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MR. ROPER: Good evening everyone. First off, let me welcome you to tonight's public information meeting Number 4, Richmond Highway Widening, and tonight there's also a public hearing for the environmental document in conformance with NEPA requirements.

Again, I want to welcome everyone for coming here tonight. Public involvement is really essential to our work and we've been working on your designs. We appreciate your input. So again, thank you for coming tonight. Your appreciation or your involvement is greatly appreciated.

I do want to recognize elected officials that are here tonight. From Fairfax County, Supervisor Dan Stork and Supervisor Jeff McKay, and state elected officials Delegate Paul Krizek, Senator Surovell, and representing Senator Ebbin is his aide Chris Leyen. Thank you.

Our format tonight, for those of you who have been coming to our previous public informations, is pretty much exactly the same. We will have a 30-40 minute presentation. We will follow that with questions and
answers, which will go until eight o’clock in the evening.

During the question and answer period, we will have a staff member with a microphone that will be stationed right in front of me, right at the entrance to the auditorium. If you have comments, questions, you can line up there and our staff member will be able to hold the microphone for you and you can ask your question, okay.

So without further ado, I’ll turn it over to Dan Reinhard, the project manager, and we’ll get the presentation started.

MR. REINHARD: Thanks, Nick.

So tonight we’re here for the Richmond Highway Corridor Improvement Project.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can’t hear you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Use the mic please.

MR. REINHARD: All right. Is this better?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

MR. REINHARD: All right.

So we’re here tonight for the Richmond Highway Corridor Improvement Project. Tonight’s meeting we’re going to be going over coordination between multiple Fairfax County initiatives. We’ll go over a quick project
overview.

As Nick said, this is the fourth public information meeting, so we're going to make that part pretty quick.

We're going to talk about some potential pedestrian underpasses along the corridor, and we are going to be reviewing schedule estimate, and then I'll turn it over to Anissa Brown, who is going to go over the environmental assessment, this is the NEPA Public hearing, and then we will have a question and answer session.

So there are three current Fairfax County initiatives along this corridor. There's the EMBARK comprehensive plan amendment, there's the Fairfax County-Richmond Highway BRT project, and then there's Richmond Highway Corridor Improvement project that we're here to discuss tonight.

The EMBARK Comprehensive plan amendment really sets forth the vision for the corridor. It proposes a mix of densities and land uses, it proposes the multi modal vision for the corridor, which includes, as I mentioned, the Fairfax County BRT and widening Richmond Highway to six lanes, and includes bike paths and sidewalks on both sides of Richmond Highway.
The second initiative is Fairfax County — the second initiative is Fairfax County BRT. That is a separate project. It extends from Huntington Metro all the way to Fort Belvoir. It will be median running. The Richmond Highway Corridor Improvements actually overlaps that. So the BRT project will be expanding to six lanes with a median running BRT and will be widened to accommodate that BRT, everywhere between Huntington Metro, along North Kings Highway, down Route One, except for before that we’re here to talk about, which is between Napper Road and Jeff Todd Way.

So just a quick overview of the project. As I said it extends from Jeff Todd way to Napper Road. So roughly three miles of widening. It includes safety improvement; congestion relief in the form of widening and the reducing entrances to Richmond Highway wherever possible; includes intersection improvements such as aligning intersections across Route 1, and T-ing up intersections wherever possible; it includes a reservation in the median for BRT.

So we will be widening the median 56 feet to accommodate the future BRT project through this segment of Richmond Highway.
It includes sidewalks and separate bicycle paths on both sides of Richmond Highway; it includes three bridge replacement, one at Little Hunting Creek, one at North Fork at Dogue Creek and one at Dogue Creek; it includes potential noise walls where there - Anissa will talk about it a little bit later how those are determined. It included utility relocations, both above ground and below ground, where there conflicts; and it includes storm water management.

This is a typical section of Route 1 that's being proposed with this project. It's 178 foot right-of-way.

As I mentioned there's a 56 foot median being proposed for future BRT. The median will incorporate turn lanes wherever needed, six through lanes. There will be a buffer look up eight feet behind the curb and then a directional bicycle path on either side of the street or more bicycle path, there will be another buffer of four feet, and then there will be a six and a half foot sidewalk on either side. (Indicating)

Because we have such a large cross section on Richmond Highway of 178 feet, it's been proposed that we look into potential other ways to cross Richmond Highway,
other than these signalized intersections where we'll have crossings.

One way to accomplish that is since we are rebuilding the bridges at each of the creeks through this corridor, is providing accommodations for pedestrian to use those creek valleys to get from one side of Richmond Highway to the other.

You would do that by exiting the sidewalk and traveling down a series of ramps that make this ADA accessible, down to the stream valley where you would then cross under Richmond Highway and back up a set of ramps on the other side of the street. (Indicating)

So as I mentioned, there's two places that this is being proposed, Little Hunting Creek. As I mentioned you would leave the sidewalk, travel down a series of ramps, under Richmond Highway, back up another series of ramps on the other side. (Indicating)

This is -- at this point it's exclusively to get you across Richmond Highway. One of the reasons for doing this is because it's such a large cross-section, crossings at grade will be two stage.

You will cross -- you will push the button at a signalized intersection, you will get the signal to
cross, you will cross half the roadway, wait for another
cycle of signals, and then cross the remainder of the
roadway. (Indicating) So this is allows for one stage
crossing.

So this is another, this is the one at Dogue
Creek. You can see the series of ramps here (Indicating)
that allow you to access the stream valley. So as I
mentioned one of the advantages is you can do a one stage
crossing.

There are several advantages. It provides an
alternative to crosswalks at signalized intersections, it
provides a single stage crossing of Richmond Highway, so
you don’t have to wait for the signal to change and cycle
through twice. And you also have reduced pedestrian and
vehicular conflicts.

