

**Briefing on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

The following draft project information forms were distributed at the March 2 meeting of the TPB Technical Committee for informational purposes. The following projects are described:

VDOT

I-95 / I-395 HOV / Bus / HOT Lanes Project.....	Page 1
Idea66 Spot Improvements Inside the Beltway .....	Page 7

MDOT

Interchange at US 340 and Jefferson Tech Park.....	Page 10
--	---------

FHWA, Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division

Manassas National Battlefield Bypass.....	Page 11
---	---------

# FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2030 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM



DRAFT

## BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Agency Project ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Secondary Agency: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Project Type:  System Expansion;  System Maintenance;  Operational Program;  Study;  Other  
(check all that apply)  Freeway;  Primary;  Secondary;  Urban;  Bridge;  Bike/Ped;  Transit;  CMAQ;  
 ITS;  Enhancement;  Other
3. Project Title: I-95 / I-395 HOV / Bus / HOT Lanes Project
4. Facility: I-95 / 395
5. From ( \_ at): Eads Street, Arlington County
6. To: Route 610 (Garrisonville Road), Stafford County

Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier		
I	95/395	HOV / Bus / HOT Lanes Project			
		<b>Connection Location:</b>	<b>Morning connections:</b>	<b>Evening connections:</b>	<b>Type of Modification:</b>
I	395	Eads Street	NB HOT Lanes to Eads Street	Eads Street to SB HOT Lanes	Expanded
I	395	Between South Hayes Street and Washington Blvd.	SB Express Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	SB Express Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	Deleted
I	395	VA 402 (Quaker Road) – (serving Shirlington)	NB HOT Lanes to Quaker Road	Quaker Road to SB HOT Lanes	New
I	395	VA 420 (Seminary Road)	NB HOT Lanes to Seminary Road	Seminary Road to SB HOT Lanes	New * (Bus only access)
I	95	Between VA 236 (Duke Street) and VA 648 (Edsall Road)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	N/A	New
I	95	VA 7100 (Fairfax County Parkway)	N/A	Fairfax County Parkway to SB HOT Lanes	New
I	95	Between VA 7100 (Fairfax County Pkwy) and VA 638 (Pohick Road)	N/A	SB HOV Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	Deleted
I	95	Between VA 7100 (Fairfax County Pkwy) and VA 642 (Lorton Road)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	N/A	New (includes in-line bus station)
I	95	Between VA 123 (Gordon Road) and VA 3000 (Prince William County Parkway)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	SB HOT Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	New
I	95	Between VA 610 (Cardinal Drive) and US 234 (Dumfries Road)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	N/A	New
I	95	Between US 234 (Dumfries Road) and VA 610 (Garrisonville Road)	N/A	SB HOT Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	Expanded

\* Integration of this proposed ramp in the project design is currently under evaluation.

7. Jurisdiction(s): Arlington County, City of Alexandria, Fairfax County, Prince William County, Town of Dumfries, Stafford County
8. Description:

Under provisions of the Virginia Public-Private Transportation Act of 1995, Fluor Virginia, Inc. and Transurban (USA) Development Inc. (together "FTU") propose to construct and operate a system of High Occupancy Vehicle/Bus/High Occupancy Toll Lanes system ("HOV/Bus/HOT") on portions of I-95/395. In October 2006, VDOT and FTU signed an Interim Agreement to commence development activities on the Project.

The project entails expanding the existing reversible High Occupancy Vehicle ("HOV") lanes between Eads Street and south of the Town of Dumfries from two to three lanes, and converting the lanes to include High Occupancy Toll ("HOT"), bus and HOV traffic. New entry/exit points into and out of the HOV/Bus/HOT lanes, as listed in Items 5 and 6 above, will be added along the corridor.

The Project also proposes to address a traffic operational issue noted with the existing HOV system. During peak PM periods, traffic traveling in a southbound direction in the current HOV system is often congested at the point in which the HOV lanes terminate and merge into the general purpose lanes at Dumfries. This project proposes to relieve this current congestion problem by both expanding this current merge point, and providing for the extension of a single lane for 9 miles, to be used by southbound HOT lanes traffic, from Dumfries to Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) in Stafford County.

The Project proposes to make improvements at Eads Street, the proposed northern termination point (for tolling purposes) of the HOT lanes. Improvements at Eads Street would affect both am and pm peak traffic, and provide for additional lanes for HOV/HOT lane traffic exiting at Eads Street, including a ramp dedicated exclusively for use by buses exiting into/out of the Pentagon reservation.

