

## Questions & Answers with the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA), 7/24/2020

Active Prince William received the following responses on July 24, 2020 from the Executive Director of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA):

1. Does NVTA require the NEPA process to be completed for this project based on the project description?

The NVTA Standard Project Agreement (SPA) requires that NVTA funded projects follow all processes and regulations including required permitting and inspection processes, applicable to the project. Please note, NVTA's funding is primarily conditioned on delivery of the project within the approved scope of work, budget and time period that is reasonably close to that agreed between NVTA and the project sponsor. The completion of the NEPA process is not required, provided that activities part of, or related to the Environmental Assessment are completed, all applicable processes are followed, and permits are received by the Army Corps of Engineers, etc.

2. Could this funding allocation be used to fund the [Centreville Rd/Route 28 STARS projects recommendations](#)? I would argue that the STARS recommendations of transitioning the existing roadway to a two phase light system with four lanes is **equivalent** to a four phase light system with six lanes (Alternative 4) and provides the same congestion/throughput benefit at a much lower cost. The project description for 2018-031-1 did indicate that "the EIS may identify additional alternatives during the study". But the EIS was never completed.

It is NVTA staff's understanding that the STARS project recommendations are primarily operational in nature. While the approved project description form/scope for the Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study notes "the EIS may identify additional alternatives during the study," NVTA is prohibited, by law, from funding operations and maintenance. Additionally, any project that NVTA funds with the 70% regional revenues, must be in TransAction, the region's long-range transportation plan.

3. Alternative 2B (Extending Godwin Rd to existing Route 28 in Fairfax County) has major environmental issues and questionable traffic benefits that could be eliminated by not receiving wetland permits or having excessive costs due to environmental or traffic mitigation. Is it possible for the PWC BOCS to endorse **two** alternatives (2B and 4/STARS) for design with the NVTA funding? This will help the PWC BOCS make a more informed decision on the best way to allocate the mobility bond funding if needed. It would be disappointing if Alternative 2B was eliminated at the 60% design next year and no other options were ready to move forward.

NVTA does not have jurisdiction over the PWCBOCS process in this regard. It is up to the BOCS to decide how they want to proceed. That said, if they endorse two alternatives, the BOCS must have a process for deciding which one to implement as it appears that the STARS alternative does not meet the provision of use for 70% regional revenue requirements. As a reminder, NVTA 70% regional revenues cannot be used for operations or maintenance. Additionally, Alternative 2B was modeled for the purposes of project evaluation. A re-model/re-evaluation may be necessary if the BOCS does not endorse Alternative 2B.

4. When is the final date that the SPA (Standard Project Agreement) can be signed for 2018-032-1 without the possibility of PWC losing the funding?

Given PWC requested and NVTA approved an FY2021 appropriation in May 2020, the immediate deadline to execute the SPA is September 10, 2020. However, PWC can request de-appropriation of FY2021 funds and request appropriation in a future fiscal year. Please note that projects included in the FY2018-2023 SYP (the Six Year Program in which the \$89 million was awarded) must have an executed SPA by FY2023 (July 1, 2022), at the latest. The FY2023 appropriations will likely occur in May 2022, in which case the final date for SPA execution will be the date of the September 2022 Authority meeting.