Some of the disadvantages, safety. So there’s
not as much visibility to pedestrians using this route.
So you’re going to be going under Richmond Highway and
that’s one of the main concerns about this alternative.

Maintenance is another one. Concerns are
trash, graffiti and snow removal. VDOT does not remove
snow or trash on pedestrian and bike facilities. So a
maintenance agreement would need to be reached with
Fairfax County in order to take care of those issues.

And the underpass could be impassable from flooding from major rain. So we’ve designed this at this point to go under water in a five year (Unintelligible) Because it’s part of the stream valley, we don’t want to block the stream valley with additional infrastructure that we’re trying to pass underneath Richmond Highway.

So I’ll quickly talk about schedule. So we are here (Indicating) at the October 29 public hearing for NEPA. The next step is a finding of significant impact.

So once we receive comments here tonight, we will address those comments and then we will submit to Federal Highway Administration for a finding of no significant impact. We hope to have that accomplished late this year - early next year.

Public hearing on design approval in the spring. We’re hoping to have the public hearing for the design of the project in the spring of 2019.

Right of way acquisition then to start in the summer of 2019. Beginning utility relocation summer of 2020, begin construction in 2023 with a completion of 2026.

The project estimate is - for this project -
is $390 million. 16 million for preliminary engineering, 169 for right of way and utilities, and 205 for construction, for a total of 390 million.

Right now, we have a total of 177.8 allocated to the project, leaving a funding gap of 212,000, I'm sorry, 212 million. 89.2 of which has been applied for through SMART Scale funding.

Now I'll turn it over to Anissa Brown to go over the environmental assessment.

MS. BROWN: Good evening. My name is Anissa Brown and I'm one of the managers here in the Northern District for Environmental section and what I wanted to do today was basically cover what is included in the environmental assessment why we actually completed the environmental assessment.

So the major law that we have to comply with in NEPA and NEPA is the National Environmental Policy Act. This Act is overseen and administered by the Federal Highway Administration for all conservation projects. Since this is a federally funded project, we had to adhere to all of the requirement of NEPA and NEPA itself isn't just one law, it's basically a - as you can see - an umbrella. (Indicating) There's a lot of little laws that
are all basically combined into one major act, and this
was established through Congress in 1969 and signed into
law in 1970 to basically make sure that all projects,
including transportation projects that have impacts to the
environment are basically evaluated thoroughly and that
includes the different laws that you see such as the Clean
Air Act. You have effective order 12898, which is the
Environmental Justice Act. You have different laws that
cover hazardous materials, endangered species. There are
a lot of different laws that are all basically tied into
NEPA.

So tonight as we go through all of the
different sections that are in the environmental
assessment, I'll try and break those down and just explain
them a little bit to you.

So, the reason why we did an environmental
assessment is you have to basically look at the type of
project that is being proposed. This particular project
is actually through an urbanized area. One thing that we
couldn't account for is the type and the level of
relocations that might be required, either commercial or
residential and because that couldn't be basically
determined at the earlier stage, in coordination -- and in
coordination with FHWA, we determined that an
environmental assessment, which basically states that
there is going to be an impact, but you're going to
evaluate it to determine be right type of impact and the
right type of mitigation measures would be applied.

So one of the things we had to look at was the
context of this particular project and the type of things
that could happen with the construction.

One of the things is the context. So we know
right now it's an urbanized setting. It's -- basically it
functions as a secondary road which is also a main street
that goes through Mount Vernon in this area. (Indicating)
So that in itself won't change with this project, it will
just be expanded with the widening.

The second thing we looked at was the
intensity. That's where we come to the right of ways,
potential right of way impacts come into play, because
what's the intensity of the impact to the community from
putting this type of a project in there.

So we have to look at the purpose and need and
what was the overall reason why we're trying to get this
project done and what are we trying to provide to the
community here.
So the first thing we were trying to look at was we’re trying to accommodate the travel. The travel, the amount that’s through here right now is a bottleneck that gets slowed down, not just on weekdays, but we’re hearing this also on weekends. A lot of people can’t get through. There’s pretty much standstill traffic because people can’t get through anywhere over there.

So what we tried to do is how can we reduce the congestion that’s going on right now and make it better for everyone, the people who live in the community and people who are traveling through the community to jobs or to get to different areas for recreational use.

The second thing we were looking at was improving the safety. In the past there have been issues with flooding at some of the current crossings, and so in order to accommodate a fix for that, we had to look at how can we improve the capacity for water and hydraulic flow as it goes through the community.

The other thing we looked at how can you enhance safety, and part of that would be providing continual bike and sidewalk through the community, because we heard a lot over the last four PMs, the last three PMs, including this one, about safety. A lot of people are
traveling through the community and basically the sidewalk ends and there's no connection, or basically kids walking to school, there's no safe way for them to get there if the roadway and the sidewalks end.

One of the last things we looked at was natural stream crossings. We did hear, believe it or not, from a lot of people, they're concerned about the wildlife and how do you get them from one side of the road to the other without passing through traffic, and that causes issues not only for safety of the passengers, but also for the wildlife.

So the larger bridges that are being proposed will actually allow for wildlife passage underneath the actual structure, which is a win for the community because the concerns of the wildlife will be met and the concerns people and vehicle strikes will actually be met because this gives an alternate path for those animals to cross other than the roadway.

So tonight some of the main things that we looked at in the environmental assessment include environmental justice, water resources, threatened and endangered species, cultural resources, hazardous materials, Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) properties, noise
analysis that was performed, the indirect and cumulative
to impacts.

All of these different items that are listed
here (indicating) we had actual reports that were done
through this document at the environmental table. Right
after this if you would like to go and take a quick review
of that, you can, and we're actually going to get all of
this uploaded to our website. So if you are able to go in
and to review the document, or if you were notified
through an email blast tonight of this meeting, we are
going to upload all those documents so that everyone can
review that.