Access to the HOT lanes would be available to automobile, motorcycles, light truck, bus and transit vehicles only. Vehicles with three or more occupants would travel on the HOT lanes for free, as per current law. Buses, transit vehicles, and emergency response vehicles would also travel on the HOT lanes for free. Other vehicles not meeting the occupancy requirement would pay a toll, using electronic toll collection equipment, at a rate that would vary by time of day, day of week and level of congestion, to insure the level of free-flow conditions as specified by Federal SAFE-TEA-LU regulations.

### **Transit Service Plan**

There are numerous transit elements integrated into this Project, including a proposed increase in bus service along the I-95/395 corridor, expansion of HOV capacity from two lanes to three lanes, an increase or expansion of access points between the HOV/Bus/HOT lanes and the general purpose lanes, and other infrastructure additions and improvements along the corridor.

The transit service plan proposed by the Project, provides for additional transit services in the corridor in the form of new and expanded bus services, including both capital and operating costs. The proposed new and expanded bus service will increase the baseline (2006) peak period total bus operating hours in the corridor as follows: 20 percent increase in 2010, 40 percent increase in 2020 and 85 percent increase in 2030. These increases in bus operating hours in the corridor will be realized via addition of new routes and reducing headways of services currently assumed in the CLRP in the respective years. Compared to the transit service assumption in the CLRP these proposed increase in bus operating hours in the corridor represent an x% in 2010, y% in 2020 and z% in 2030.

## CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

The proposed service plan will add 13 new routes in the corridor in 2010, at headways of 60 minutes. These new routes are currently in the CLRP but for the 2030 time period. The proposed plan will reduce the headways on these new routes in 2020 to no more than 45 minutes and reduce the headways in 2030 to no more than 30 minutes. Headways on the existing routes in the corridor will also be reduced in the proposed plan to no more than 45 minutes in 2010, 30 minutes in 2020, and 20 minutes in 2030.

The Project team intends to continue its coordination with the Transit Advisory Committee ("TAC"), which was formed in the fall of 2006 to facilitate coordination between the HOV/Bus/HOT Project and local transit agencies and service providers. The transit service plan, as proposed, is designed to remain flexible for future refinements, enhancements or substitutions as may be developed by the TAC.

In addition to the new bus service, the seamless, free-flowing network of the HOV/Bus/HOT lanes, park & ride lots and access points along the corridor will create the opportunity for current public, private regional/local service providers to expand their existing services, or provide new services to key activity and employment centers in the I-95/395 and I-495 corridors beyond that which is included in this Project.

Beyond the addition of the above high quality bus service and the opportunities afforded to existing transit providers through the addition of new/expanded infrastructure, the Project also proposes to provide a bus-only ramp into and out of the Pentagon at Eads Street (part of the northern terminus of the HOT lanes), an in-line bus station, located in the vicinity of the Lorton VRE station, and a transit-only access ramp at Seminary Road in the City of Alexandria.

The Project also proposes to add six (6) park & ride facilities, an equivalent of 3,000 additional parking spaces, to the network of park & ride lots along the corridor. The Project has proposed one facility be located in Fairfax County, two in Prince William County, two in Stafford County and one in Spotsylvania County. The location plans for these lots are being developed in consultation with the local jurisdictions and the TAC. The Project also proposes to provide enhancements to several existing bus stations/stops along the corridor.

Once the I-95/395 HOV lanes have been converted into HOV/Bus/HOT lanes, they will still be classified as "fixed guideway miles" for purposes of the transit funding formulas administered by the Federal Transit Administration.

The project team believes initiating the enhanced transit services at the same time as the works to convert the HOV lanes into HOV/Bus/HOT lanes should be considered. This transit enhancement could form part of the project's Congestion Management Plan and will allow direct stakeholder and community outreach to promote transit services.

### **Tolling Policy**

HOT lanes will remain free-flowing for all users, even during rush hour, in accordance with Federal SAFE-TEA-LU regulations. Dynamic pricing will be used to maintain these free-flow conditions. Prices will be adjusted by the time of day, by the day of the week and in response to the level of traffic. Federal requirements to insure free-flowing conditions mandate significant and continuous monitoring of traffic flow conditions on the HOT lanes. To facilitate compliance with this Federal requirement, there will be no price caps on the level of tolls. These requirements for monitoring the HOT lanes exceed any such requirements on the existing HOV lanes.

