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Timeline Recap
Major Investment Study & EIS

- **1994:** Develop new forecast model
- **1994:** Purpose and need approved
- **1995-96:** Corridor Study conducted
- **July 1997:** Selection of a locally preferred alternative by the MPO
- **Sept. 1997:** CTB endorsement of the MPO’s LPA
- **Oct. 1999:** Draft EIS approved
- **Early 2000:** Public Hearings
- **July 2000:** CTB approved Alternative 9
MIS Selection Criteria

• Important criteria for meeting purpose and need:
  ♦ Reduce volumes at HRBT by 10% or more
  ♦ Address existing and future regional O&D
  ♦ Connect ports and major freight corridors
  ♦ Connect to controlled access freeways
  ♦ Relative cost
  ♦ Relative ease of implementation
MIS concluded with Corridor 9 being selected by the MPO as the Locally Preferred Corridor
NEPA Process

- EIS must look at reasonable alternatives
- EIS alternatives include:
  - No-Build Alternative
  - Candidate Build Alternative 1: within I-64 corridor
    - Same as Corridor 1 in MIS
  - Candidate Build Alternative 2: I-64 corridor w/ VA 164 connector
    - New EIS alternative
  - Candidate Build Alternative 9: within I-664 corridor
    - Identical to Corridor 9 selected by MPO as the LPA
Candidate Build Alternative 1
Candidate Build Alternative 2
Multimodal Tube remains an Important Element
Opportunity to Move People

As a Busway - Could move as many people as 3-10 conventional lanes.

As a Light Rail System - Could move as many people as 4-16 conventional lanes.

As a Rapid Rail System - Could move as many people as 8-56 conventional lanes.
Additional Modal Opportunities to Consider During Design

- Could accommodate high speed rail
- Could accommodate heavy rail
- Details must be addressed in design phase
Current Overview
### Access to Major Port Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>CBA 1</th>
<th>CBA 2</th>
<th>CBA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New direct access to:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 4(^{th}) Marine Terminal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improves Access to:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNMT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Access to Naval Base Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBA 1</th>
<th>CBA 2</th>
<th>CBA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New direct access</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improves Access</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improves Access between NBN &amp; Naval Facilities in Portsmouth</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Issues

HRBT 2018 Peak Hour Per Lane Traffic Volumes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>CBA 1</th>
<th>CBA 2</th>
<th>CBA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-39%)</td>
<td>(-40%)</td>
<td>(-17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transportation Issues

### 2018 Daily Crossing Trips Between Peninsula & Southside:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>CBA 1</th>
<th>CBA 2</th>
<th>CBA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>243,000</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>244,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Trips per Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBA 1</th>
<th>CBA 2</th>
<th>CBA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,920,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>15,330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important Environmental Issues

- No environmental fatal flaws anticipated
- No Air Quality Violations
- Noise impacts can be mitigated
- Biological impacts can be mitigated
- Social impacts held to minimum
## Relocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBA 1</th>
<th>CBA 2</th>
<th>CBA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Power of God in You Church and Dickerson Court Community Center
Cost Estimate (1999 $)

- Candidate Build Alternative 1 - $1.2 Billion
- Candidate Build Alternative 2 - $2.0 Billion
- Candidate Build Alternative 9 - $2.7 Billion
Public Hearings
Hearings held in January and March 2000
Total of 135 people attended 3 hearings
96 Comment sheets received from public
# of People Favoring a Particular Alternative:
- No Build Alternative 8
- CBA 1 3
- CBA 2 5
- CBA 9 69
- Other 11
Preferred Alternative of Local Municipalities

- CBA 9 recommended by:
  - Chesapeake
  - Newport News
  - Norfolk
  - Portsmouth
  - Suffolk
  - Virginia Beach
  - Isle of Wight
CBA 9 also recommended by:

- Hampton Roads Transit
- Virginia Port Authority
- Hampton Roads Maritime Association
- Hampton Roads Partnership
- Norfolk Southern Corporation
Recommendation to CTB
(approved July 20, 2000)

• Advance CBA 9 to FEIS & Design
  ♦ Meets all criteria for purpose and need
  ♦ Best improves total mobility
    • More than 5 times above CBA 1
  ♦ Strong citizen and MPO support
  ♦ Can be constructed in usable segments
    • Each improving total mobility in Hampton Roads
CBA 9
-Stage Construction-

- Cost about $1.2 B
- Cost about $700 M
- Cost about $400 M
- Cost about $150 M
- Cost about $250 M
Schedule

- Location Approval: July 20, 2000
- FEIS: Fall 2000
- ROD: Fall-Winter 2000
- Next Step: Design