So the environmental study area, it's not
quite the same graphic that was seen initially on the
presentation. (indicating) The environmental study area
it's a little bit different because you have to look at
the overall area that could be impacted by the type of
project that's being proposed, and in this particular
case, what we did was we took the center line of Richmond
Highway and we went 300 feet outside of the existing
alignment right now.

What that means is there's going to be a lot
of properties that were evaluated that may not actually be
impacted by this project, but we still wanted to account for them so that we can verify that there will be no impact to them.

So environmental justice. So the effective Act order that was actually signed into effect in 1994 is basically for minority and low-income communities that have Transportation Acts, transportation projects and other projects that basically go through the community. It gives them the ability to come to the meetings, just like this one, and voice your concerns, so that basically you're not being used as because it's a lower priced area for right of way, people believe in the past that was where they would take projects through.

In 1994 it was determined that something had to be done to give all the community more teeth and more involvement in the process moving forward.

So on this project right now, our environmental justice area has 16 units on five residential parcels potentially displaced. (indicating)

We say potentially because right now we are working to try and bring in the footprint of the project as much as humanly possible. We have actually done a lot up to this point, but we know we can still do better and
we're going to keep trying.

So we're going to keep working to try and make a better project for all of you and for everyone in the community.

So potential relocations. We do have right of way here tonight. They can talk to anyone who has been identified as maybe being potentially impacted and the fact that maybe you would have to move out of the area or basically you're being displaced by the project.

What we have on this slide right here (Indicating) is basically going through some of these stages and some of the steps that need to be done.

So basically the project itself is being equally designed for either side of the existing roadway, and by doing that we are basically treating both sides and all the communities, whether you're minority or non-minority, the same. As long as we can show that this project is being moved forward in a equally impactful way, we are meeting all of the requirements of not only environmental justice, but we are trying right fit the project and make sure that everyone in the community basically is treated fairly and treated the same.

So tonight again, on the potential
relocations, if you can go to our right of way table, the
brochure that you're seeing in the presentation right now,
they have those at that table, they will basically walk
you through the type of rights you have, and you can voice
your concerns about the project.

Additionally, if you have real concerns right
now, and when I say real concerns I mean things that you
are thinking of right now, and you would like to have
those put on the actual transcript of tonight's meeting,
we do have a court reporter who is right here.

(Indicating) She's willing and ready to take any of your
comment and these comments become part of the official
transcript of this project tonight and will track with the
project for the rest of the time that we're working on it
and the Federal Highway Administration is actually
requiring us to make sure that all of these are thorough,
because they are really interested in finding out what you
have to say about this project and the impacts to you and
to your community right now.

So if you can, if you'd like to, if you have a
chance please talk to our court reporter tonight.

So water resources. Because of the three
crossings that that we have currently within the project.
corridor, we have Dogue Creek, Northfork at Dogue Creek and Little Hunting Creek. Of the waters of the US, there are -- we have .2 acre for the entire project, which I should tell you for a lot of projects, especially one of this magnitude, to have such a low amount of Wetland impact, is this is showing that we've gone above and beyond to try and minimize impacts to the environment and actually provide a very good project to the community as a whole.

Right now overall, for stream impacts we have 963.2 linear feet of impact. We've spread them out equally amongst all three of the crossings due to the fact that there is a new structure going to each one of them.

The last thing we have showing right now would be flood plane impacts and overall for this project we have 8.6 Acres of flood plane impact.

For any impacts to waters of the US, which would be any waterway that is considered jurisdictional by the US Army Corps, we will have to seek permitting, some kind of a permitting process, but that will not happen until the final design section of the project, and also we are looking at mitigation measures.

All of these right now, we are kind of
minimizing the impacts that will require additional or
extensive mitigation, because anything that we can do to
minimize that, it gives us more time and funds to put
right back into the project.

Currently we have two federally listed species
that have been found or have been known to be within this
area of Richmond Highway. One is the Northern Long Eared
Bat and it's listed not necessarily because it's been
found here, but because all of Fairfax County is within
the home range of this one particular species. So because
we're in the home range, we still have to list it as a
potential, even though we don't anticipate impacting this
species here.

The second species we have listed is the
Atlantic Sturgeon, and this particular species, it's been
seen here in the vicinity, but it hasn't actually been
seen here in the water ways, but because there's a known
fact that there is a history of it possibly being here, we
still are listing it as a potential.

Cultural resources. So in looking over our
project, the whole entire footprint and everything that's
within the environmental study area, we came up with four
potential sites that could be for preserved architecture,
the different resources, the original Mount Vernon High
School, the Pope-Leighey House, the Woodlawn Historic
District, and the National Trust property.

Three of these properties are all overlapping
together at the southern end of the project, and when we
went through looking for archaeological resources, we did
not find any currently. We do know there's a potential
during construction, so we're saying right now we haven't
found any.

So, hazardous materials. There are different
properties that over time they were once maybe a hotel or
maybe they were a gas station, and they've been remade
into something else, either housing or a school or
anything on the corridor.

What we're looking at right now for the
hazardous materials is what could potentially have some
kind of an impact or potentially have some kind of a risk
to the community.

We're doing studies right now in the field to
determine if we have any actual issues, but there were
19 sites that were listed as potential and we're currently
looking at those, and in order to be thorough, we're
actually looking at every property that is frontage to the
current Richmond Highway to make sure that everything's
been addressed.

    So Section 4(f). Section 4(f) was basically
established under the US DOT Act of 1966 and applies to
any public parks, any wildlife refuge, waterfowl or any
historic sites.

    Because of the way parks have fallen outside
of the existing adjacent land to the existing Richmond
Highway, we do not currently see ourselves as having any
section 4(f) issues.

    The only one that we were kind of on the fence
about was actually the original Mount Vernon High School
and we did go ahead and coordinate with the property owner
and with the state preservation officer.

