he was accurate in stating that phase one would represent a new two lane bridge ending up with six lanes. Mr. Utterback clarified that a new bridge would carry four lanes of traffic, two general and two managed with an eventual total of eight lanes, four in each direction. Mr. Miller asked about the bridge height, and Mr. Utterback expects 100 foot.

Mr. Miller asked if managed lanes is the same as HOT lanes, and Mr. Utterback stated it could be HOV or HOT. Mr. Miller noted that HOT was more expensive due to the technology and though it returned net negative revenue. Mr. David Miller stated that it was positive net revenue but not enough to pay incremental cost of connector construction. Mr. Shepperd Miller opined that the purpose of HOT lanes is not financial revenue generation, but traffic management.

Ms. Jodi Wagner shared concern that initial planning did not produce enough revenue and questioned whether legislative leaders are capable of passing legislation to improve the situation. Mr. Page expressed optimism regarding legislators finding a way to provide Hampton Roads with a high quality transportation network.
Mr. Page questioned whether the information presented is sufficient for Dr. Ravanbakht to share with TPO. She stated that it was sufficient but that she needs to have HRTAC endorsement.

Mr. Shepperd Miller noted that FSAC is not recommending any bonds or toll revenue—it is 100% Pay-Go. He suggested that everyone encourage decision-makers to keep the projects in mind and that the plan is good but does not get the ultimate problem fixed.

Mr. Utterback interjected with a suggestion that how to start a harbor crossing in 2018 be a consideration.

Chair Crawford thanked him for his comments, added that he shared sentiments of Ms. Wagner and Mr. Miller, and noted that the FSAC was trying to make some progress. He offered hope that changes may occur and thus affording the possibility of beginning larger projects.

Mr. Inglima added that absent a mandate from HRTAC, the plan works with available money. Mr. Shepperd Miller stated that he was uncomfortable without a clear mandate.

Chair Crawford stated that the FSAC will again ask for specific direction from HRTAC.

Mr. Shepperd Miller Moved to present the six year plan to HRTAC and request a public hearing for discussion of the projects; seconded by Mr. Koch. The Motion carried.

**Next Meeting**
The next HRTAC Funding Strategies Advisory Committee meeting is March 15, 2016 at 9:30 a.m.

**Adjournment**
With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission Funding Strategies Advisory Committee, the meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

_______________________________
Neal Crawford
HRTAC Technical Advisory Committee Chair
Hampton Roads SEIS

• VDOT and FHWA have released the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to reevaluate the Hampton Roads Crossing Study.

• HRTAC continues to advance project finance
  • Funding setout for first phase in approved 2016-2022 funding plan – A long range view of all 9 projects developed in February 2016 needs to be updated
  • Bond Counsel engaged to begin bond validation work
  • Plan of Finance Consultant is developing funding scenarios based on the SEIS Alternatives
Road sections that comprise the alternatives retained for analysis
Alternative A

- Includes improvements to I-64 between I-664 and I-564
- Would result in a consistent six-lane facility
- Improvements to HRBT would be largely confined to existing right of way
- Cost - $3.3B in 2016 dollars with a 40% Contingency
- 2034 Est VMT – 56,556,700
Alternative B

Includes:

• I-64/HRBT, I-564, I-564 Connector, Route 164 Connector, Route 164
• Cost - $6.6B in 2016 dollars with a 40% Contingency
• 2034 Est VMT – 56,767,200
Alternative C

Includes:
• I-664, I-664/I-564 Connectors, I-564, Route 164 Connector
• Includes dedicated transit lanes
• Cost - $12.5B in 2016 dollars with a 40% Contingency
• 2034 Est VMT – 56,816,500
Alternative D

- Includes all components of Alternatives B and C
- Applies a more narrow footprint than Alternative C
- The different footprint allows for more information and options to be available to the study
- Cost - $11.9B in 2016 dollars with a 40% Contingency
- 2034 Est VMT – 57,040,800
## HRTAC Funding Plan

