

Feasibility Study of Additional Corridors from the HRCS SEIS

The comments on the Guidance for Scope of Work from the City of Portsmouth are provided below for your review and consideration.

1. This feasibility study is an independent project. It should have its own “name” or “title” to distinguish it from the HRCS SEIS.
2. This project will require dedicated and extensive time, resources, etc. The results from the feasibility study will shape the future of regional transportation projects in the future. Therefore, it should have an independent project manager.
3. The feasibility study should be based on a detailed analysis of the proposed road segments. To ensure a thorough analysis, a full list of road segments should be established instead of relying on predetermined routes and corridors. Current data, specifically traffic data, should be used throughout. The working group should also have a discussion concerning the model to provide an opportunity have certain questions answered to develop a level of comfort with the tool.
4. The scope of work should identify the basis of design for which all the road segments will be compared. It is recommended that all road segments are analyzed using interstate standards. As part of this comparison, the road segments should be examined to determine if they can be constructed to the standard in the basis of design and include requirements for stormwater management, soundwalls, etc. (constructability analysis)
5. The scope of work should clearly define the tolling concepts and scenarios. Modelling scenarios that do not include tolls are incomplete and flawed given the current impacts of the VDOT contract with ERC. Note that this may require that the region develop a policy on tolling.
6. The scope of work should define the term “financial feasibility”. The intent of this study is to inform the LRTP for the region. The LRTP is required to be fiscally constrained. What happens with projects that do not meet HRTF funding standards? Will public private partnerships be considered?
7. The scope of work should clearly identify environmental considerations. What is the nature of the various wetland impacts? What are the real mitigation factors? What are the impacts to property based on the constructability analysis?
8. The scope of work should identify the standard assumptions and define the fatal flaws based on the basis of design, financial feasibility, and environmental considerations.
9. What is the impact of the CTB action referencing “appropriate access options” for Craney Island? The feasibility study should ensure that a full list of segments for Craney Island is analyzed. Those segments should be studied jointly and independently as necessary.
10. What are the impacts for the Port? What is the real completion date for the proposed terminal expansion at Craney Island?
11. The stakeholders should include Homeland Security (US Coast Guard). They are not technically classified as military but are very critical to these projects considering the impact on waterways, design, permitting, etc. as well as the potential impacts to their own installation.