    What we found is the impact we are having to
the school is to the bus loop in the very front of the
property, and overtime the bus loop has been remodeled and
refurbished and has been changed at least five times, and
because each time it changed and it was altered, it lost
its overall integrity to the original property, and so
currently it's not listed as a historic feature, but
everything from the back lawn on is considered historic,
and so we are treating the whole property as a historic
resource.

We were able to get a no adverse impact on the property due to the bus loop impact because it is not considered historic.

Section 6(f) is part of the Land and Water Conservation Act. This Act basically mean that if you buy land with federal dollars for a park, you would have to basically coordinate and replace any impacted parcel, or any impacted land, with another parcel adjacent to that property.

This project does not actually have any of its property listed on there. So I just wanted to cover what it was.

Noise analysis. So over the last two PMs, we've actually got into detail about the noise analysis and some of the things that we had to do to address the noise for this federally funded project.

This overall process for the noise analysis to do the study requires us to look at three different criteria. The first is, is there -- will there be a noise -- will there be a noise impact. What that means is first we have to go out and do field studies and basically take a baseline over what is the existing noise levels so that
we can basically create a calibrated model and then we use forecasted data to figure out what the new impact would be based on the new numbers of people and the volume of traffic that will be going through the area.

For this project, because we're looking at a 2025 - 2026 open year, we're looking at the future numbers for 2045.

The second step is feasibility, is it feasible to actually construct this project.

We're trying to figure out if you are shown to be noise impacted in a particular area, we're trying to figure out if a wall is constructed, is it feasible to actually construct it, will it work acoustically. And what that basically means is there are different requirements.

So does it work acoustically. 50 percent of the people who would be benefitting from this wall, would actually have to have some kind of noise decrease. And up here where showing there's a 5 as a minimum. (Indicating)

And can it be constructed. So although there are walls that are shown to be feasible, if we can't construct it, we wouldn't be going through the process of trying to basically keep it moving forward if we can't.
construct the wall because basically if you can't meet the second step, then we wouldn't move on to the third step.

The last step in this would be reasonable. So on here what we have is cost-effectiveness. (indicating) We use a minimum amount right now of 1600 square feet per benefitted receptor. That's something that the state has adopted and it's based off of the FHWA noise guidance.

We also have a design goal. So at least one person who would possibly be benefitted by this wall has to 7 decibels, which is the measurement for noise that we use of a reduction. If you can't even get that, then the wall wouldn't be considered reasonable.

But if we can get that, then we move on to the last thing that's in there which would be viewpoints of the benefitted receptors.

So that would mean if someone here within your community is showing, based off of the preliminary noise analysis that was completed, that there's a potential for your community or your home do have a sound wall, what we do is we finish our design, and at the very end of our design we do another noise study, the final noise study because over the time of the preliminary noise study and the final design things have changed.
We're trying to tighten up our footprint right now or we may have to push out the design in some spots, which means the impact to the different areas and the different people in the community is going to change. So we go back and we do a follow-up noise study to verify if the original walls are still valid, and in some cases new walls do show up as potential.

And what we do is we reach out to those community members through a voting process and let them vote if they want the wall.

Some people don't want a wall, maybe they like their view. Some people do want a wall, but we try and open this up so that everyone in that community gets to voice their opinion.

So currently for this project what we're showing is there are five different noise barrier systems that have been shown as potential sound walls in this corridor.

I'll give you a moment if you want to look this over. (Indicating)

So currently the length of sound walls in the corridor equal 6.5 percent of the overall length of the project. So it doesn't seem like a lot, but it is going
to be measurable for the people who are noise impacted who
are basically potentially eligible for the wall.

So we wanted to give you a sample, kind of
just something that shows what happens when we're talking
about the voting process could be going on for this
project.

So, we took one barrier system, Barrier 6P
(Indicating) which is right off of Richmond Highway and
Shannon's Green, and what it's showing right here is on
the very frontage of Richmond Highway, you will see 11
yellow dots that are there. Those are people that are
basically impacted and benefitted and they get a vote.

The people that you are seeing are the dots
that are blue, those are benefitted and not impacted.
They also would get a vote because they're getting the
benefit from that particular structure.

The difference is a yellow vote is actually
rated as of 5 and the blue vote is rated as a 3.

The vote also includes property owners and
tenants. So whether you're renting that property or it's
your property itself, those people will get a vote just to
let everyone know.

So the difference is if you are a green dot,
which is not benefitted and not impacted, or a red which
is impacted but not benefitted, for the barrier system you
would not be allowed to vote on the wall, only the people
who are yellow and blue would be able to vote on this
wall.

So, now what we're going to -- to basically to
kind pf round up what we've talked about all night, was
all of the different impacts, if you take them
incrementally, what we've determined is each impact from
every single resource overall, since so many of them were
no impact or little impact, what we're finding is overall
the project does not have a significant impact on the
community or the environment because of the fact that it
is already in a transportation used and also that overall
the project, because we're trying to mitigate as much as
possible, will be lessened by all that work that is being
put in right now.

This is the end of my presentation right now.
What I did want to do is let you know that our comment
period is open until December 6th, and basically as part
of this process for NEPA, the National Environmental
Policy Act, we really need your comments. We really need
your interaction here because there is a huge part of
public involvement, which is why NEPA was created in the first place, and we're really looking forward to all of your comments and to find out what you were thinking about the project and the environmental document, because we need your comments to show that we have come out to you and that you have had an opportunity to review the information.

The last thing that we're going to be doing is addressing the comments that are received tonight and also all the way through December 6th, and also once we are completed and we have addressed everything, we will be going through and submitting for the finding of no significant impact, which is the final decision document that you can get from the Federal Highway Administration, and that would complete our process and allow us to possibly start the right of way phase of this project.

Potential impacts. I'm going to hand this back over to Dan. We're going to kind of roll up everything.

