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Project Goals and Objectives
III. Project Goals and Objective

GOAL

The project goals for the Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study are to identify infrastructure improvements that will improve travel times and network reliability within the Route 28 Corridor through Prince William County, the City of Manassas and City of Manassas Park and develop a plan to implement these improvement project(s).
III. Project Goals and Objective

Objectives

1. Reduce congestion and improve network reliability on Route 28 from Godwin Drive through Historic Downtown Manassas to Liberia Avenue.

2. Reduce congestion and improve network reliability on Route 28, Centreville Road – between Liberia Avenue and Compton Road.

3. Facilitate the weekday peak period commuter flows between I-66 and the residential communities in Manassas Park, Manassas, and Prince William County.

4. Provide increased opportunities for alternative modes of travel such as travel by bicycles, walking and carpooling/vanpooling.

5. Provide improved access to transit facilities.

6. Identify improvement project(s) that have public consensus.

7. Identify improvement project(s) that avoid or minimize environmental impacts.
III. Project Goals and Objective

Objectives – cont.

8. Identify improvement project(s) that avoid or minimize impacts to existing development.

9. Identify improvement project(s) that complement other Route 28 improvements currently being implemented by VDOT, Fairfax County, City of Manassas, City of Manassas Park, and Prince William County. These include:
   
   a. Widening of Route 28 to six lanes between Godwin Drive and Pennsylvania Avenue. Improvements include adding a dual-turn lane on northbound
   
   b. Route 28 Phase III - Widening of Route 28 to a six-lane divided facility between Linton Hall Road and Pennsylvania Avenue.
   
   c. Widening of Route 28 to six lanes in Fairfax County between Bull Run and Route 29 including intersections improvements and pedestrian/bicycle facilities.
Study Area and Scope
IV. Study Area
IV. Alternatives Screening / Evaluation

01 Preliminary Alternatives

02 Initial Screening
Criteria: Meeting study goals objectives
Environmental fatal flaws
Political support
Ability to be implemented

03 Feasible Alternatives
Up to 5 for detailed analysis

04 Alternatives Evaluation
Criteria: Effectiveness in meeting study objectives
2040 Congestion Relief
Environmental Impacts
Right of Way / Utility Impacts
Costs

05 Recommended Alternative(s)
Existing Conditions
V. Existing Conditions

Results

Travel Times

- Route 28 from Godwin Drive to Old Centreville Road
  - AM northbound ~ 49 mins.
  - PM southbound ~ 30 mins.

LOS

- A total of 34 signalized intersections were analyzed
- No. of intersections operating at a LOS E and/or worse
  - AM peak hour – 8
  - PM peak hour – 9

Queueing

- Excessive queuing, blocking, and system volatility observed between Liberia Avenue to New Braddock Road along Route 28
  - AM peak hour – northbound
  - PM peak hour – southbound
Development of Preliminary Alternatives
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

ALT. 1: No Build

ALT. 2A: Godwin Drive extended to Route 28 south of Bull Run

ALT. 2B: Godwin Drive extended to Compton Road

ALT. 3: Godwin Drive extended to match I-66 near the existing Compton Road crossing (the former Tri-County Parkway alignment)

ALT. 4: Widening Route 28 on existing alignment between Liberia Avenue and the Fairfax County line

ALT. 5: New Route 28 Reversible Lanes between Manassas Drive and the Fairfax County Line

ALT. 6: Widening Old Centreville Road/Ordway Road throughout its length

ALT. 7: Converting Old Centreville Road/Ordway Road to a reversible facility

ALT. 8: Transit Alternatives to include BRT and/or VRE expansion along the corridor (Not Shown)

ALT. 9: Euclid Avenue extension north and south

ALT. 10: An new Eastern alignment
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alt 2A – Godwin Drive Extended

Alt 2B – Godwin Drive Extended to Compton Rd

Potential Access Points:
- Sudley Drive
- Lomond Drive
- Old Centreville Rd
- Route 28 (Each End)
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alt 3 – Godwin Drive Extended to I-66
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alt 10 – New Eastern Bypass

Potential Access Points:

- Liberia Avenue
- Wellington Drive
- Manassas Drive Extended
- Euclid Avenue Extended
- Route 28 (Each End)
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alternatives 2A, 2B, 3 & 10

TYPICAL SECTION
(Not to Scale)
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alt 4 – Widen Route 28

Alternative chosen to be modeled:

- Add a lane in each direction between Liberia Avenue and end of Fairfax County widening.
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alternative 4

TYPICAL SECTION
(Not to Scale)
VIII. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alt 5 – Reversible Lanes on Route 28

1. Barrier separated lane between Manassas Drive and Fairfax County Line
2. No left turns between Manassas Drive and Bull Run all day.
3. Add a lane in each direction between Liberia Avenue and Manassas Drive
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alternative 5

TYPICAL SECTION
(Not to Scale)
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alt 9 – Euclid Avenue Extension
North & South

Alt 6 – Widen Old Centreville Rd
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alternatives 6 & 9

TYPICAL SECTION
(Not to Scale)
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alt 7 – Reversible Lands on Old Centreville Rd
VI. Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Alternative 7

TYPICAL SECTION (Not to Scale)

Southern Portion

SIDewALK PARKING SHARED USE PATH

AM Peak Hours

PM Peak Hours

Off Peak Hours

Northern Portion

AM Peak Hours

PM Peak Hours

Off Peak Hours
Development of Screening Criteria
VII. Development of Screening Criteria

