



## Meeting Minutes

**Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study**  
**Project No. 11-0845-007**  
**3-10-2017**

A Technical Committee Meeting was held at the City of Manassas, 8500 Public Works Drive, Manassas, VA on March 10, 2017 for the above referenced project. The following people were in attendance:

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Calvin O'Dell	City of Manassas Park	<a href="mailto:c.odell@manassasparkva.gov">c.odell@manassasparkva.gov</a>	703-335-0019
Robert Iosco	VDOT	<a href="mailto:Robert.Iosco@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Robert.Iosco@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>	703-259-2764
Tina Curtis	VDOT	<a href="mailto:Tina.Curtis@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Tina.Curtis@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>	703-259-2744
Aleksandra Tuliszka	VDOT	<a href="mailto:Richard.Burke@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Richard.Burke@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>	703-366-1960
Anna Fortune	VDOT	<a href="mailto:Terry.Yates@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Terry.Yates@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>	703-259-2413
Steve Burke	City of Manassas	<a href="mailto:sburke@ci.manassas.va.us">sburke@ci.manassas.va.us</a>	703-257-8476
Brian Foster	City of Manassas	<a href="mailto:bfoster@ci.manassas.va.us">bfoster@ci.manassas.va.us</a>	703-257-8226
Rick Canizales	Prince William County	<a href="mailto:rcanizales@pwcgov.org">rcanizales@pwcgov.org</a>	703-792-7060
Elizabeth Scullin	Prince William County	<a href="mailto:escullin@pwcgov.org">escullin@pwcgov.org</a>	703-792-4051
Trent Berger	Prince William County	<a href="mailto:tberger@pwcgov.org">tberger@pwcgov.org</a>	703-792-6824
Paul Doku	Fairfax County	<a href="mailto:Paul.Doku@fairfaxcounty.gov">Paul.Doku@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>	703-877-5716
James Beall	Fairfax County	<a href="mailto:James.Beall@fairfaxcounty.gov">James.Beall@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>	
W. Todd Minnix	Fairfax County	<a href="mailto:Wesley.Minnix@fairfaxcounty.gov">Wesley.Minnix@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>	703-877-5749
Smitha Chellappa	Fairfax County	<a href="mailto:Smitha.Chellappa@fairfaxcounty.gov">Smitha.Chellappa@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>	703-877-5761
Sonali Soneji	VRE	<a href="mailto:ssoneji@vre.org">ssoneji@vre.org</a>	571-238-9058
Sree Nampoothiri	NVTA	<a href="mailto:Sree.Nampoothiri@thenovaaauthority.org">Sree.Nampoothiri@thenovaaauthority.org</a>	703-642-4656
Perrin Palistrant	PRTC	<a href="mailto:ppalistrant@omniride.com">ppalistrant@omniride.com</a>	703-580-6162
Rodney Hayzlett	JMT	<a href="mailto:rhayzlett@jmt.com">rhayzlett@jmt.com</a>	804-267-1269
Randy Boice	JMT	<a href="mailto:rboice@jmt.com">rboice@jmt.com</a>	703-464-7862
Sujith Racha	JMT	<a href="mailto:sracha@jmt.com">sracha@jmt.com</a>	703-464-7745

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the evaluation process for screening the preliminary alternatives that were identified 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.

The following items were discussed:

1. Randy Boice started off the preliminary alternatives discussion by explaining the typical sections developed for each of the alternative by JMT and received following feedback from the technical committee:
  - Alternative 3 (Godwin Drive extended to I-66) – the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) describes this alternative as a six lanes roadway on 200 feet proposed right-of-way (ROW) with wide

median; it was collectively agreed by the technical committee that this alternative should consider a four-lane roadway on a tighter proposed ROW to be in line with the VDOT's approach of reducing ROW impacts; Rick Canizales recommended to use the County's principal arterial standard with 128 feet of proposed ROW