(Brief pause)

So what this is, is just a summary slide of everything that I just talked about. (Indicating) I know it might be a little hard to see it, but we have bigger
boards out in the auditorium and in the cafeteria, for you
to kind of review all of this. So I'll leave this for you
here and we're going to go over the project benefits.

MR. REINHARD: Anissa did a great job of
explaining how we review the environmental impacts to the
project.

What I did want to leave you with tonight is
the benefits of the project. So there's going to be
significant transportation improvements at the end of this
project in the form of reduced time in traffic, providing
alternate nodes of travel, including pedestrian and
bicycle facilities.

We're going to be reserving space for the
future BRT. I'm not sure if I said this, BRT is bus
rapid transit. There should be significant storm water
improvements from this project.

Right now, many of the properties along the
corridor were developed with no storm water management
facilities. So we're going to be addressing the quantity
and quality of the storm water exiting the roadway.

There's going to be eco system benefits which
Anissa's pointed out earlier. We're replacing three
bridges. Each one of those bridges it's going back taller
and wider than it was before. Each one of those should provide a good path for wildlife to get across Richmond Highway.

Anissa mentioned that a large part of the environmental assessment is public feedback. So we want to get that feedback from you. So you actually have four ways of doing that.

One, is you can do it here tonight with common cards that are available out in the hallway. You can do it by approaching our court reporter. She's here now, after the question and answer session I believe we're going to move her back over to the cafeteria. So you can give your comments directly to her. You can mail them to me directly at VDOT's regional office, the address is here, (Indicating) it's also on the brochures, as is the last way to give us comments which would be email and that email address is also on the brochures.

I think that concludes our presentation for tonight. Oh, I can't forget, responses are due or comments are due by December 6.

I'm going to conclude the presentation here and I will turn it over to Nick, who is going to walk us through the question and answers.
MR. ROPER: Thank you, Dan.

Before we get started on the Q & A, I really want to urge people to give us your comments, in particular with regards to the pedestrian underpasses. We are very much interested. It’s a new feature we just introduced tonight. We want to get your feedback on that, there’s a couple of questions specifically on the comment form that ask you if you like the design feature. We interested to know whether or not you think you would use it.

So your input will be very important to us for the decisions that need to be made going forward, whether or not to include these alternatives for crossing Richmond Highway.

So with that, we’re going to get started on the Q & A period. Again, one of our staff members, Olivia, is right at the center of the auditorium, right by the entrance. What I would ask people to do who have questions or comments, is to line up and Olivia will hold the microphone for you. You can ask a question or make a comment.

We will go until there are no questions or comments or until eight o’clock, at which time at eight
o'clock we will stop at eight to allow people to go back
into the cafeteria so they can look at the boards and
other displays one more time or maybe ask more detailed
questions of staff members.

So, if you have a question or comment, our Q &
A period will begin.

(A hand was raised)

Sir, you will need to get up and go up the
aisle to where Olivia is, where people are standing.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is George Kyriacou
and I'm voicing our family's concern. The property has
been in our family for about 56 - 57 years, 8312 Richmond
Highway, which is earmarked for storm water management.
On two of the boards across the way, one of them is above
ground, the other one now is showing underground, but we
currently have the property - trying to market it. We
have two developers very interested in it, but
everything's been put on hold because -- I've reached out
to Fairfax County and VDOT with no responses as far as why
they're earmarking our property, that we've had for over
56 years, as a storm water management site.

You have Mount Vernon High School, the Old
Mount Vernon High School, right across the highway. That
could be easily put on the backside of the property and
not encumber any of the historical value.

But with that, I want to make sure the court
reporter documents my comments. If I need to go speak her
directly I’ll do that, but again, we strongly oppose the
placing of the storm water management at 8312 Richmond
Highway, which is right across the road, across Richmond
Highway, across from the Old Mount Vernon High School.

Thank you.

MR. ROPER: Thank you.

MR. CRITER: My name is Greg Criter. (ph) I
actually went to (Unintelligible) library the other day
and saw this document and so I have a question on. I took
those, but I didn’t bring it with me.

There’s a section in there, it talks about
Super Street and I know it was discussed before and the
last thing (Unintelligible) looked at as an alternative
based on the impact and the costs and so forth, that’s no
longer a consideration.

So I just wanted to confirm the Super Street
design is not part of this and then I guess
(Unintelligible) will be updated (Unintelligible)

MR. ROPER: Yeah, Super Street is not part of
our current design. We have traditional intersections throughout. At the beginning it was part of it and it makes some locations and it requires more right of way, so it gave us a greater footprint to look at for the environmental assessment. But that is not longer part of our design. We have traditional intersections.

MR. CRITER: Thank you.

MS. WINDSOR: My name is Betsy Windsor and I am a bit confused about what you showed us. I was wondering about what you have now. You have the left turn area on some of the intersections and this does not show any right turn areas, in which case the third lane you're in wouldn't really have much of an advantage.

Also, I'm curious about whether you will be reducing the number of stop lights in order to facilitate traffic flow, to make traffic move a lot faster.

MR. ROPER: Well, I would, in a very general sense, in response to your question, being able to make left turns is going to be restricted in the future. That's a necessary feature of the project with regard to bus, rapid transit. So all the left turns will occurring at signalized intersections.

There are currently ten, one additional one
proposed and we don’t have a full answer on that yet, and
that’s at -- right across from the US Post Office is the
location we’re looking at and that would be the only new
signalized location that is being examined.

MS. WINDSOR: And the other question I have is
when the center bus lane (Unintelligible), how will bus
passengers get across safely (Unintelligible) How many
stops will there be, how many will they have?

MR. ROPER: There are two stops within the
limits of this project. The pedestrians will be able to
cross at signalized intersections to the bus platforms
that will be there.

If you want to see the other details, back in
the cafeteria in the far right corner as I’m looking at
it, is where our bus rapid transit station is. The
Fairfax County project manager is there and can provide
you more details.