Screening Criteria established to attain study objectives

- Obj. 1: Reduce Congestion (Historical Downtown Manassas)
- Obj. 2: Reduce Congestion (Liberia Ave to Compton Rd)
- Obj. 3: Facilitate Peak Period Commute Flows
- Obj. 4: Increased Opportunities for Alternative Modes of Travel
- Obj. 5: Improved Access to Transit Facilities
- Obj. 6: Improvement Projects with Public Consensus
- Obj. 7: Improvement Projects with Minimal Environmental Impacts
- Obj. 8: Improvement Projects with Minimal Existing Conditions Impacts
- Obj. 9: Improvement Projects that Complement Route 28 Operations
VII. Development of Screening Criteria

Traffic Impacts

3. Peak Periods (AM & PM) Traffic Served by Alternative

1. Change in Peak Periods (AM & PM) Traffic per Lane on Route 28 (Historic Downtown Manassas)

2. Change in Peak Periods (AM & PM) Traffic per Lane on Route 28 (Liberia Ave to Compton Rd)

3. Annual Travel Time Savings per Vehicle

4. Multimodal Compatibility

Key Objective Attainable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objectives Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. Development of Screening Criteria

Policy Considerations

1. Consistency with Local & Regional Plans

Environmental Impacts

- 4f Properties / Conservation Easements / Historical Impacts
- Floodway / Floodplains / Streams / Wetlands

Key Objective Attainable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objectives Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socioeconomic/ROW Impacts

- ROW Impacts to Businesses / Residential / Churches / Schools
- Access Management Issues
Screening of Preliminary Alternatives
### VIII. Screening of Preliminary Alternatives

#### Alternative Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Impacts</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Minimal / No Positive Impact</td>
<td>0 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Positive Impact</td>
<td>1 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Positive Impact</td>
<td>2 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Positive Impact</td>
<td>3 pts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Impacts</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Minimal / No Negative Impact</td>
<td>0 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Negative Impact</td>
<td>1 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Negative Impact</td>
<td>2 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Negative Impact</td>
<td>3 pts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. Screening of Preliminary Alternatives

Alternative Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Alternative</th>
<th>Alignment Color</th>
<th>Key Objectives Attainable</th>
<th>Traffic Impacts (when compared to 2040 No-Build)</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Socioeconomic/ROW Impacts</th>
<th>Alternative Status to Move Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt 2A</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="chart1" alt="Traffic Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2" alt="Policy Considerations" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3" alt="Environmental Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4" alt="Socioeconomic/ROW Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart5" alt="Alternative Status to Move Forward" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 2B</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="chart1" alt="Traffic Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2" alt="Policy Considerations" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3" alt="Environmental Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4" alt="Socioeconomic/ROW Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart5" alt="Alternative Status to Move Forward" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 3</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="chart1" alt="Traffic Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2" alt="Policy Considerations" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3" alt="Environmental Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4" alt="Socioeconomic/ROW Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart5" alt="Alternative Status to Move Forward" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 4</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="chart1" alt="Traffic Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2" alt="Policy Considerations" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3" alt="Environmental Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4" alt="Socioeconomic/ROW Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart5" alt="Alternative Status to Move Forward" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 5</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="chart1" alt="Traffic Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2" alt="Policy Considerations" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3" alt="Environmental Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4" alt="Socioeconomic/ROW Impacts" /></td>
<td><img src="chart5" alt="Alternative Status to Move Forward" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- This alternative is recommended to be advanced for further study.
- This alternative is not recommended to be advanced for further study.
- Based on Executive Committee input, these alternatives may be advanced for further study.
- Alternative 3 is not recommended to move forward due to significant environmental impacts and the likelihood of the alternative to be approved by Federal agencies based on outcome of previous NEPA studies.
- Alternative 8: Exclusive BRT option along Route 28 is not currently planned or included in the MWCDG model. Therefore, this alternative is eliminated from further evaluation.

**Objective 6 (Public Consensus)** will be evaluated under second screening process.

**Legend**
- **Negative Impacts**
  - 0 pts. Neutral / Minimal / No Negative Impact
  - 1 pts. Low Negative Impact
  - 2 pts. Medium Negative Impact
  - 3 pts. High Negative Impact

- **Positive Impacts**
  - 0 pts. Neutral / Minimal / No Positive Impact
  - 2 pts. Medium Positive Impact
  - 3 pts. High Positive Impact

**Alternate Corridor Feasibility Study**

Preliminary Alternative Evaluation Matrix: 1st Screening
VIII. Screening of Preliminary Alternatives
Alternatives Carried Forward

Executive Committee Recommendations
VIII. Screening of Preliminary Alternatives

Alternatives Carried Forward

Typical Sections

Alternatives 2A, 2B

TYPICAL SECTION
(Not to Scale)

Alternative 4

TYPICAL SECTION
(Not to Scale)

Alternative 9

TYPICAL SECTION
(Not to Scale)
Open Discussion

Route 28 Corridor Feasibility Study
Wrap-Up
X. Next Steps

- Develop Forecasts for Each Alternative
- Evaluate Alternatives
- Select Preferred Alternative
- Second Round of Public Involvement and Briefings of Elected Officials
- Public Information Meeting
- Brief County Board and City Councils
# Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Boice, JMT</td>
<td>703-464-7862</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RBoice@jmt.com">RBoice@jmt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Hayzlett, JMT</td>
<td>804-267-1269</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RHayzlett@jmt.com">RHayzlett@jmt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sujith Racha, JMT</td>
<td>703-464-7745</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SRacha@jmt.com">SRacha@jmt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Curtis, JMT</td>
<td>804-267-1256</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BCurtis@jmt.com">BCurtis@jmt.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>