### HRTAC 2016-2022 Funding Plan

**HRTAC Program Level Spreadsheet**

Approved March 17, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Drawdowns</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>HRTAC Funding</th>
<th>HB2 Funding</th>
<th>VDOT Funding</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2018</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2019</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2020</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2021</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg I - UPC 106505</td>
<td>$122,551,685</td>
<td>$22,551,685</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>($28,429,982)</td>
<td>$54,657,495</td>
<td>$36,976,631</td>
<td>$51,487,571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg II - UPC 106665</td>
<td>$189,707,675</td>
<td>$134,303,320</td>
<td>$54,804,115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$41,286,868</td>
<td>$69,160,055</td>
<td>$56,831,351</td>
<td>$14,429,401</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg III - UPC 106489</td>
<td>$311,303,820</td>
<td>$221,207,975</td>
<td>$90,195,845</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$54,600,000</td>
<td>$59,958,448</td>
<td>$53,167,598</td>
<td>$101,050,818</td>
<td>($58,816,017)</td>
<td>($5,810,993)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/264 - UPC 57048 (Phase I)</td>
<td>$157,142,416</td>
<td>$152,094,716</td>
<td>$5,047,700</td>
<td>($5,054,702)</td>
<td>($18,201,817)</td>
<td>($49,211,271)</td>
<td>($58,130,306)</td>
<td>($26,544,320)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/264 - UPC 17630 (Phase II)</td>
<td>$190,031,747</td>
<td>$178,428,847</td>
<td>$11,602,900</td>
<td>($14,240,679)</td>
<td>($18,162,221)</td>
<td>($32,199,910)</td>
<td>($38,592,666)</td>
<td>($31,000,000)</td>
<td>($31,000,000)</td>
<td>($24,836,271)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Southside High Rise Br - UPC 106692 (Phase I)</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($341,708)</td>
<td>($19,658,292)</td>
<td>($150,000,000)</td>
<td>($190,000,000)</td>
<td>($190,000,000)</td>
<td>($50,000,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Southside High Rise Br - UPC 106692 (Phase II)</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($541,708)</td>
<td>($19,658,292)</td>
<td>($150,000,000)</td>
<td>($190,000,000)</td>
<td>($190,000,000)</td>
<td>($50,000,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Roads Crossing Study - UPC 106724 (SEIS)</td>
<td>$6,352,527</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$6,352,527</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($1,875,000)</td>
<td>($2,500,000)</td>
<td>($1,977,527)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Projects

- Harbor Crossing Project (Phase I) | $266,647,109 | $266,647,109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
- Ft Eustis Interchange - UPC 106700 | TBD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
- I-64 Southside-High Rise Br - Phase II | TBD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
- Rte 460/58/13 Connector | TBD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
- I-64/I-264 Interchange (Phase III) | TBD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### Total Yearly Costs

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $1,843,736,979 | $1,575,733,852 | $145,000,000 | $123,003,127

### Total VDOT SYIP Funding

$32,376,717 | $81,000,000 | $5,626,410 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

### Projected HRTAC Revenue

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- Total: $1,677,560,513 | $388,335,811 | $166,300,000 | $171,900,000 | $177,950,000 | $184,150,000 | $190,700,000 | $197,550,000 | $200,674,702 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### Total Funding

$420,712,528 | $664,019,113 | $741,207,859 | $621,801,559 | $343,504,432 | $268,863,113 | $284,362,275 | $375,284,689 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

### Residual Cash Flow

$366,645,457 | $509,377,420 | $406,629,992 | $241,823,684 | $78,163,113 | $86,812,275 | $174,609,987 | $101,826,662 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

* Planning Level Cost Estimate - $180M to include 8 lane widening
** Planning Level Cost Estimate - $800M - $1.0B
*** Anticipated HB2 Funds Pending CTB approval and award of funding June 2016
**** Previous revenues reflect HRTF ending balance on 12/31/2015
Latest HRTF revenue forecast from FY 2016 to FY 2022 received February 26, 2016
Assume equal amounts of revenues collected in two semi-annual periods for each FY.