- Alternative 2A (Godwin Drive Extension), Alternative 2B (Godwin Drive to Compton Road), and Alternatives 10A, 10B and 10C (New Eastern Bypass) – the technical committee recommended using the same typical section as Alternative 3 which is the County's principal arterial standard with four lanes on 128 feet proposed ROW
- Alternative 4 (widen Route 28) – this alternative will again use the same principal arterial standard from Prince William County (128 feet proposed ROW) but with three travel lanes in each direction, thereby reducing the median width to 16 feet
- Alternative 5 (reversible lanes on Route 28) – both barrier and no-barrier options were discussed for this alternative and the technical committee recommended to move forward with the barrier option – two travel lanes in each direction and the center barrier separated lane operating as a reversible lane (northbound direction in AM peak and southbound direction in PM peak); this alternative will eliminate the left-turns from the mainline impacting accesses to the businesses
- Alternative 6 (widen Old Centreville Road) and Alternatives 9A, 9B and 9C (Euclid Avenue extension north and south) – the typical sections for alternatives 6 and 9 will have two travel lanes in each direction separated by 16 feet median on 104 feet proposed ROW
- Alternative 7 (reversible lanes on Old Centreville Road) – Old Centreville Road will be converted to serve traffic only in one direction in the peak periods – both travel lanes allowing northbound direction traffic in AM peak and southbound direction traffic in PM peak

The proposed typical sections developed for each of the alternatives considered pedestrian accommodations such as shared use path and sidewalks. The revised typical sections based on the comments received from the technical committee and the existing roadways typical sections are provided along with these minutes for reference.

2. Sujith Racha discussed the criteria and the rating process that was developed for screening the preliminary alternatives and received the following feedback from the committee members:
  - The technical committee recommended showing just the barrier option for alternative 5 and advised to remove the no-barrier option for alternative 5.
  - Rick Canizales advised technical committee to remove key objective 10 (consistency with comprehensive plans) from the project's key objective list as the current study is to identify the suitable alternative solution for Route 28 operations that can go into the Prince William County's Comprehensive Plan and the members of the technical committee agreed to it.
  - The technical committee recommended to include maintenance and operations costs in addition to the construction costs for each of the alternatives in the evaluation matrix.
  - Exclusive BRT option along Route 28 is not currently planned nor included in the MWCOG model. Therefore, Alternative 8 is eliminated from further evaluation.
  - The technical committee advised to rank the alternatives or recommend top five alternatives based on the screening results to help committee narrow down the alternatives.
    - *After the meeting, the City of Manassas and the Prince William County reached out to JMT and advised combining some of the criteria identified for screening alternatives to simplify the rating process. The following were the changes suggested by the City and agreed by the County:*
      - *Combine 4f Properties/Conservation Easements and Historical Impacts*



- *Combine Floodway/Floodplains and Streams/Wetlands*
- *Combine Residential Impact with School and Church Impacts*
- *In addition to the above changes, JMT is recommending some additional changes to the evaluation matrix to enhance the screening process. The technical committee is advised to reach out to JMT with any concerns or question on the following changes:*
  - *Recommend changing the traffic impacts metrics to look at peak period volumes as compared to the ADTs. As the project is striving to provide solution for relieving congestion to commuter traffic, it is advised to compare the peak period volumes rather than the ADT to quantify the impacts effectively; below are proposed traffic impacts columns in the matrix table:*
    - a. *Peak Periods (AM & PM) Traffic Served by Alternative*
    - b. *Change in Peak Periods (AM & PM) Traffic per Lane on Route 28 (Historical Downtown Manassas)*
    - c. *Change in Peak Periods (AM & PM) Traffic per Lane on Route 28 (Liberia Ave to Compton Rd)*
    - d. *Average Annual Delay Cost (this cost is based on travel delay value of a passenger car inflated to year 2040 {Ref: USDOT Work Zone Road Users Costs - Concepts and Applications})*
    - e. *Annual Travel Time Savings per Vehicle*
  - *Alternatives 9A, 9B, and 9C follow very similar path with differences in access points which will be considered if the alternative passes the initial screening, therefore to simplify the evaluation matrix, it is recommended to represent these alternatives as one Alternative 9.*
  - *Similarly, Alternatives 10A, 10B, and 10C follow very similar path with differences in access points which will be considered if the alternative passes the initial screening, therefore to simplify the evaluation matrix, it is recommended to represent these alternatives as one Alternative 10.*

The updated goals and objectives document, and revised evaluation matrix template based on the comments received from the technical committee and proposed JMT changes is provided along with these minutes for reference.

