



## Environmental Documentation for Route 28 Corridor Coordination Meeting with Fairfax County

Fairfax County Department of Transportation  
Tuesday, June 19, 2018, 10:00 AM

---

A Coordination Meeting with Fairfax County was held on the above date and time for the Environmental Documentation for Route 28. Meeting participants are listed below:

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Elizabeth Scullin	Prince William County	703-792-4051	escullin@pwcgov.org
Paolo Belita	Prince William County	703-792-6273	pbelita@pwcgov.org
W. Todd Minnix	Fairfax County DOT	703-877-5749	wesley.minnix@fairfaxcounty.gov
Jim Beall	Fairfax County DOT	703-877-5673	james.beall@fairfaxcounty.gov
Stuart Tyler	Parsons Project Manager	571-437-3098	stuart.tyler@parsons.com
Surbhi Ashton	Parsons Deputy Project Manager/Environmental	202-469-6567	surbhi.ashton@parsons.com
Joe Springer	Parsons/Traffic	202-775-3493	joseph.s.springer@parsons.com

The discussions are summarized below by agenda topic. Action items are highlighted in **bold** text.

### 1. Introductions

Meeting attendees introduced themselves (see table above). Stuart indicated that Robert Iosco is the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) point-of-contact on the project and was invited to the meeting as well, but he was unable to attend.

Stuart added that the meeting was an opportunity for the two counties to share status updates on adjacent Route 28 projects and to coordinate efforts.

### 2. Overview of Current Scope of Work

Stuart started by summarizing that Prince William County originally planned to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Route 28 project from Godwin Drive in Prince William County to Compton Road in Fairfax County. After coordinating with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and VDOT, however, it was determined that the first step should be the preparation of a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Concurrence Form (and requisite data collection and information gathering required to prepare the form) to determine the level of NEPA documentation required for the project.

Stuart noted that in some cases, the December 2017 *Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study* (Feasibility Study) used more expansive resource boundaries (e.g., battlefields) than would typically be appropriate for a NEPA study. Parsons would focus on identifying more precisely the boundaries of sensitive resources (such as wetlands and historic properties) and reviewing

Alternatives 2A, 2B, and 4 to determine whether the alignments can be adjusted to minimize potential environmental impacts. Lowering the impacts from those reported in the Feasibility Study would reduce the potential level of significance of the impacts, which could influence the type of environmental document to be prepared pursuant to NEPA. If the impacts are clearly significant, as defined under NEPA, an EIS would be required. If the impacts are not clearly significant, then preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) would be appropriate to formally determine if the impacts would be deemed significant.

The goal of this phase would be to obtain concurrence from FHWA on the level of NEPA document to prepare for the study. Following the FHWA decision, a scope of work for the second phase would be prepared accordingly. Note that preparation of an EA does not necessarily preclude the need to later prepare an EIS should FHWA conclude that they are not able to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). Notwithstanding, all of the work completed as part of Phase 1 would be transferrable and carried forward into Phase 2 and the eventual NEPA document, whether it is an EA or an EIS.

### *Traffic*

VDOT's 2015 *Route 28 Corridor Safety and Operations Study* and the Feasibility Study have been reviewed and traffic data extracted for purposes of noting trends in data. Joe summarized that recent traffic counts (6-hour turning movement and 48-hour mainline), travel time run data, and Streetlight (cell phone) data would form the basis of the traffic analysis (volumes and level of service) that would be completed to support the Purpose and Need. The fieldwork has concluded and the traffic data is currently being processed. He added that the Streetlight data would be helpful in illuminating travel patterns and potential demand for the alternative alignments.

To develop forecasts, Parsons will use the validated 2015 Prince William County model and 2040 model (a subset of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) model) that incorporates the MWCOG Version 9.1 Cooperative Forecasts and 2030 Comprehensive Plan projects. **The Fairfax County Route 28 Widening Project (ultimate 2040 configuration), as described in Section 3 of this meeting summary, would need to be added to the model.**

### *Environmental*

As indicated above, during this phase, the team will focus on wetlands and historic properties. At the same time, Parsons will inventory other environmental resources as well, such as parks and recreation areas, churches, schools, and environmental justice populations. Elizabeth asked whether part of Bull Run Regional Park was acquired in the past for purposes of constructing Route 28. Jim responded that Route 28 was likely built first (the current southbound lanes in the 1960s and the current northbound lanes in the 1980s) and parkland acquired around the roadway right-of-way (ROW).

Property notification letters, including to properties within Fairfax County, have been mailed to those properties where access will likely be required (not to all properties along the alignments).