*Updated Cost Based Upon Contract Award*

*Construction Phase*

*Estimate Still Under Development*

*Added by PFM*

*Adjusted to VDOT Comments 3/4/16*
HRTAC 9 Project Plan to be Updated

HRTAC Regional Financing Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total PV Cost</th>
<th>Funded by</th>
<th>Funded by</th>
<th>Funded by</th>
<th>Funded by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg I</td>
<td>$117,818</td>
<td>$15,010</td>
<td>$9,222</td>
<td>$5,136</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg II</td>
<td>$117,818</td>
<td>$15,010</td>
<td>$9,222</td>
<td>$5,136</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/364 Interchange (Phase I)</td>
<td>$123,190</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Crossing Project (Phase II)</td>
<td>$8,421</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$3,545</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
(1) Inflated annual costs for I-64 Widening Segments, I-64/364 Interchange, High Rise Bridge Phase I and HRC Study were provided by VDOT in February 2016.

(2) Uninflated costs in 2015 dollars for HCF Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III and Rt 460/55/13 Connector were provided by CH2M HILL in October 2015 assuming no direct connectors; these costs are used for HOT Tolling scenarios and used as a proxy for General Purpose lanes in No Toll scenarios.

(3) For High Rise Bridge Phase I, assume $1 billion in 2015 dollars and construction takes 4 years.

(4) Latest HRTFC revenue forecast through FY 2022 released in December 2015 ($204.3M in FY 2022); PMT extrapolated the projection from FY 2023 to FY 2045 based on revenue growth rate derived from the prior forecast released in September 2015 that is extended to FY 2045 ($382.2M in FY 2045); from FY 2046 and onwards, assume sales tax revenue increase by 3.5% and fuels tax revenue increase by 5%.

(5) S625M H82 funding in future dollars available – see “2040 HRTF Forecasted Revenues” prepared by HRTFC, confirmed via email by HRTFPO on 1/5/2016 and by VDOT on 2/11/2016; $145M allocated for I-64 Widening Segments (dollar for dollar match); the remaining H82 funding per-rate allocated to I-64/364 Interchange Phase II, High Rise Bridge Phase I and HCF.

(6) S123M VDOT SP funds in future dollars available through 2017.

(7) TIFIA loan is the only toll revenue pledge debt; preliminary toll revenue projection provided by CDV Smith in October 2015.

Prepared by PMT as of 2/15/2016
5. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary summarizes information contained in the Hampton Roads Crossing Study (HRCS) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). Specifically, this summary discusses the history of the study, alternatives considered, environmental effects of the alternatives, temporary construction effects, and next steps for the study. The summary is presented in question and answer format and includes commonly asked questions regarding the study.

1. WHAT IS AN EIS?

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is a document required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that takes into consideration the effects of a Federal agency’s proposed action on the environment. NEPA requires Federal agencies to prepare an EIS when an action they are proposing has the potential to significantly affect the environment. An EIS identifies the purpose and need for the action; considers alternatives to meet the Purpose and Need; describes the affected environment; and analyzes the environmental consequences of the alternatives.

2. WHAT IS A SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND WHY IS IT NEEDED?

Following completion of an EIS, and prior to the implementation or construction of the Preferred Alternative, new information or changes to the project may arise that have significant impacts on the environment that had not been previously considered. When this happens, the EIS is required to be supplemented. The resulting SEIS introduces up-to-date information, reconsiders alternatives, as necessary, and identifies potential mitigation for new adverse impacts. In addition, the public is afforded opportunities to review the new information and provide input before any final decisions are made.

3. WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF THE HRCS?

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 allocated funds for highway projects demonstrating innovative techniques of highway construction and finance. The Interstate 64 (I-64) crossing of Hampton Roads was included as one of the innovative projects. A Major Investment Study (MIS) of the I-64 crossing of Hampton Roads was completed in 1997. The MIS documented an initial review of alternatives to reduce congestion at the I-64 crossing. Following the MIS, the HRCS Draft EIS (DEIS) and Final EIS (FEIS) were published in 1999 and 2001, respectively, documenting the preferred alternative. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in 2001, completing the NEPA process. Other studies were completed to further evaluate potential Hampton Roads crossing improvements. In 2003 FHWA and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) completed a re-evaluation of the FEIS that analyzed implementing a portion of the preferred alternative. That re-evaluation validated the previous decisions. In 2011 FHWA and VDOT issued an Environmental Assessment (EA)/Re-evaluation of the HRCS FEIS covering the segments of the preferred alternative including the I-664 Connector, the I-564 Connector, and the VA 164 Connector. The Re-evaluation was not advanced due to fiscal constraints; no ROD was prepared. In 2012 FHWA and VDOT published the Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel (HRBT) DEIS. The DEIS evaluated options for improvements to I-64 between Hampton and Norfolk. The DEIS found that the Retained Alternatives would result in high impacts to historic and private properties. High impacts, along with lack of public and political support, led FHWA to rescind the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the project. In 2013 the 2011 EA was revised but the FHWA never made a final decision before the
decision to prepare a SEIS was made. This SEIS is being prepared in part due to the time that has lapsed since the 2001 FEIS. Environmental regulations and conditions in the Hampton Roads region and have changed substantially during the fifteen years that passed since the FEIS was completed, resulting in the need for a thorough reevaluation. Additionally, the preparation of this SEIS has been supported by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