Dynamic message signs will provide drivers with current toll rates so they can choose whether or not to use the lanes. Toll collection on the HOV/Bus/HOT Lanes will be totally electronic. There will be no toll booths.

**Schedule**

Construction for the Project is projected to begin in early 2008, with an estimated construction completion time of two and a half years. The facility is expected to enter operations in mid to late 2010. The current schedule calls for environmental review in compliance with Federal (NEPA) and state regulations. The FHWA has further conditioned environmental approval to the Project being included in a conforming Transportation Improvement Program ("TIP") and Constrained Long Range Plan ("CLRP") for construction.

**Federal Environmental Review ("NEPA") Process**

At the end of August 2006, the FHWA signed the NEPA documentation concurrence form for pursuing the environmental review for the Project, with a Categorical Exclusion as the suggested level of NEPA Document. The environmental review is currently being conducted in full accordance and compliance with Federal and state law. The NEPA guidelines require the project to be part of a conforming CLRP prior to receiving environmental clearance. Subsequent to receiving environmental clearance on an approved scope, the Project team will pursue the final engineering design of the Project.

**Coordination with Other Projects in the Corridor**BRAC Actions

The Project team is working with the Army, the Marines, and their respective teams of consultants to coordinate the transportation project needs related to the BRAC action with the HOV/Bus/HOT Lanes Project. The proposed elements for this project reflect the latest discussions with the Army relative to their planned transportation-related activities at the Engineering Proving Ground in Fairfax County. Close coordination with the BRAC consultants will continue as they further develop their road improvement plans, and reasonable transportation needs related to this project are not precluded.

14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Corridor Project

The Project team will continue to coordinate with Eastern Federal Lands of FHWA relative to the northern terminus of the HOV/Bus/HOT Lanes. It is expected that variations of HOV and HOT lane access across the bridge will be considered by Eastern Federal Lands as an alternative in their Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Corridor Project. Based on the TPB's update to the 2007 CLRP, Eastern Federal Lands will assume this proposed project as part of the pre-existing environment for the purposes of their Draft EIS.

**Financial Plan**

Construction cost for the proposed project is estimated to be \$492M (PE-\$60M, ROW-\$4M and CN-\$428M). Funding sources for the project includes a combination of private equity and third party debt, including private bank loans and/or Private Activity Bonds, with the potential for TIFIA funding as a form of subordinated debt. As the Project progresses, FTU will explore all avenues of funding to ensure the lowest cost of capital for the Project. The Project will not require Commonwealth or Federal funds.

FTU will be fully authorized to toll the facility, which will serve to pay debt service, operating costs and return on equity. Toll revenue will be the main source of revenue. The Commonwealth will enter into a Comprehensive Agreement with FTU, which will authorize them (FTU) to raise the necessary funds to construct the Project.

The project also estimates to incur additional costs of about \$390M, over the 20 year period between 2010 and 2030, to fund the capital and operating expenses of the proposed transit service. The capital cost component of this is estimated to be \$115M. Funding for this 20-year expense is assumed to be derived, equally, from US-DOT transit capital funding program grants (including the New Small Start and the Bus Capital Discretionary program) and a dedicated transit initiative fund provided by the project sponsor. The 20-year operating cost is estimated to be \$275M. Funding for this 20-year expense is assumed to be derived from the fare box of the service, toll revenues and a dedicated transit initiative fund provided by the project sponsor.

**Stakeholder Outreach**

FTU, in conjunction with VDOT, has and will continue to put a great deal of effort into communicating with local stakeholders. The stakeholder outreach program provides the opportunity for direct engagement with various groups along the corridor, including all the local political leadership, transit service providers, the Transit Advisory Committee, various special interest groups, and business and community leaders. There are also opportunities for the public to learn more about the Project, as well as provide comments, both through the CLRP process and the NEPA process.

As a prerequisite to submitting the NEPA documentation, FHWA requires the Project to conduct a series of Citizen Information Meetings and a Public Hearing. The Citizen Information Meetings are scheduled to be held in spring 2007. The dates for the meetings will be communicated to stakeholders along the corridor through various channels, including area publications, postings via the website, and direct interface with the leadership within the local jurisdictions. A date for the Public Hearing will be identified as the Project advances through the process.