Fieldwork will begin June 25, 2018. No other public involvement is included in the current scope of work.

Stuart summarized that Alternatives 2A, 2B, and 4 are being carried forward at this point. Alternatives 2A and 2B follow Godwin Drive and the original Route 28 bypass alignment, west of Route 28. Alternative 4, which would widen existing Route 28, is also being evaluated for comparison. Alternative 9 (the “Euclid Extension”, to the east of Route 28) ranked last in the second level of screening in the Feasibility Study so was eliminated from consideration for purposes of the current study. If an EIS is ultimately required, this alternative may need to be revisited in the discussion of the range of alternatives considered.

### *Purpose and Need*

Stuart summarized that traffic data and travel pattern information will be used to frame the problem being solved (with solutions identified in the Alternatives chapter), and the Purpose and Need that would be developed would be translatable to either an EA or EIS.

### *NEPA Concurrence*

The data gathered during this phase would be used to prepare a concise NEPA Concurrence Form for FHWA’s use in deciding on the level of NEPA document (EA or EIS).

Fairfax County will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion for their Route 28 Widening Project (NEPA Concurrence Form signed by FHWA on March 12, 2018).

## **3. Update from Fairfax County on Route 28 Widening Project**

The Route 28 Widening Project southern terminus is the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NVRPA) entrance (just north of the Bull Run bridge). The Prince William project extends to Compton Road so there is some overlap between the two.

The Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan includes widening Route 28 to four lanes in each direction with high occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV). Providing HOV lanes in the corridor would be difficult, however, as there are no interchanges or direct connections at cross streets or interchanges. The intent, therefore, is to build eight lanes and not preclude HOV. The Transform 66 Project will be including direct access to the express lanes from northbound Route 28 to eastbound I-66 (the reverse movement is not being provided at the interchange).

The Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance (NVTA) funding has been reduced from \$38 million to \$16 million; therefore, while eight lanes is the ultimate configuration (Compton Road to New Braddock Road would be 4 lanes SB and 3 lanes NB, then the 4<sup>th</sup> lane in the NB direction would be added just before New Braddock Road to make it 8 lanes approaching Route 29), only six lanes will be built at this time. A shared-use path is provided on both sides of the roadway and a 32-foot median is being maintained along most of the corridor, with the median width reducing somewhat where ROW is constrained in the southern section. ROW will be acquired and the design completed for the ultimate configuration, including stormwater management, and the widening to eight lanes would be completed when funding become available.

Opening year for the six-lane widening is projected to be 2023 and analysis is being completed for 2030 and 2035 to determine failure year. Traffic analysis already confirms failure by 2040.

Four options for the intersection of Ordway Road and Old Centreville Road were reviewed:

- #1 = improvements at same location
- #2 = realign Ordway Road to create a four-way intersection with Old Centreville Road west of current T-intersection
- #3 = realign Ordway Road similar to Option #2 but include a roundabout
- #4 = extend Old Centreville Road south to tie into Ordway Road south of the current T-intersection (and abandon Compton Road between Old Centreville Road and Route 28)

Options 1 is the least expensive, so the intent is to bid the six-lane project and include as options the addition of another lane from Point A to Point B (to be determined) or Ordway Road/Old Centreville Road Option #4.

Todd added that noise walls would be considered by Fairfax County in the corridor.

**The group agreed that the traffic analysis for this task will evaluate both Options #1 and #4 at Ordway Road/Old Centreville Road.**

Elizabeth added that given the inclusion of a shared-use path in the Route 28 Widening Project and that our project ties into it (and Sudley Road also includes a shared-use path), **a shared-use path would likely need to be included in the typical section for this project as well.**

Todd then described some of his firsthand experience and observations driving in the Prince William County project area, especially highlighting cut-through routes used by commuters in the morning and afternoon peak periods.

#### 4. Schedule

Stuart reported that the task would be completed by mid- to late-August.

The group discussed the August 1, 2018 deadline for Smart Scale funding. Status of the NEPA work would be based on whatever information is available at that time.

#### 5. Next Steps

**Jim will send PDFs of the Fairfax County plans to Joe for use in the traffic analysis.**

The Technical Committee will be reconvened in the next phase.

Prepared by: Surbhi Ashton

*This meeting summary reflects the preparer's understanding of the discussions at the meeting. This summary shall initially be considered as draft, open to comments for a period of five (5) business days beyond the date of initial issuance. If no comments are received within five (5) business days, this meeting summary shall be considered final.*