4. WHAT AREA DOES THE PROPOSED STUDY COVER?

The study covers the metropolitan region known as “Hampton Roads” in southeastern Virginia. The Study Area Corridors span several local jurisdictions including the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Suffolk.

5. WHO IS LEADING THE STUDY?

FHWA is the lead federal agency for the NEPA study. VDOT is the lead state agency.

6. WHAT ARE STUDY AREA CORRIDORS AND HOW WERE THEY DEVELOPED?

The Study Area Corridors are buffers around the existing and proposed road corridors which comprise the different alternatives. The Study Area Corridors capture the natural, cultural and social resources that may be impacted by improvements to those corridors. The Study Area Corridors are sufficiently wide to account for any needed right-of-way and construction impacts, while providing flexibility for efforts to avoid and minimize those impacts. The Study Area Corridors are generally defined as 250 feet on either side of the centerlines of I-64, I-564, I-664, Route 164, and proposed new location alignments. Areas around the interchanges included in the Study Area Corridors vary based on the anticipated footprint of proposed modifications; for instance, the new and existing interchanges where more extensive improvements are anticipated have larger boundaries.

7. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES ARE INVOLVED IN THE STUDY?

Other agencies include Cooperating Agencies and Participating Agencies. Cooperating Agencies are agencies other than a lead agency that have jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental resource impacted by the project. The following agencies have accepted invitations to be Cooperating Agencies: City of Hampton, City of Newport News, City of Norfolk, City of Portsmouth, City of Virginia Beach, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), USACE, US Coast Guard (USCG), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the US Navy. Participating Agencies are those with an interest in the project. Several dozen Federal and state agencies and groups, as well as the localities within and adjacent to the Study Area Corridors, have served as Participating Agencies for the study. A complete list of the agencies and their role in the study is provided in the Coordination Plan (Appendix C). A copy of the Agency Correspondence received to date is included in Appendix D.

8. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE HRCS AND WHY IS IT NEEDED?

The purpose of the HRCS is to consider alternatives that relieve congestion at the I-64 HRBT in a manner that improves accessibility, transit, emergency evacuation, and military and goods movement along the primary transportation corridors in the Hampton Roads region, including the I-64, I-664, I-564, and Route 164 corridors. The HRCS addresses the following needs:
Accommodate travel demand – capacity is inadequate on the Study Area Corridors, contributing to congestion at the HRBT;
Improve transit access – the lack of transit access across the Hampton Roads waterway;
Increase regional accessibility – limited number of water crossings, inadequate highway capacity, and severe congestion decrease accessibility;
Address geometric deficiencies – insufficient vertical and horizontal clearance at the HRBT contribute to congestion;
Enhance emergency evacuation capability – increase capacity for emergency evacuation, particularly at the HRBT;
Improve strategic military connectivity – congestion impedes military movement missions; and,
Increase access to port facilities – inadequate access to interstate highway travel in the Study Area Corridors impacts regional commerce.

9. WHAT ALTERNATIVES HAVE BEEN CARRIED FORWARD FROM PREVIOUS STUDIES?

Candidate Build Alternatives (CBA) 1, 2, and 9 from the 2001 FEIS have been modified and re-evaluated as Alternatives A, B, and C, respectively, in this Draft SEIS.

10. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED BUT NOT RETAINED FOR ANALYSIS?