FTU has also conducted a series of meetings with transit stakeholders operating in the corridor. Starting in June 2006, FTU met with these operators to solicit input on how transit services in the corridor might change as a result of the addition of the HOT Lanes system. The recommendations resulting from this outreach are contained in FTU's Transit Opportunity Study, which was provided to the TAC in December. FTU maintains active participation with the TAC.

- 9. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations:  Not Included;  Included;  Primarily a Bike/Ped Project;  N/A
- 10. Total Miles: 36
- 11. Project Manager: Larry Cloyed - VDOT
- 12. E-Mail: [larry.cloyed@VDOT.Virginia.gov](mailto:larry.cloyed@VDOT.Virginia.gov)
- 13. Project Information URL: [www.virginiadot.gov](http://www.virginiadot.gov)
- 14. Projected Completion Year: 2010
- 15. Actual Completion Year: N/A  Project is ongoing. Year refers to implementation.
- 16. N/A\_ This project is being withdrawn from the Plan as of:
- 17. Total cost (in Thousands): \$882 million (PE-\$60M, ROW-\$4M, Construction-\$428M, Other-\$370M)
- 18. Remaining cost (in Thousands): N/A
- 19. Funding Sources:  Federal;  State;  Local;  Private;  Bonds;  Other

**CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION**

- 20. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project?  Yes;  No
- 21. If so, describe those conditions:  Recurring congestion;  Non-site specific congestion;  Frequent incident-related, non-recurring congestion;  Other
- 22. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other arterial highway of a functional class higher than minor arterial?  Yes;  No
- 23. If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria (see *Call for Projects* document)?  Yes;  No
- 24. If not, please identify the criteria that exempt the project here:
  - The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile
  - The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange
  - The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as a bicycle or pedestrian facility
  - The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
  - The project received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992

- The project was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or construction funds were already committed in the FY98-03 TIP.
- The construction costs for the project are less than \$5 million.

### **SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS**

25. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:

- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.
  - a. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue?  Yes;  No
  - b. Please identify issues:  High accident location;  Pedestrian safety;  Other  
 Truck or freight safety;  Engineer-identified problem
  - c. Briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:
    - Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.
    - Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.
    - Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
    - Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
    - Promote efficient system management and operation.
    - Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION**

26. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project?  Yes;  No (Currently being investigated)
27. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?
- Air Quality;  Floodplains;  Socioeconomics;  Geology, Soils and Groundwater; Vibrations;
  - Energy;  Noise;  Surface Water;  Hazardous and Contaminated Materials;  Wetlands

### **INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS**

28. Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to Federal Rule 940 Requirements?  Yes;  No
29. If yes, what is the status of the systems engineering analysis compliant with Federal Rule 940 for the project?  Not Started;  Ongoing, not complete;  Complete N/A
30. Under which Architecture: N/A
- DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture
  - WMATA Architecture
  - COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture
  - Other, please specify:
31. Other Comments

# FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2030 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM



DRAFT

**BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Agency Project ID: VDOT Secondary Agency:
2. Project Type:  System Expansion;  System Maintenance;  Operational Program;  Study;  Other  
(check all that apply)  Freeway;  Primary;  Secondary;  Urban;  Bridge;  Bike/Ped;  Transit;  CMAQ;  
 ITS;  Enhancement;  Other
3. Project Title **Idea66 Spot Improvements Inside the Beltway**
4. Facility: 

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:	I	66 WB	Spot 1 Fairfax Dr to Sycamore St	Extend accel/decel la.
5. From ( _ at):	I	66 WB	Spot 2 Washington Blvd to Dulles Airport Access Connector (DAAR)	Add accel/decel la.
6. To:	I	66 WB	Spot 3 Lee Hwy/Spout Run to Glebe Road	Extend accel/decel la.
7. Jurisdiction(s): Arlington/Fairfax
8. Description:
 

Spot 1 Arlington County– Extend existing westbound acceleration / deceleration lane (1.5 miles) from Fairfax Drive on-ramp to existing deceleration lane at Sycamore Street off ramp to reduce congestion and improve safety by reducing short distance weave and merge movement.

Spot 2 Arlington and Fairfax Counties– Add a continuous acceleration /deceleration lane from Sycamore St/Washington Blvd on ramp to existing Dulles Airport Access Ramp Rte 267 (1.6 miles).

