

#### **Meeting Minutes**

Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study Project No. 11-0845-007 2-21-2017

A Technical Committee Meeting was held at the Prince William County Offices, 5 County Complex Court, Woodbridge, VA on February 21, 2017 for the above referenced project. The following people were in attendance:

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Calvin O'Dell	City of Manassas Park	c.odell@manassasparkva.gov	703-335-0019
Robert Iosco	VDOT	Robert.losco@VDOT.Virginia.gov	703-259-2764
Tina Curtis	VDOT	Tina.Curtis@VDOT.Virginia.gov	703-259-2744
Dic Burke	VDOT	Richard.Burke@VDOT.Virginia.gov	703-366-1960
Terry Yates	VDOT	Terry.Yates@VDOT.Virginia.gov	703-259-2413
Steve Burke	City of Manassas	sburke@ci.manassas.va.us	703-257-8476
Brian Foster	City of Manassas	bfoster@ci.manassas.va.us	703-257-8226
Rick Canizales	Prince William County	rcanizales@pwcgov.org	703-792-7060
Paul Doku	Fairfax County	Paul.Doku@fairfaxcounty.gov	703-877-5716
James Beall	Fairfax County	James.Beall@fairfaxcounty.gov	
Christine Hoeffner	VRE	choeffner@vre.org	703-838-5442
Sree Nampoothiri	NVTA	Sree.Nampoothiri@thenovaauthority.org	703-642-4656
Rodney Hayzlett	JMT	rhayzlett@jmt.com	804-267-1269
Randy Boice	JMT	rboice@jmt.com	703-464-7862
Brian Curtis	JMT	bcurtis@jmt.com	804-267-1256
Sujith Racha	JMT	sracha@jmt.com	703-464-7745

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the updates on existing conditions report and analysis results; and to provide update on travel demand modeling performed to relieve congestion on Route 28 (Nokesville Road/Center Street/Church Street/Centreville Road) through the City of Manassas, the City of Manassas Park, and Yorkshire area of Prince William County. In addition, initial discussion on screening and modeling the preliminary alternatives was made. Finally, the meeting ended with updating the member list for the Executive Committee and selecting the topics to be presented in The Executive Committee Meeting.

The following items were discussed:

- 1. Sujith Racha discussed the updates on existing conditions document and analysis results that was put together for the study and received the following feedback from the committee members:
  - The technical committee recommended adjusting colorsrepresenting levels of service (LOS) on the operational analysis maps when presented to the Executive Committee.
    - VRE reached out to JMT after the meeting and recommended to include a high-level discussion of the purpose of the current corridor study in the existing conditions document.

## Technical Committee Meeting # 4



Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study

- o JMT responded saying that the "intent of the Existing Conditions Report is to document the observed conditions along the corridor and to show that our traffic models have been calibrated for use in screening the selected alternatives. The Existing Conditions Report is a section that will be incorporated into the overall study. The higher-level discussion on the purpose of the study will be included in the introductory section of the overall study document which is still in the early stages of development. Goals and objectives for the study was discussed during the second Technical Committee meeting for the study."
- The technical committee had formally accepted and approved the revised existing conditions document distributed at the meeting.
  - JMT will mark the existing conditions document as "approved by the Technical Committee on February 21, 2017" and a digital copy will be distributed to the technical committee along with these meeting minutes for filing purposes.
- 2. Sujith Racha provided the status update on the travel demand modeling for the study and received the following feedback from the committee members:
  - Results from the travel demand model without the Bi-County Parkway indicated approximately 5% reduction in ADTs' along Route 28 and the street network connecting to Route 28 which is very nominal. Therefore, Rick Canizales from Prince William County took a voting from the technical committee whether to use the MWCOG model directly or use the modified travel demand model without the Bi-County Parkway for alternative evaluation. Some members of the technical committee recommended the use of MWCOG model which includes the Bi-County Parkway to maintain consistency and consider the model as worst case scenario based on higher ADTs' along the project corridor. Below are the results of the voting conducted:

Agency	Use of MWCOG model for	
	alternative evaluation?	
Prince William County	No	
VDOT	Yes	
Fairfax County	Yes	
City of Manassas	Yes	
City of Manassas Park	Yes	
NVTA	Yes	
VRE	Abstain	

- Based on the voting results, JMT was directed to use the MWCOG model which included the Bi-County Parkway for alternative evaluation.
- Christine Hoeffner from VRE brought to JMT's attention that the ridership numbers utilized to compare the impacts of Haymarket Extension to Broad Run Station relocation were incorrect and indicated that MWCOG under reports VRE ridership at Broad Run Station. JMT noted down the correct inputs to the ridership numbers and mentioned that the traffic forecasts developed for this project will consider VRE growth and adjustments will be made to the impacted roadways as part of the post processing for volume development. This way, the study uses the MWCOG model to maintain consistency with all the programmed projects within the area.
  - VRE is on board with the approach of adjusting the traffic forecasts as part of post processing.
- 3. Brian Curtis initiated the discussion on preliminary alternatives to identify the screening criteria and received the following feedback from the committee members:

### **Technical Committee Meeting # 4**



Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study

- Each alternative was discussed with potential access points, logical terminus and to get a consensus from the committee members if an alternative should be considered for screening purposes or not.
- Rick Canizales mentioned that all the preliminary alternatives that were recognized must go through
  the complete screening process with each of the criterion identified before they get discarded for
  further assessment.
  - o <u>Alternative 2A (Godwin Drive Extension)</u> concurrence received from the technical committee as presented for further evaluation.
  - o <u>Alternative 2B (Godwin Drive to Compton Road)</u> concurrence received from the technical committee as presented for further evaluation.
  - <u>Alternative 3 (Godwin Drive extended to I-66)</u> concurrence received from the technical committee as presented for further evaluation. Included in the Fairfax County comprehensive plan. Terminate at I-66 with interchange.
  - o <u>Alternative 4 (widen Route 28)</u> concurrence received from the technical committee as presented for further evaluation.
  - Alternative 5 (reversible lanes on Route 28) add center additional reversible lane where two-way left turn lane does not exist; convert existing two-way left turn lane to reversible lane. The reversible lane will be barrier separated with no-left turns at all.
  - o <u>Alternative 6 (widen Old Centreville Road)</u> concurrence received from the technical committee as presented for further evaluation.
  - Alternative 7 (reversible lanes on Old Centreville Road) Old Centreville Road will operate as one-way street in both AM and PM peak periods with direction of travel switched.
  - Alternative 8 (transit alternatives) dedicated lane for the buses; consult PRTC for any
    planned BRT improvements; VRE recommends to look into the signal operations with transit
    accommodations.
    - Perrin Palistrant from PRTC reached out to the committee after the meeting and suggested further discussion on BRT/other transit improvements along Route 28 in relation to the improvements along I-66, which may provide an opportunity for limited stop/express bus service to operate quickly through the corridor from points south to the Dulles Corridor.
    - JMT had enquired whether PRTC has a master plan and if that plan got incorporated into the MWCOG model for BRT facilities as it is not appearing in the MWCOG model that is being used for the traffic projections in the current study. JMT also asked PRTC if there were any conversation been held with Fairfax County regarding their upcoming widening project to accommodate BRT facilities.
    - Perrin confirmed that PRTC does not have a master plan on the Route 28 corridor and most of their improvements center around services along I-66 as part of the TransAction service plan.
    - JMT has ongoing discussions with PRTC to capture more information in this regard.
  - o <u>Alternatives 9A, 9B and 9C (Euclid Avenue extension north and south)</u> concurrence received from the technical committee as presented for further evaluation.
  - o <u>Alternatives 10A, 10B and 10C (New Eastern Bypass)</u> concurrence received from the technical committee as presented for further evaluation.
- Rick Canizales suggested JMT to setup screening criteria to evaluate alternatives based on, but not limited to the factors listed below:
  - o economic impacts;
  - o access management issues;
  - environmental impacts;
  - historical impacts;



#### congestion impacts;

- o housing impacts; and
- o right-of-way impacts
- 4. Brian Curtis provided a list for the Executive Committee Members and notes the changes based on the feedback from the committee members:
  - Add Maria Sinner from VDOT to the member list.
  - Change Councilmember to Mayor for Jeanette Rishell from the City of Manassas Park.
  - Add Senator Jeremy McPike to the member list.
  - Exclude Jonathan Way from the City of Manassas.
  - Add Delegate Jackson Miller to the member list.
  - Exclude Frank Jones from the City of Manassas.
  - Add Doug Allen, the CEO from VRE to the member list.
- 5. The technical committee came into agreement with the following topics be covered in the meeting with Executive Committee:
  - Discuss base/existing model results.
  - Talk through the screening criteria that will be established for the study.
  - Discuss alternative alignments.
  - Discuss results from preliminary alternative screening.

JMT will communicate with the Executive Committee members to find out potential dates for meeting in early April to go over the project updates.

- 6. The JMT team and the technical committee will meet again on March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017 to discuss the progress of the project.
- 7. The next steps moving forward in the project are:
  - Develop No-Build Forecasts
    - Need approval/planned developments from each jurisdiction
  - Screen Preliminary Alternatives
    - Setup screening criteria for alternative screening and develop screening matrix to prioritize the alternatives
  - Prepare Handouts for Executive Committee Meeting

# **Technical Committee Meeting #4**



Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study

The above represents a true and accurate account of the discussion during this meeting to the best of my knowledge. If there are any conflicts, misrepresentations, or omissions with the above statements, please contact the undersigned within 10 days of this date.

Sujith Racha	March 17, 2017

Copy:

Calvin O'Dell c.odell@manassasparkva.gov Robert Iosco Robert.losco@VDOT.Virginia.gov Tina Curtis Tina.Curtis@VDOT.Virginia.gov Dic Burke Richard.Burke@VDOT.Virginia.gov **Terry Yates** Terry.Yates@VDOT.Virginia.gov Steve Burke sburke@ci.manassas.va.us **Brian Foster** bfoster@ci.manassas.va.us **Rick Canizales** rcanizales@pwcgov.org

Paul Doku Paul.Doku@fairfaxcounty.gov James Beall James.Beall@fairfaxcounty.gov

Christine Hoeffner choeffner@vre.org

Sree Nampoothiri Sree.Nampoothiri@thenovaauthority.org

Rodney Hayzlett rhayzlett@jmt.com Randy Boice rboice@jmt.com **Brian Curtis** bcurtis@jmt.com Sujith Racha sracha@jmt.com

Project File: https://projectcenter.jmt.com/sites/11/11-0845-007/ProjectFiles/00-Public/Technical Committee Meetings/Meeting 4 2-21-2017/Route 28 Study - Technical Committee Meeting-4 Draft Minutes.docx