The alternatives that were considered but not retained for further analysis in both the 2001 HRCS FEIS and the 2012 HRBT DEIS were re-examined for the Draft SEIS. Additional alternative concepts were also identified during the 2015 scoping period for this SEIS. The description of these alternatives and the reasons why they were not carried forward for detailed analysis are summarized in Chapter 2 of this Draft SEIS.

11. WHAT ALTERNATIVES ARE BEING CONSIDERED IN THIS DRAFT SEIS?

Five alternatives are under consideration in this Draft SEIS: the No-Build Alternative and four Build Alternatives. Modified versions of the alternatives retained for analysis in the 2001 FEIS are under consideration as part of this SEIS (Alternatives A, B, and C). In addition, a fourth alternative has been identified which captures elements of all alternatives (Alternative D).

Alternative A would create a consistent six-lane facility along I-64 from I-664 in Hampton to the I-564 interchange in Norfolk. A parallel bridge-tunnel would be constructed west of the existing I-64 HRBT; the tunnel width would match the expanded capacity on the approaches.

Alternative B would include all of the improvements included under Alternative A and also includes improvements along the existing I-564 corridor that extends from I-64 west across the Elizabeth River via a new bridge-tunnel. A new roadway would extend south from the new bridge-tunnel, along the east side of the Craney Island Dredged Material Management Area (CIDMMA), and connect to existing VA 164. VA 164 would be widened to I-664.

Alternative C would include improvements along I-564, across the Elizabeth River, and south to VA 164 that are included in Alternative B. However, this alternative does not include improvements to I-64 or VA 164. Instead, this alternative would continue west from I-564 over water and tie into I-664. This alternative would widen I-664 from I-64 in Hampton to I-264 in Chesapeake. A parallel bridge-tunnel would be constructed west of the existing Monitor-Merrimac Memorial Bridge-Tunnel (MMMBT); the tunnel width would match the expanded capacity on the approaches. Alternative C also converts the
HOV lanes along I-564 in Norfolk to transit only. The I-564 Connector and the I-664 Connector would be constructed with one transit-only lane in each direction. These transit-only lanes continue in each direction north along I-664 to the terminus with I-64 in Hampton.

Alternative D would include improvements to I-64 between Hampton and Norfolk with a new parallel bridge-tunnel west of the existing HRBT. It also includes improvements along the existing I-564 corridor from I-64 west across the Elizabeth River via a new bridge-tunnel. A new roadway would extend south from the new bridge-tunnel, along the east side of CIDMMA, and connect to existing VA 164. VA 164 would be widened to I-664. I-664 would be widened from Hampton to Chesapeake with a new parallel bridge-tunnel west of the existing MMMBT.

12. WHAT IS AN OPERATIONALLY INDEPENDENT SECTION?

Each alternative considered in this Draft SEIS can be implemented and built using operationally independent sections (OISs). The OISs are provided for analysis purposes so that when it comes time to identify a Preferred Alternative, identification of OISs may allow one alternative to incorporate less costly or less environmentally damaging sections, creating a hybrid alternative not currently considered. Decision-makers may employ this approach to advance an alternative that balances cost, impacts, and effectiveness while meeting the elements of Purpose and Need. More detail on OISs are provided in Chapter 2 of the Draft SEIS.

13. WHEN WILL A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE IDENTIFIED?

After the publication of this Draft SEIS, there will be a 45-day public comment period in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.10. This comment period will include Location Public Hearings that will provide an opportunity for the public to review and discuss the results of the study with study team members. Following the comment period, the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) will be briefed on the study; the alternative that FHWA, VDOT, and the Cooperating Agencies recommended as the Preferred Alternative; and the public and agency input that has been received to date. It is anticipated that following this briefing, the CTB will identify a Preferred Alternative. FHWA and VDOT will prepare a Final SEIS to document the Preferred Alternative and respond to substantive comments received on the Draft SEIS.

