

## **Meeting Minutes**

Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study Project No. 11-0845-007 6-20-2017

A Technical Committee Meeting was held at the Prince William County Offices, 5 County Complex Court, Woodbridge, VA on June 20, 2017 for the above referenced project. The following people were in attendance:

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Calvin O'Dell	City of Manassas Park	<u>c.odell@manassasparkva.gov</u>	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
Steve Burke	City of Manassas	sburke@ci.manassas.va.us	703-257-8476
Brian Foster	City of Manassas	<u>bfoster@ci.manassas.va.us</u>	703-257-8226
Rick Canizales	Prince William County	rcanizales@pwcgov.org	703-792-7060
Todd Minnix	Fairfax County	Wesley.Minnix@fairfaxcounty.gov	703-877-5749
James Beall	Fairfax County	James.Beall@fairfaxcounty.gov	
Sree Nampoothiri	NVTA	Sree.Nampoothiri@thenovaauthority.org	703-642-4656
Elizabeth Scullin	Prince William County	escullin@pwcgov.org	703-792-4051
Perrin Palistrant	PRTC	ppalistrant@onmiride.com	703-580-6162
Carol Sinclair	VDOT	Carol.Sinclair@VDOT.Virginia.gov	703-259-2924
Trent Berger	Prince William County	tberger@pwcgov.org	703-794-6824
Rodney Hayzlett	JMT	<u>rhayzlett@jmt.com</u>	804-267-1269
Randy Boice	JMT	<u>rboice@jmt.com</u>	703-464-7862
Brian Curtis	JMT	<u>bcurtis@jmt.com</u>	804-267-1256

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the preliminary results of the second screening of alternatives.

The following items were discussed:

- I. Introductions
- II. 2<sup>nd</sup> Screening Evaluation of Alternatives
  - a. Preliminary Costs:

Preliminary costs were generated for the four alternatives carried forward using VDOT planning level cost estimate lookup tables from VDOT TMPD. Cost estimates included costs for construction, right of way, utility relocation, and environmental mitigation. Construction costs included items such as noise barriers and storm water management basins. A range of costs were generated for each alternative. It was recommended that the high value be shown for each alternative in the evaluation table.



It was recommended that VDOT's PCES cost spreadsheets be used to generate the preliminary costs instead. The County will provide historic bid data and costs per mile. There was some discussion on how to escalate the estimated costs for a future construction year. There was no decision of how it should be done. The County and VDOT agreed to look at historic values. Inflation factors are built into VDOT's PCES software that could be used. Engineering costs should also be broken out from the construction costs.

b. Preliminary Traffic Benefits

The alternatives were evaluated for changes in ADT at several locations along the corridor, and changes in travel times when compared to the No-Build condition. The number of intersections operating at or over capacity and multimodal compatibility were also evaluated.

It was recommended that more definitions be added to the evaluation table but that the terminology be keep simple. Clarification of what is included in each evaluation criteria should also be added. JMT should take a second look at the thresholds for some of the evaluation criteria ratings to make sure they make sense.

It was recommended that the total number of intersections and the percentage of intersections operating over capacity be added to the evaluation criteria.

It was also recommended that the travel time savings along existing Route 28 as well as along the alternative be shown in the evaluation table. It was recommended that the starting and ending points be defined for the travel time savings criteria.

c. Preliminary Environmental Impacts

Potential environmental impacts were shown for each alternative. Impact categories include 4f properties, floodway/floodplains, streams/wetlands, hazardous material sites, environmental justice, noise impacts, relocations to businesses, relocations to residential properties, and conservation easements. Each impact area was identified by a 20-foot buffer around the preliminary construction limits of each alternative.

It was recommended that the same corridor wide of 200 feet be used for each alternative to identify impacts.

There was some discussion on whether no relocations to businesses should be shown as a positive rating versus a neutral rating. It was decided that the neutral rating was appropriate.

III. Schedule of Executive Committee Meeting



The following dates were recommended for the Executive Committee Meeting: July 31<sup>st</sup>, August 2<sup>nd</sup>, or August 3<sup>rd</sup>. The Executive Committee will be polled to determine which date will have the best attendance. The meeting will be held at Prince William County Complex.

IV. Discuss Potential Dates and Materials for Public Meetings

September 7<sup>th</sup> was tentatively set as the date for the Public Meeting. Mayor Rishell of the City of Manassas Park had previously offered up the new Manassas Park Community Center for the public meeting. It was decided that the public meeting should be held at the Community Center.

## V. Open Discussion

The Technical Committee decided that JMT should update the evaluation tables based on the input from the meeting and then meet again prior to the Executive Committee Meeting. The next meeting was set for July 18, 2017.