MS. CHUNG: Hi, I’m Sue Chung. I’m one of the
owners of a commercial property that’s located at 8334
Richmond Highway. I’m interested in knowing if you guys
have any hard figures anywhere which shows how much of
land taking that would take place with this widening on
each side of the street for the property owners?
MR. ROPER: Yes and I think we certainly
should on the boards. Also, you can go over to the
interactive map, okay, that's available in the near right
corner of the cafeteria. That's a GIS map application.
The design, you can use GIS features to look at details of
the design. I think we would have some information there
that might be able to help you.

MS. CHUNG: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SIGNIK: Hello, Pete Signik (ph) Frankly,
the only question I have is on the right of way
acquisition. I understood from previous meetings that it
was going to start occurring in the spring of 2019, but I
see in the brochure it's summer of 2019.

MR. ROPER: Yes, sir. Right now we're looking
at summer of 2019. We had been hoping to be at stage
three (Unintelligible) the public hearing this fall, but
we still have some design features that we are working on.
So we moved the public hearing for this project back and
so that would delay our initial right of way start, but
we're not anticipating an overall delay to the start of
construction.

MR. SIGNIK: Summer is June or --

MR. ROPER: Summer is a broad season. We
don't have a specific month identified.

MR. SIGNIK: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.

MS. MOREFIELD: Hi, I'm Debora Morefield. I actually have a news question for you. A lot of these streams and waterways in this area are interconnected and a lot of (Unintelligible) with all the winding road and (Unintelligible) why did you only pick 300 feet back from the center line?

MR. ROPER: Anissa?

MS. BROWN: So the reason why we went with 300 feet is overall for the border, we figured that the widening itself would probably be within the first 200 feet, but we tried to double that space to make sure that we evaluated everything on there.

So you're right, for the waterways it does go back further, but for the environmental study area, it's just 300 feet from the center line to make sure that we fully addressed everything, all of the different features and resources that could fall within that study area.

MR. ROPER: The drainage design is not limited to 300 feet within the -- beyond the center line of Richmond Highway. As mentioned, Dogue Creek, Little
Hunting Creek, all tributaries, all those contribute to the entire watershed that comes into where the process currently are, so our drainage design for what we call the hydraulic use is much greater than that, than the 300 feet.

MS. MOREFIELD: So the Richmond Highway is the low point of this watershed. It's all draining towards the (Unintelligible)

MR. ROPER: Where the three major crossings are right now, where Dogue Creek, Northfork at Dogue Creek and Little Hunting Creek. The entire watershed that's (Unintelligible), save for Dogue Creek, that's north of Richmond Highway, is all being accounted for in the drainage design.

MS. MOREFIELD: Okay. I'll look at the documentation. It should be in there, correct?

MR. ROPER: Yes.

MS. MOREFIELD: Okay. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you discuss why these (Unintelligible) were retained above ground?

MR. ROPER: I'm so sorry. Could you say that again?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you explain why they
utilities were retained above ground?

MR. ROPER: The utilities are being retained
above ground because of the cost of putting them
underground. About 45 additional million dollars is
needed.

MS. CHASE: Hi, my name is Irene Chase. I've
been proactive a bit on this project. I understood that
when you all started talking about widening on Route 1
here eight years ago maybe it was, the talk was that you
were going to make additional (Unintelligible) for all of
the people that were being relocated to Fort Belvoir from
all over the area.

Now that the military's decided not to do
that, they've abandoned their project and I'm wondering
why we still have to put up with that, having the road put
through that has a center divide that will keep people
from accessing -- they're already in trouble with this
design is (Unintelligible), why they can go all the way
down to a mile or two or three or four to make their turn
and come back and have to do it again coming home.

MR. ROPER: Ma'am, I'm not sure about the
relocation issue that you referred to. But I do know that
in approximately 2015 I think, Tom, whenever the DRPT did
it's transit study?

In 2015 DRPT concluded a transit study where they were looking at mass transit all along the Richmond Highway corridor that included a light rail, monorail and bus rapid transit and bus rapid transit was looked at and selected as the preferred alternative given all the redevelopment that the county is planning for the Richmond Highway area.

MS. CHASE: The impetus of this was the military people moving all of these offices out of Crystal City and all over getting them back onto a military facility and they seen the error of their ways, they changed their mind, they've got buildings down on the other side of the base that they can't fill, because nobody's moving into them. And I wonder why we have to have (Unintelligible) so that we can't access this along the corridor?

MR. ROPER: Well, I do think know that --

MS. CHASE: And now you've got to take down more trees. When we moved into this house in the early '90s, you could feel a 10 degree drop from the highway to the back of the house, now you get maybe 2 or 3 degrees.

You paved over everything, you're taking all
the trees out, now we can’t move up and down the road and
I can imagine I’m not the only person here who feels that
way.

MR. ROPER: Yes, ma’am. Thank you. I do know
that Fairfax County, as was mentioned here early on, has a
significant comprehensive plan amendment on the way for
redevelopment of the Richmond Highway corridor to include
several central business centers, so I think that there’s
that -- that development is also being viewed as a
catalyst for the need for this project.

MS. CHASE: I guess what we feel here is
you’re not listening to us. When we said don’t take the
horse farms, don’t widen the road, don’t make this a
thoroughfare for (Unintelligible) community coming into
town instead of taking the highway, you didn’t listen to
us and now you’re going to block the center of that road
where all these businesses, that are already struggling on
this corridor, will not be used by people because nobody’s
going to go out and run all over the whole world and turn
around and come back to get Staples or Costco or any of
the things that are actually important to you.

Thank you.

MR. ROPER: Yes, ma’am.
MR. CHASE: I'm Bob Chase. I have just one other comment and that is we live at the end of Central Avenue and every day people come from the high school, come down there, walk across, go to Reddick and go across the road and I don't know if that's being considered at all, but that is the main access for people, students, who come to Mount Vernon High School from the other side of Route 1.