Spot 3 Arlington – Extend existing acceleration lane from Lee Hwy/Spout Run on-ramp to existing deceleration lane at Glebe Road off ramp to create a continuous acceleration / deceleration lane (0.9 miles).

Work on all three projects will be within existing ROW, including any required retaining and sound walls relocations or additions. All the proposed spot improvements encompass design evaluation of enforcement areas / safety pull offs, sight distance improvements, ramp metering, signing, traffic management systems, and reconstruction of the shoulder to provide for emergency evacuation.
9. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations:  Not Included;  Included;  Primarily a Bike/Ped Project;  N/A
10. Total Miles: Three improvements totaling approximately 4 miles
11. Project Manager: L&D Project Manager – Jeff Daily 12. E-Mail: Jeff.Daily@VirginiaDOT.org
13. Project Information URL: [www.virginiadot.org/projects/const-project.asp?ID=404](http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/const-project.asp?ID=404)
14. Projected Completion Year: 30% design plans completed 2008, 100% design plans completed 2010 or Design Build construction beginning 2010
15. Actual Completion Year: **N/A** \_\_\_\_\_Project is ongoing. Year refers to implementation.
16. his project is being withdrawn from the Plan as of: **N/A**
17. Total cost (in Thousands): Spot 1 – \$31.6M (PE\$3.6M, CN \$28M), Spot 2 – \$29.9M (PE \$3.4M, CN \$26.5M), Spot 3 – \$14.1M (PE \$1.6M, CN \$12.5M): Total construction costs for all three improvements – \$75.6M
18. Remaining cost (in Thousands):
19. Funding Sources:  Federal;  State;  Local;  Private;  Bonds;  Other

**CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION**

20. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project?  Yes;  No
21. If so, describe those conditions:  Recurring congestion;  Non-site specific congestion;  
 Frequent incident-related, non-recurring congestion;  Other
22. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other arterial highway of a functional class higher than minor arterial?  Yes;  No
23. If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria (see *Call for Projects* document)?  Yes;  No
24. If not, please identify the criteria that exempt the project here:
- The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile
  - The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange
  - The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as a bicycle or pedestrian facility
  - The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
  - The project received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992
  - The project was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or construction funds were already committed in the FY98-03 TIP.
  - The construction costs for the project are less than \$5 million.

**SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS**

25. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:
- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
  - Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.
    - a. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue?  Yes;  No
    - b. Please identify issues:  High accident location;  Pedestrian safety;  Other  
 Truck or freight safety;  Engineer-identified problem
    - c. Briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:  
 Existing levels of congestion is exacerbated by the intense weaving and merging movements happening over a short distance along with inadequate sight distance. The recurring congestion and associated operational/safety effects poses concerns on the corridor's ability to serve as an efficient emergency evacuation route.
  - Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.
  - Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.
    - Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
    - Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
  - Promote efficient system management and operation.
    - Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

**ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION**

26. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project?  Yes;  No
27. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?

Air Quality;  Floodplains;  Socioeconomics;  Geology, Soils and Groundwater; Vibrations;  
 Energy;  Noise;  Surface Water;  Hazardous and Contaminated Materials;  Wetlands

### **INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS**

28. Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to Federal Rule 940 Requirements?  Yes;  No
29. If yes, what is the status of the systems engineering analysis compliant with Federal Rule 940 for the project?  Not Started;  Ongoing, not complete;  Complete
30. Under which Architecture:
- DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture
  - WMATA Architecture
  - COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture
  - Other, please specify:
31. Other Comments:
- The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) in approving the preliminary engineering work for the proposed project in January 2006, indicated six points of clarification that were to be incorporated into the study. The following notes how these points have been incorporated into the overall agency's activities.
1. Coordination with the planned extension of Metrorail to Tysons so as to not preclude a third Metrorail track: VDOT is a member of the planning team working directly with VDRPT and Dulles Rail project staff on the Dulles Rail project. The proposed spot improvements on westbound I 66 do not preclude a third Metrorail track and any express bus operations.
  2. Certify that project complies with NEPA: VDOT is in full compliance with all requirements of NEPA. A Categorical Exception is the NEPA document type approved by FHWA for the spot improvements and work on this document is underway.
  3. Clarify if all proposed construction can occur within existing right of way and adjacent parkland and Custis trail will be maintained: The right of way boundaries were validated by a detailed land survey and the proposed construction can occur within the existing Commonwealth right of way. Proposed construction will maintain adjacent parkland and trails.
  4. Evaluation of HOV enforcement areas, a continuous 12-foot shoulder, signing, TMS and ramp metering: Evaluation of HOV enforcement areas, a continuous 12-foot shoulder, signing, TMS and ramp metering has been included in the current PE work and where validated as needed will be included in the design and construction.
  5. Coordination with ongoing efforts to develop a regional emergency evacuation plan: VDOT is an active participant in the state's and MWCOC's efforts in developing regional emergency coordination plans. The proposed spot improvements fully considers the benefits it could provide for efficient traffic movement along westbound I 66 in events of emergency as anticipated by the regional emergency plans.
  6. Safety (along westbound I 66) will not be degraded: The proposed spot improvements will improve safety due to the enhanced access and egress conditions, improved signage, improved sight distance and other project evaluations and designs.



**FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2030  
PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM**



**BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Agency Project ID: **Federal Highway Administration, Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division**  
Secondary Agency:

2. Project Type:  System Expansion;  System Maintenance;  Operational Program;  Study;  Other  
(check all  Freeway;  **Primary**;  Secondary;  Urban;  Bridge;  **Bike/Ped**;  Transit;  CMAQ;  
that apply)  ITS;  Enhancement;  Other

3. Project Title: **Manassas National Battlefield Bypass**

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:			<b>Route 29</b>	
5. From (_ at):			<b>Route 29 west of Centreville</b>	
6. To:			<b>Route 29 east of Gainesville, via Route 234</b>	

7. Jurisdiction(s): **Prince William and Fairfax Counties, VA**

8. Description: **Close Routes 29 and 234 through the Manassas National Battlefield Park to through traffic and provide alternative means to accommodate the traffic displaced due to these closings. The preferred alternative, in the draft environmental impact statement, proposes a four lane bypass in three segments. These segments are described in item 31 below.**

9. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations:  Not Included;  **Included**;  Primarily a Bike/Ped Project;  N/A

10. Total Miles: 8.9 miles

11. Project Manager: **Jack Van Dop**

12. E-Mail: **jack.j.vandop@fhwa.dot.gov**

13. Project Information URL:

14. Projected Completion Year: **2020**

15. Actual Completion Year:  Project is ongoing. Year refers to implementation.

16.  This project is being withdrawn from the Plan as of:

17. Total cost (in Thousands): \$266,<sup>000</sup>(2007)

18. Remaining cost (in Thousands):

19. Funding Sources:  **Federal**;  State;  Local;  Private;  Bonds;  Other

**CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION**

20. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project?  Yes;  **No**

21. If so, describe those conditions:  Recurring congestion;  Non-site specific congestion;  
 Frequent incident-related, non-recurring congestion;  Other

22. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other arterial highway of a functional class higher than minor arterial?  **Yes**;  No

23. If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria (see *Call for Projects* document)?  **Yes**;  No

24. If not, please identify the criteria that exempt the project here:

The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile

The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange

The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as a bicycle or pedestrian facility

**DRAFT**

- The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
- The project received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992
- The project was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or construction funds were already committed in the FY98-03 TIP.
- The construction costs for the project are less than \$5 million.

**SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS**

25. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:

- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.

**X Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.**

- a. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue?  Yes; **X No**
- b. Please identify issues:  High accident location;  Pedestrian safety;  Other  
 Truck or freight safety;  Engineer-identified problem
- c. Briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:

- Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

**X Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.**

**X Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.**

- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.
- Promote efficient system management and operation.

**ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION**

26. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project? **X Yes**;  No

27. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?

- Air Quality;  Floodplains;  Socioeconomics;  Geology, Soils and Groundwater; Vibrations;
- Energy;  Noise;  Surface Water;  Hazardous and Contaminated Materials;  Wetlands

**X National Park Preservation and Use**

**INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS**

28. Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to Federal Rule 940 Requirements?  Yes;  No

29. If yes, what is the status of the systems engineering analysis compliant with Federal Rule 940 for the project?  Not Started;  Ongoing, not complete;  Complete

30. Under which Architecture:

- DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture
- WMATA Architecture
- COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture

\_ Other, please specify:

DRAFT

31. Other Comments

**Project consists of three proposed roadway segments.**

- **Segment 1**, new four lane roadway on new alignment in Fairfax County, VA
- **Segment 2**, existing two lane roadway to be widened to four lanes in Prince William County, VA
- **Segment 3**, co-location on existing planned alignment of the Tri-County Parkway/Route 234 North in Prince William County, VA

The Tri-County Parkway and Route 234 North are included in the current CLRP

This application requests inclusion of the first two, above listed, segments (segments 1 & 2) of the proposed Manassas National Battlefield Bypass in the 2007 CLRP.

