



# Route 28 Corridor Environmental Assessment

## Early Coordination Meeting

WebEx  
Monday, February 25, 2019, 7:30 AM

A WebEx was held on the above date and time as part of the scoping efforts for the Route 28 Corridor Environmental Assessment. Meeting participants are listed below:

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Lee Fuerst	US Army Corps of Engineers	757-201-7832	lee.a.fuerst@usace.army.mil
Barbara Okorn	US Environmental Protection Agency	215-814-3330	okorn.barbara@epa.gov
Stephanie Kubico	US Environmental Protection Agency		kubico.stephanie@epa.gov
Hannah Schul	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality	804-698-4074	hannah.schul@deq.virginia.gov
Mackenzie Scott	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality		mackenzie.scott@deq.virginia.gov
John Simkins	Federal Highway Administration		john.simkins@dot.gov
Robert Iosco	VDOT	703-259-2764	robert.iosco@vdot.virginia.gov
Bryan Campbell	VDOT		bryan.campbell@vdot.virginia.gov
Rick Canizales	Prince William County	703-792-6825	rcanizales@pwcgov.org
Elizabeth Scullin	Prince William County	703-792-4051	escullin@pwcgov.org
Paolo Belita	Prince William County	703-792-6273	pbelita@pwcgov.org
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
Chloe Delhomme	City of Manassas	703-257-8235	cdelhomme@ci.manassas.va.us

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

### 1. Introductions/Opening

Stuart opened the meeting and announced the names of attendees.

Lee indicated that Theresita Crockett-Augustine from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Norfolk District Northern Virginia Field Office would be the contact person for a request for jurisdictional determination (JD) confirmation. An approved JD is an official USACE determination that jurisdictional “waters of the United States” (WOUS) are either present or absent on a particular site.

During the review of the meeting agenda and purpose, Stuart emphasized that the primary focus of the discussion today would be coordination on WOUS and to gather initial input on impacts

and additional data needs or information required so that the agencies could provide informed scoping comments.

## 2. Background

Stuart summarized that since the 1960s, an element of Prince William County's Comprehensive Plan has been the development of a bypass of existing Route 28 to relieve traffic on this roadway that travels through the Cities of Manassas and Manassas Park and Prince William County. The bypass would be located to the west of existing Route 28 and tie into Route 28 north of Bull Run.

The Tri-County Parkway (TCP) Location Study was conducted by VDOT in 2005. Although the alternatives incorporated a portion of the Route 28 bypass, also known as "Godwin Drive Extended," this was a broader study extending approximately 14 miles from the Route 234 Bypass in Prince William County on the south end to Route 50 in Loudoun County on the north end. Ultimately, the Preferred Alternative was not the one that encompassed Prince William County's Comprehensive Plan alignment due to, among other factors, the magnitude of WOUS impacts and impacts to Bull Run Regional Park. The TCP project was put on the shelf after the identification of a Preferred Alternative and before a Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision could be completed.

Stuart pointed out that the alignment of the TCP within Prince William County is not entirely the same as the alignment of alternatives under consideration as part of the current project; the TCP alternatives bisected Bull Run Regional Park, whereas the current alternatives pass through the Park on existing roads (Route 28 and Old Centreville Road/Ordway Road), thereby minimizing impacts to this resource. Fairfax County is currently designing a widening of existing Route 28 between the Prince William County Line and the US 29 interchange near I-66.

The 2017 Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study refocused Prince William County's need to relieve congestion in the Route 28 corridor. The study examined various alternatives to tie into Fairfax County's widening project and after two levels of screening, four alternatives emerged from the study. Alternatives 2A and 2B would be on new alignment to the west of Route 28, Alternative 4 would widen existing Route 28, and Alternative 9 would be on new alignment to the east of Route 28. Alternatives 2A and 2B follow the Comprehensive Plan/TCP project alignment south of Bull Run Regional Park and tie into Route 28 after crossing Bull Run, as described above.

Alternative 9 ranked the lowest of the four alternatives as it did not serve traffic as well the other three alternatives and due to its ranking on other environmental impacts, such as residential relocations. Therefore, Alternative 9 is not being carried forward in the Environmental Assessment. A discussion of all of the alternatives examined in the Feasibility Study will be included in the Alternatives chapter of the Environmental Assessment.

Rick added the distinction that Alternatives 2A and 2B would provide a new four-lane limited access roadway whereas Alternative 4 would be a two-lane widening with impacts to many commercial properties and access to those properties. The character of Alternative 4 would not be of a limited-access bypass as envisioned for the project.

A Comprehensive Plan update would be required for any of these alternatives. Route 28 is a four-lane divided road in the Comprehensive Plan and Alternative 4 proposes to widen the facility to six lanes. Alternatives 2A and 2B are on different alignment than the Tri-County Parkway alignment currently identified in the Comprehensive Plan, thus these two alternatives would also necessitate an update.

### 3. Route 28 Corridor Environmental Assessment

The current study will pick up where the Feasibility Study left off and assess the environmental impacts of the three alternatives, 2A, 2B, and 4. The delineation of WOUS, including wetlands, has been conducted (not submitted for confirmation yet), as well as identification of suitable habitat for threatened and endangered species (as identified by the US Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] Information for Planning and Consultation [IPaC] online service); cultural resources (archaeology, architecture, battlefields); and other sensitive resources (parks, community facilities, relocations, etc.). Traffic studies have also been completed and public scoping meetings were held December 5 and 6, 2018.

### 4. WOUS and Wetlands Impacts

Potential impacts have been identified within the 250-foot-wide corridors of the three alternatives with the understanding that the ultimate roadway would not be that wide. **The next step in the process is to examine ways to minimize impacts of Alternatives 2A and 2B by making adjustments to the roadway typical section and alignment shifts.**

Alternative 4 does have lower impacts to WOUS and wetlands; however, this alternative has higher impacts to other resources, such as commercial properties, as discussed above.

### 5. Discussion

**USACE, EPA, and DEQ all agreed that a thorough alternatives analysis and documentation would be required of why alternatives dismissed did not meet purpose and need and were not deemed practicable. In addition, any minimization measures and mitigations would also need to be well documented.**

When asked whether coordination has been conducted with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR), National Park Service (NPS), or USFWS, Stuart responded that contact had not yet been made, other than for acquiring the initial IPaC official species list for federally listed species. The cultural resource surveys have been finalized and would be forwarded to DHR. A meeting with NOVA Parks to discuss potential impacts to Bull Run Regional Park has been held, but coordination with NPS was pending. No specific species presence surveys or Section 7 effects discussions have been conducted with USFWS at this time.

It is uncertain right now whether any federal funding will be used for the project; however, Prince William County is proceeding as if there would be a federal contribution. An Environmental Assessment is being completed and FHWA has been engaged. John Simkins noted that it is not unusual for FHWA to be involved in projects having the potential for federal funding. If federal

funding is used, then FHWA would be the federal lead. If federal funds are not utilized, USACE would be the federal lead.

Rick indicated that one of the goals of this early coordination is to get a better sense of whether the agencies think Alternatives 2A or 2B would be permissible for this project before proceeding too far along on the environmental document given the outcome of events for the TCP project (USACE had said that given the magnitude of WOUS impacts they could not permit the project alternative that included Prince William County's Comprehensive Plan alignment).

## 6. Schedule/Next Steps

- **The agencies will provide scoping comments by March 8, 2019.**
- **Lee will forward the materials to Theresita so she is up to speed with the project.**
- The Environmental Assessment is planned for completion by this fall.

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.*