I probably see 50 - 60 students every day walking there. I never counted them, but there's a constant movement of them from the high school to get back to their homes which are on the other side of Route 1. So I don't know if you're considering that at all as far as the process of trying to allow better access for them. That's just a comment, because I happen to notice that.

MR. ROPER: Yes, sir. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good evening. I'm (Unintelligible) for 8850 Richmond Highway next to the Roy Rogers. Getting back to the (Unintelligible) ways, you are taking away about 40 feet of our frontage and that makes everything much closer to the door and as such potentially (Unintelligible) my tenants and the military, they will not come (Unintelligible) any more because of
closeness to the road and that impacts us very
(Unintelligible)

The second thing is the proposed
(Unintelligible) something there proposed
(Unintelligible), the hotel is there on that property and
now the dock area being taken away (Unintelligible) not be
done. (Unintelligible)

MR. ROPER: Yes, sir. I'm going to ask you to
get with one of our staff members after the Q & A period
so that you can show them exactly where and they can go
over some of the details of your comments.

MR. SHANNON: Hello, my name is Dave Shannon.
This is the first one of these meetings I've attended, so
I can't state whether or not this particular issue was
discussed previously, but having come from one residential
area that (Unintelligible) major improvements to a state
road and now seeing it happen here, the primary premise is
to relieve the traffic congestion (Unintelligible) New
Jersey (Unintelligible) overpasses and underpasses were
traffic lights are. I know for a fact that every time an
emergency vehicle pulls out onto Route 1, it messes up the
timing of the lights and as we put these (Unintelligible),
which we continually (Unintelligible) down here, it just
mucks things up more and I can see certainly at Jeff Todd
Way and Richmond Highway intersection, since you already
went through all the hubbub with the Pope-Leighey House
and the National Trust and stuff, and already kind of
disrupted that area, getting rid of that light, which I
see every day coming back from work backed up considerably
waiting for traffic (Unintelligible), that would disappear
with an overpass and an underpass.

I'm just wondering, we're talking about these
bus lanes, which I don't think based on what I've seen in
Arlington, you know, south of Crystal City, I don't think
that's the best utilization of space.

Obviously an overpass and underpass costs a
lot of money, but I would gladly like to see a comparison
of data on how you would improve the volume with an
overpass and underpass and how that cost would compare to
putting in these bus lanes. I think the overpass -
underpass would win.

So has that even entered into the conversation
I guess is my question.

MR. ROPER: No, sir. Underpasses and
overpasses really have to have -- again, Fairfax County
has a significant redevelopment for this area that's
planned, that’s really looking to convert Richmond Highway
to more of a main street feel. So we have looked at
retaining the signalized intersections and improving them
so that even though the signals would still remain in
place, we still have acceptable levels of service on
Richmond Highway.

MR. SHANNON: All right. But again, the final
premise is to increase the traffic flow, correct?

MR. ROPER: Yes, sir, and the design still
will do that.

MR. SHANNON: So again, the comparison I think
were you to look at it, would be hands down comparison
wise.

MR. ROPER: I don’t disagree. A free flowing
highway with no signals at all would certainly be must
faster through there, but it’s beyond the scope of this
project as it was completed.

MR. SHANNON: All right.

MS. PEYTON: Hi, my name is Mary Peyton. I
was surprised that your environmental assessment did not
assess the effects of the bridges over the creeks on the
environment of the creeks, because, you know, how much
(Unintelligible) but it didn’t talk about whether there
would be increased flooding, for example, on Dogue Creek
where you’re opening up from a 20 foot culvert to 200 foot
bridge span.

The county assessment says that that will
increase the frequency of flooding and your staff tonight
said it would not, so I think we should get a study so
the county and VDOT to get together and see what would
happen before we build the bridge and if there needs to be
some mitigation work done to keep decrease the frequency
of flooding, that should be part of this plan as well.

Are there plans to do that?

MR. ROPER: Ma’am, as far as the hydraulic
design for the bridges, we’ve already looked up to 1000
feet downstream, which is very close to these residential
properties approximately are. We see no changes right now
in water surface elevation or flood plane limits that far
downstream.

So we don’t think there will be an adverse
impact or any increase in flooding, but we will address it
in the environmental assessment.

MS. PEYTON: Isn’t this the environmental
assessment?

MR. ROPER: This is, but a part of the public
information process is to get feedback and if you're requesting that we look at that as a comment on the environmental assessment, then that's what we will do.

MS. PEYTON: I am requesting that. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm (Unintelligible) Me and my parents own 8149 Richmond Highway. Currently, I'm the budget engineering manager and my dad (Unintelligible) the proposed budget (Unintelligible) intersection, people come from (Unintelligible)

MR. ROPER: Sir, I would ask you, it would be a lot easier probably to give you an answer and we'll have the engineer meet you at the board where your property is and they can go into detail.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: All right. I just wanted to make the comment, so I mean understand

MR. ROPER: I understand. Thank you very much.

Okay. The last two gentlemen in line. I see we're past eight o'clock, so the last two questions sand then we'll break.

MR. SEIGEL: I'm Paul Seigel. I believe (Unintelligible) and I want to congratulate you on recognizing (Unintelligible), but not really taking into
the possibility of (Unintelligible) highways and super
highways (Unintelligible)

   So I encourage you to think about that harder
   and at least do something more than just pass on the
   responsibility to the county because VDOT doesn't do
   trash. VDOT should do it and do it correctly
   (Unintelligible)

   Thank you.

   MR. ROPER: Yes, sir.

   Last comment.

   AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is (Unintelligible)
   I just want to share my observation on what the gentleman
   mentioned earlier about the intersection of Richmond
   Highway and Central Avenue.