14. HOW WILL THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE IDENTIFIED?

Following the public comment period on the Draft SEIS, FHWA and VDOT will recommend to USACE the alternative the agencies believe should be identified as the Preferred Alternative and the preliminary Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). This recommendation will be informed by the data presented in the Technical Reports and Draft SEIS. It will also be based on input received from the public during the Citizen Information Meetings, Location Public Hearings, and associated comment periods and input from the Cooperating and Participating Agencies. This may provide sufficient information for USACE to determine the preliminary LEDPA. The LEDPA is not identified until a permit application is submitted. Identifying a preliminary LEDPA as this stage in project development provides support that the Preferred Alternative is permissible and can be implemented via individual projects/permits. Once USACE had concurred on this recommendation, it will be presented to the Cooperating Agencies for concurrence as the recommended Preferred Alternative. This recommendation will then be presented to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) for official action. If approved by the CTB, the Preferred Alternative will be carried forward to the Final SEIS.
15. COULD THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE A COMBINATION OF THE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN THE SEIS?

Consistent with the response to Question 11, the Preferred Alternative may be a combination of OISs from the different alternatives under consideration in order to balance cost, impacts, and the alternative’s ability to meet the Purpose and Need, resulting in a hybrid alternative not evaluated as a stand-alone alternative in the Draft SEIS. Should decision makers select a hybrid alternative as the Preferred Alternative, it will be fully documented in the Final SEIS. Depending on the nature of a hybrid alternative, if selected, public involvement opportunities may be offered to solicit additional public comment.

This Draft SEIS includes impact information broken down by OISs to inform the development of potential hybrid alternatives (Appendix A).

16. IS TRANSIT BEING CONSIDERED?

Each alternative retained for analysis in this SEIS accommodates transit. In some cases, as with Alternative C, this occurs through dedicated transit lanes and offers a competitive time advantage to transit operations. For other alternatives, transit operations occur in lanes open to other vehicles. Specific descriptions of how transit could operate under each alternative are included in Chapter 2 of this Draft SEIS. If appropriate, additional transit modeling would occur once the Preferred Alternative is identified and would be summarized in the Final SEIS.

During the initiation of the HRCS SEIS, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit (DRPT) and Hampton Roads Transit Agency provided preliminary ridership projections for rail and bus transit along the Study Area Corridors. As a result of this preliminary analysis, DRPT recommended that dedicated light rail transit should not continue to be studied. DRPT also noted that the results of the preliminary analysis supported continued study of high frequency Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service in a fixed guideway or in shared high occupancy vehicle (HOV) or high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. Therefore, BRT is the mode of transit considered in this Draft SEIS.

17. WILL THERE BE TOLLS?

The alternatives in the SEIS can accommodate general purpose lanes, HOV lanes, HOT lanes, or lanes tolled/managed in other ways. The traffic analysis for the Draft SEIS was based on general purpose lanes and in the case of Alternative C, general purpose lanes and dedicated transit lanes. If the identified Preferred Alternative includes a specific toll or management scenario, that scenario would be documented and analyzed in the Final SEIS. It should be noted that the identification of HOV, HOT, or toll management is not required to conclude the NEPA process. Such decisions could be made after the NEPA process, when more detailed design and cost estimating would occur.

18. HOW WOULD TRAFFIC ON THE HRBT AND MMBBT CHANGE?

The impact to traffic volumes on the HRBT and MMBBT depends on the alternative under consideration. In general, travel demand across Hampton Roads is projected to increase between now and 2040. This increased travel demand will result in increases in daily traffic on both the HRBT and the MMBBT even without any improvements (No Build alternative).
When capacity is added on either the HRBT or MMMBT, traffic will tend to shift to the facility with the most capacity. Under Alternatives A and B, the HRBT would see additional increases in traffic daily volume compared to No Build conditions, while traffic volumes on the MMMBT would decrease slightly. Conversely, traffic volumes would decrease on the HRBT and would increase on the MMMBT under Alternative C, compared to No Build conditions. Under Alternative D, which includes widening on both the HRBT and the MMMBT, the overall increase in traffic volumes would be spread between the two bridge-tunnels, and traffic volumes on both the HRBT and MMMBT are projected to be higher than those under No Build conditions.

19. WOULD REGIONAL TRAFFIC PATTERNS CHANGE?

Regional traffic patterns would change in concert with the shift in traffic between the HRBT and MMMBT, depending on where tunnel capacity is increased. In addition, local roadways that parallel the Study Area Corridors that would be widened under the project and currently accommodate spill-over traffic could experience traffic volume reductions as drivers gravitate to improved roadways with better travel conditions.