3. Randy Boice provided the updated list for the Executive Committee Members based on the feedback received from the technical committee in the earlier meeting. The first Executive Committee meeting will be held on April 3<sup>rd</sup> at 10 AM in Prince William County Offices based on the polling results.
4. The JMT team and the technical committee will meet again on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017 to discuss the results of the alternative screening process.
5. The next steps moving forward in the project are:
  - Screen Preliminary Alternatives
    - Complete screening evaluation matrix and prioritize the alternatives
  - Prepare Materials for Executive Committee Meeting



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 22, 2017

Copy:

Calvin O'Dell	<a href="mailto:c.odell@manassasparkva.gov">c.odell@manassasparkva.gov</a>
Robert Iosco	<a href="mailto:Robert.Iosco@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Robert.Iosco@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>
Tina Curtis	<a href="mailto:Tina.Curtis@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Tina.Curtis@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>
Aleksandra Tuliszka	<a href="mailto:Richard.Burke@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Richard.Burke@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>
Anna Fortune	<a href="mailto:Terry.Yates@VDOT.Virginia.gov">Terry.Yates@VDOT.Virginia.gov</a>
Steve Burke	<a href="mailto:sburke@ci.manassas.va.us">sburke@ci.manassas.va.us</a>
Brian Foster	<a href="mailto:bfoster@ci.manassas.va.us">bfoster@ci.manassas.va.us</a>
Rick Canizales	<a href="mailto:rcanizales@pwcgov.org">rcanizales@pwcgov.org</a>
Elizabeth Scullin	<a href="mailto:escullin@pwcgov.org">escullin@pwcgov.org</a>
Trent Berger	<a href="mailto:tberger@pwcgov.org">tberger@pwcgov.org</a>
Paul Doku	<a href="mailto:Paul.Doku@fairfaxcounty.gov">Paul.Doku@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>
James Beall	<a href="mailto:James.Beall@fairfaxcounty.gov">James.Beall@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>
W. Todd Minnix	<a href="mailto:Wesley.Minnix@fairfaxcounty.gov">Wesley.Minnix@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>
Smitha Chellappa	<a href="mailto:Smitha.Chellappa@fairfaxcounty.gov">Smitha.Chellappa@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>
Sonali Soneji	<a href="mailto:ssoneji@vre.org">ssoneji@vre.org</a>
Sree Nampoothiri	<a href="mailto:Sree.Nampoothiri@thenovaauthority.org">Sree.Nampoothiri@thenovaauthority.org</a>
Perrin Palistrant	<a href="mailto:ppalistrant@omniride.com">ppalistrant@omniride.com</a>
Rodney Hayzlett	<a href="mailto:rhayzlett@jmt.com">rhayzlett@jmt.com</a>
Randy Boice	<a href="mailto:rboice@jmt.com">rboice@jmt.com</a>
Sujith Racha	<a href="mailto:sracha@jmt.com">sracha@jmt.com</a>

Project File: [https://projectcenter.jmt.com/sites/11/11-0845-007/ProjectFiles/00-Public/Technical Committee Meetings/Meeting 5 3-10-2017/Route 28 Study - Technical Committee Meeting-5 Draft Minutes.docx](https://projectcenter.jmt.com/sites/11/11-0845-007/ProjectFiles/00-Public/Technical%20Committee%20Meetings/Meeting%205%203-10-2017/Route%2028%20Study%20-%20Technical%20Committee%20Meeting-5%20Draft%20Minutes.docx)