   There 100,000 (Unintelligible) and also the
   retirement community (Unintelligible) within that
   intersection and that intersection is very close to Mount
   Vernon Highway, all the children were forced to walk to
   Mount Vernon High School. So there's no school bus for
   students because (Unintelligible) to Mount Vernon.

   I'm asking if you propose getting traffic
   light for that intersection.

   MR. ROPER: There will be traffic lights, of
course, at Buckman and Mount Vernon and Janna Lee. So
there will be signalized intersections at Buckman and one
to the north of that and then another one next to that as
well.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we’re a
little bit over our time. Thank you very much for your
comments. Thank you all for coming.

(The court reporter moved to the cafeteria to
take further comments)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MR. KYRIACOU: My name is George Kyriacou and
I’m one of the owners of 8312 Richmond Highway, which is
earmarked for storm water management. We sent this
letter, I sent this letter just a couple of week ago, but
I did send it back in May also and I haven’t really gotten
a response to it.

The property, 8312, is included in an approved
redevelopment plan by Fairfax County Zoning to be
developed and now this breaks on our ability to market the
property.

We do have two developers that are very
interested and have issued letters of intent to purchase.

Again, everything stopped because of this indecisiveness
on the storm water.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you, sir.

MR. KYRIACOU: And I’ll send comments to the email provided.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, ma’am.

MS. ARNETT: Let me just add a couple of comments. I’m Debra Arnett. I’m a realtor for the property.

We’ve had two very reasonable offers on the property, one for four million and one at 3.775 as an initial offer, and I’ve been unable to close the transaction due to the storm water retention that is tentatively planned for the property.

I respectfully request the water retention be removed from the property. Thank you.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir, can I get your name?

MR. RETCHER: Kevin Retcher, 8305 Richmond Highway, 12A.

So what I would like to know, when I purchased my property seven-eight years ago I paid like 270, and the values have dropped substantially because of this project. So I think it’s only fair that the county
analyze what commercial properties have done throughout the county and that be -- if values have increased, as they have, and we have decreased, that that has to be part of the compensation when they take part of our parking lot in the front, because our value -- no one wants to buy a property in the section right now, so our values are being driven down by this project, not only in what we're losing but also value. So that's my biggest issue.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
Can I get your name?

MR. SHORES: Jim Shores. We represent Mount Zephyr Business Center, located right beside the old Mount Vernon High School on Richmond Highway. We're concerned about the parking that's going to be taken for this new addition to Route 1.

I want to know what's going to happen to people who need to park in that -- park in that --

MS. SHORES: It's our entire parking lot.

MR. SHORES: We have 20 businesses, so we're thinking -- they're taking -- the whole front parking lot is going to be taken.

MS. SHORES: We do have parking on the side, but the front obviously is (Inaudible due to background
noise)

MR. SHORES: We're already overpopulated in my opinion.

THE COURT REPORTER: Ma'am, your name?

MS. SHORES: Vickie Shores.

MR. SHORES: I'm in the same complex.

The other thing I would mention is the amount of -- the impact of people even coming and stopping at -- they're going to be taking away one entrance.

MR. SCHEIRER: Both entrances.

MR. SHORES: So that's going to be -- both entrances to pull in, so they're going to have to go behind us to even find us. So that's going to have a direct impact on foot traffic from people coming to get like insurance or coming to get mortgages or computers.

MS. SHORES: Computer repairs.

MR. SHORES: They have to carry -- they have to carry things into the business, so if they can't park in front, they're going to then have to be trucking things from the back, which is going to impact their business.

MS. SHORES: Not to mention we actually brought Route 1 frontage for a reason.

MR. SHORES: Yes, amen to that.
MS. SHORES: The parking is a big deal to us because right now our customers can drive up, some carry their computers into your shop without issues. Our techs only work weekends, they can just walk up and so we're really concerned where the parking is going to be.

MR. SHORES: Thank you.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir. Thank you.

(Brief pause)

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir. Can I get your name.

MR. SCHEIRER: Carson Scheirer. My suggestion is for Buckman Road, the south side of Buckman Road should be widened all the way to Janna Lee and Janna Lee should be widened so it has a left turn and right turn, two lanes, coming out because in the morning it gets very backed up all the way to Janna Lee as it is now. This would alleviate that I believe.

That's all I wanted to say.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you, sir.

Yes, ma'am, can I get your name.

MS. LORENTZEN: Connie Lorentzen. I have some concerns about the cross under, the proposed cross under. While I like the idea of a way for pedestrians to get
across the main highway, I'm concerned that this could put
people in harms way and that some people might become
targets of people who are less fortunate.

The Route 1 corridor demographics are unique
within Fairfax County. Close to 40 percent of the low to
moderate income people live on six percent of the land in
Fairfax County and that six percent is the Route 1
corridor.

While there is not a distinct correlation
between that and crime, there is a need to protect all of
the people who would possibly use that from the percent of
that population that might see them, again, as targets.

I do support a cross over, something maybe
over top of the road like 295 with chain link so that the
roadway is safe from pedestrians going across it.

I thank everyone for thinking of a way to help
people get across this big road safely.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

Can I get your name please.

MS. CRANE: Lesa Crane. I'm concerned about
the Buckman Road intersection not having -- not being
widen enough to handle the traffic going onto Route 1,
because it's already backing up to my home.
I'm also concerned that my area has not been
developed by the county like it was supposed to be. It
was the Mount Vernon Gateway Project that has become
defunct. That and the Janna Lee intersection need to be
widened in order to help the traffic in our area.

The other concern I have is the closing of the
south intersection of Buckman Road. By closing that off
it doesn't give a lot of -- it doesn't allow for a
transition onto Route 1. The current intersection is
dangerous and needs to be redone, but the way they have it
configured going by the county (Inaudible due to
background noise)

* * * * *

(Whereupon, at approximately 8:30 o'clock,
p.m., the proceedings were concluded)
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