DRAFT

**Project: Manassas National Battlefield Bypass, Prince William County and Fairfax County, VA**

**Project consists of three proposed roadway segments.**

- **Segment 1**, new four lane roadway on new alignment in Fairfax County, VA
- **Segment 2**, existing two lane roadway to be widened to four lanes in Prince William County, VA
- **Segment 3**, co-location on existing planned alignment of the Tri-County Parkway/Route 234 North in Prince William County, VA

The Tri-County Parkway and Route 234 North are included in the current CLRP

This application requests inclusion of the first two, above listed, segments (segments 1 & 2) of the proposed Manassas National Battlefield Bypass in the 2007 CLRP.

**Total Project Cost (2007)**

Segment 1 = \$ 85 million  
 Segment 2 = \$ 48 million  
 Segment 3 = \$133 million (in current CLRP)  
 = **\$266 million**

Anticipated project construction complete in 2020

<b><u>Project Cost (1000s of \$)</u></b>	<b><u>2008</u></b>	<b><u>2009</u></b>	<b><u>2010</u></b>	<b><u>2011</u></b>	<b><u>2012</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
Capitol Cost (segments 1 & 2 only)	\$0	\$0	\$5	\$10	\$12	\$27
Project Revenues (1000s of \$)*	\$0	\$0	\$5	\$10	\$12	\$27

\*Source of revenue for design, right of way and construction of this project is reasonably expected to be provided as federal appropriations. This is based on project purpose to improve/protect federal property, history of funding of similar federal lands projects and initial/partial funding authorization by Congress in the public law that directed initiation of a study for the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass.

**Notes:**

Costs escalated 6.5 % per year

Capital Cost includes funding for preliminary engineering, right of way and construction

# CONGESTION MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM FOR PROJECTS IN THE 2030 CLRP



**BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Agency: **Federal Highway Administration, Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division**  
Secondary Agency:

2. Project Title: **Manassas National Battlefield Bypass**

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:			<b>Route 29</b>	
5. From ( _ at):			<b>Route 29 west of Centreville</b>	
6. To:			<b>Route 29 east of Gainesville, via Route 234</b>	

7. Jurisdiction(s): **Prince William and Fairfax Counties, VA**

8. Indicate whether the proposed project's location is subject to or benefits significantly from any of the following in-place congestion management strategies:

- Metropolitan Washington Commuter Connections program (ridesharing, telecommuting, guaranteed ride home, employer programs)
- A Transportation Management Association is in the vicinity
- Channelized or grade-separated intersection(s) or roundabouts
- Reversible, turning, acceleration/deceleration, or bypass lanes**
- High occupancy vehicle facilities or systems
- Transit stop (rail or bus) within a 1/2 mile radius of the project location**
- Park-and-ride lot within a one-mile radius of the project location**
- Real-time surveillance/traffic device controlled by a traffic operations center
- Motorist assistance/hazard clearance patrols
- Interconnected/coordinated traffic signal system
- Other in-place congestion management strategy or strategies (briefly describe below:)

9. List and briefly describe how the following categories of (additional) strategies were considered as full or partial alternatives to single-occupant vehicle capacity expansion in the study or proposal for the project.

a. Transportation demand management measures, including growth management and congestion pricing

b. Traffic operational improvements

c. Public transportation improvements

d. Intelligent Transportation Systems technologies

DRAFT

e. Other congestion management strategies

f. Combinations of the above strategies

10. Could congestion management alternatives fully eliminate or partially offset the need for the proposed increase in single-occupant vehicle capacity? Explain why or why not.

11. Describe all congestion management strategies that are going to be incorporated into the proposed highway project.

12. Describe the proposed funding and implementation schedule for the congestion management strategies to be incorporated into the proposed highway project. Also describe how the effectiveness of strategies implemented will be monitored and assessed after implementation.

**Note:**

**This project is to provide new expanded roadways to replace roads within the National Battlefield that will be closed as part of this action. The intent is to transfer existing capacity from existing roads that are to be closed to the proposed new and expanded roads.**