20. WHAT IMPACTS ARE ANTICIPATED TO RESULT FROM THE ALTERNATIVES?

Potential environmental consequences of the alternatives were estimated based on each alternative’s limit of disturbance (LOD). The LOD has been identified for alternative comparison purposes and decision-making during the NEPA process and would be further refined during final design. Proposed impacts of the alternatives are summarized in Table S-1. Values provided include both permanent and temporary impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>No-Build Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
<th>Alternative D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way number of properties (acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (0.5)</td>
<td>29 (0.6)</td>
<td>58 (1.9)</td>
<td>69 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (1.3)</td>
<td>10 (2.7)</td>
<td>23 (4.7)</td>
<td>23 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (0.9)</td>
<td>14 (54.8)</td>
<td>35 (104.2)</td>
<td>33 (94.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (2.8)</td>
<td>14 (113.3)</td>
<td>15 (117.7)</td>
<td>20 (120.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.6)</td>
<td>7 (22.5)</td>
<td>3 (23.2)</td>
<td>7 (22.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (1.1)</td>
<td>27 (23.9)</td>
<td>59 (44.1)</td>
<td>66 (44.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 (3.1)</td>
<td>29 (31.2)</td>
<td>8 (44.9)</td>
<td>30 (31.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Residential Relocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Commercial Relocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relocations*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Facilities # (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (22.4)</td>
<td>4 (162.9)</td>
<td>4 (168.1)</td>
<td>4 (163.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>No-Build Alternative</td>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Alternative B</td>
<td>Alternative C</td>
<td>Alternative D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Census Block Groups with Environmental Justice Populations Present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities (#)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Worship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>260.4</td>
<td>333.0</td>
<td>335.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>112.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>119.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Properties (#)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream Impacts (linear feet)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>547.9</td>
<td>547.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigable Waters (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>215.6</td>
<td>369.9</td>
<td>480.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained Navigable Channels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>119.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Protection Areas (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>127.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>213.3</td>
<td>213.3</td>
<td>313.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Roads Aquatic Habitat (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155.7</td>
<td>201.2</td>
<td>572.6</td>
<td>660.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benthic Communities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153.9</td>
<td>240.7</td>
<td>664.7</td>
<td>741.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Fish Habitat, Habitat Areas of Particular Concern, and Anadromous Fish Use Areas (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>214.3</td>
<td>565.4</td>
<td>636.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened &amp; Endangered Species Habitat (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>163.9</td>
<td>153.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Habitat (Forested Area) (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>177.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Short-term and minor, beneficial long-term impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Architecture Resources (#)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology Resources (#)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts (#)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>2,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>No-Build Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
<th>Alternative D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Minor Short-term Impacts</td>
<td>Minor Short-term Impacts</td>
<td>Minor Short-term Impacts</td>
<td>Minor Short-term Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Hazardous Materials Sites</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impacts</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Minor to moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Minor energy requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Right-of-Way data was gathered from each of the localities. Land use data was gathered from HRTP. *Other parcels include industrial, institutional, military, and open space.

21. HOW MUCH WILL EACH ALTERNATIVE COST?

The estimated construction costs of each alternative are provided by each alignment section that makes up the operationally independent sections of the alternatives. Detailed cost estimates are provided in Chapter 2 and summarized in Table S-2 below. The costs are in 2016 dollars and include a 40 percent contingency. Once a Preferred Alternative is identified, refinement of that alternative in the Final SEIS could result in updates to the costs presented in this Draft SEIS.

Table S-2: Alternative Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate Elements</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
<th>Alternative D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$3.0B</td>
<td>$5.9B</td>
<td>$11.2B</td>
<td>$10.6B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$237.6M</td>
<td>$487.4M</td>
<td>$857.9M</td>
<td>$809.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way and Utilities</td>
<td>$68.8M</td>
<td>$224.9M</td>
<td>$466.3M</td>
<td>$466.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$3.3B</td>
<td>$6.6B</td>
<td>$12.5B</td>
<td>$11.9B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. WHEN WILL THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE CONSTRUCTED?

There is no schedule for construction at this time, and there are a number of steps that would need to occur before construction could begin on a Preferred Alternative. Following the Draft SEIS and Location Public Hearings, a Preferred Alternative will be identified and a Final SEIS will be prepared. Before FHWA can issue its ROD for the project, funding will need to be identified to construct the project, and that funding will need to be programmed in the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization’s (HRTP) Long Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program, as well as the VDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Once a ROD is issued, decisions would be made on how the project funding will be procured. These decisions would affect the sequence and timing of subsequent steps like detailed design, acquisition of permits, right-of-way activities, and construction.
23. HOW HAS THE PUBLIC BEEN INVOLVED IN THE STUDY?

Public input has been solicited since the study began and will continue throughout the study process. As part of the NOI to prepare the SEIS (published in June 2015), FHWA solicited input on issues that should be considered in the study. At the same time, VDOT initiated scoping to gather information from a variety of local, state, and Federal agencies and the public. Two rounds of Citizen Information Meetings were held in July and December of 2015 to present the public with study information and to solicit feedback on the conduct of study, Purpose and Need, and alternatives to be retained for analysis. Email updates have been regularly sent to a study mailing list which includes citizens who have requested more information on the study. The project website, www.HamptonRoadsCrossingStudy.org, has been regularly updated with study information, public meeting materials, and various technical studies and documents. The website also provides the public with an option to submit comments to VDOT at any time. EPA issued a Notice of Availability for this Draft SEIS in the Federal Register to notify the public that the document is available for review and comment, and VDOT has used a number of strategies to notify the public of the document’s availability. VDOT will conduct Location Public Hearings within the 45-day comment period for the Draft SEIS and notify the public of the Hearing dates and locations via mailings and newspapers and project website notifications.

24. WHAT OPPORTUNITIES HAVE BEEN PROVIDED FOR AGENCIES TO BE ENGAGED IN THE STUDY?

At the onset of the study agencies and localities were invited to be Participating and Cooperating Agencies (see details provided in Appendix C [Coordination Plan]). FHWA and VDOT have held and will continue to hold regular meetings with the Cooperating Agencies to keep them informed and engaged as the study progresses. The Federal Cooperating Agencies have been asked to provide written concurrence on the various study elements including: Purpose and Need, Alternatives Considered, and the recommended Preferred Alternative/preliminary LEDPA. The Cooperating Agencies have reviewed drafts of the supporting technical documents and the preliminary Draft SEIS. VDOT and FHWA have also had a number of meetings with the Participating Agencies and have afforded them an opportunity to review and comment on the Purpose and Need of the project as well as the Alternatives Considered. Finally, VDOT has briefed other agencies, localities, and groups as the study has progressed (see Chapter 6 for more detail).

25. HOW CAN THE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS SUPPLEMENTAL EIS?

The public will be notified in local newspapers, other media outlets, and the Federal Register when the Draft SEIS is available for public review. Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.10 and 23 CFR 771.123(j), the public (including local, state and federal public agencies) will be provided at least 45 calendar days to review and provide comments on the Draft SEIS after the Federal Register notice. VDOT will also hold a Location Public Hearing approximately 30 days following the Federal Register notice pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.6(c) and 23 CFR 771.111(h). Comments may be submitted to VDOT electronically using the project website (www.HamptonRoadsCrossingStudy.org) or at the Location Public Hearing by oral testimony or written comment form. Additional information regarding how to comment will be included in the public notices.

All comments received during the 45-day comment period on the Draft SEIS, including at the Location Public Hearing, will be considered and all substantive comments will be addressed in the Final SEIS, which is scheduled for Spring 2017.
26. WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?

Following the publication of this Draft SEIS there will be a 45-day comment period in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.10. During this time the Draft SEIS will be made available for review and the results will be presented at the Location Public Hearings. Following the comment period, VDOT and FHWA will coordinate with USACE to identify the preliminary LEDPA. Once the agencies have agreed on the preliminary LEDPA, VDOT, FHWA, and the other Federal Cooperating Agencies will concur on the recommended preferred alternative. This recommendation will be presented to the CTB along with the study findings and input received on the Draft SEIS. If the CTB approves the Preferred Alternative, a Final SEIS will be prepared to document the Preferred Alternative and respond to substantive comments received on this Draft SEIS. Once funding is identified for the Preferred Alternative, FHWA will be in a position to issue a ROD.