Working Group Attendees

Group Member	Representing	Email
Jack Crosby	Wolf Trap Woods HOA (Supervisor Foust selection)	jackcrosby01@gmail.com
Andy Galusha	Fairfax County Park Authority	Andrew.Galusha@fairfaxcounty.gov
Denver Supinger	Supervisor Hudgins' Office	Denver.Supinger@fairfaxcounty.gov
Jennifer Kaplan	Supervisor Foust's Office	Jennifer.Kaplan@FairfaxCounty.gov
Rodney Hayzlett	JMT (Project Design Consultant)	RHayzlett@jmt.com
Randy Boice	JMT (Project Design Consultant)	RBoice@jmt.com
Eric Knudsen/Pam	Great Falls Citizens' Association (GFCA)	m.eric.knudsen@gmail.com
Grosvenor		
James A. Robertson	McLean Citizens Association (MCA)	jim@ann-jim.com
Tim Thompson	Supervisor Hudgins selection	tctthompson@msn.com
William Dunn	VDOT Project Manager	William.Dunn@VDOT.Virginia.gov
Bryan Campbell	VDOT Environmental	bryan.campbell@VDOT.Virginia.gov
Kathleen Leonard	VDOT Public Affairs	kathleen.leonard@VDOT.Virginia.gov
Nicholas Roper	VDOT ADA for Project Development	nicholas.roper@VDOT.Virginia.gov
Allison Richter	VDOT Fairfax/Arlington County Liaison	allison.richter@VDOT.Virginia.gov
Terry Yates	VDOT Fairfax/Arlington County Liaison	terry.yates@VDOT.Virginia.gov

SUBJECT: Route 7 Widening Project – Working Group Meeting #17

MEETING DATE: August 16, 2017: 9:30 am – 12:30 pm

MEETING LOCATION: VDOT Department of Transportation

4975 Alliance Drive, 1st Floor, Potomac Conference Room

REFERENCE: Route 7 Widening Project

Project Number 0007-029-128, P102, R202, C502, B610 UPC 52328

Fairfax County, Virginia

A working group meeting was conducted on August 16th, 2017 to discuss the next section of Route 7 widening from Reston Avenue to the Dulles Toll Road, specifically the following items:

U-turns from WB to EB at Jarrett Valley Drive

- Existing Conditions exist due to drivers trying to avoid the toll plaza, peak hours, shifting AM vs PM. WG members maintain this happens all day long, in both directions.
- Crashes before construction: 75% are rear end collisions, some deer-strikes. Most crashes occurring Westbound Rear-end (19). Crashes after construction: only had one year of data. 5 crashes occurred at Westbound Rear-end. Crashes follow pattern, more westbound then eastbound, mostly rear-end. No time related pattern (related to peak hours or night time or anything).
- Most crashes are property damage only; no fatalities, no injuries.
- WG is interested in prohibiting the U-turn at Jarret Valley Drive. Community non-responsive to outreach about prohibiting U-turn. No traffic engineering reasons to prohibit the U-turn. It could be prohibited if crashes are seen between high-volume of right turn onto EB 7 and U turn traffic.
- Currently about 10 cars can fit into the turn lane. More than 10 backs into through lane.
- Cannot count number of U turns using loops, would have to have a person on the intersection.
- Final configuration will hold approximately 40 cars. TE says that expectation is that the rear end collisions will drop.
- No channelization of the left turn lane is proposed.
- Third lane on the bridge will not be added until the widening project is finished.
- Option: Permissive left or left on arrow only?
 - o That is a concern. Left on arrow only during certain hours?
- Ability to eliminate this U-turn completely?

- WG's is also concerned about vehicles from loop ramp from eastbound DTR to westbound Route 7 cutting across lanes to get into the left turn lane.
- VDOT to observe in the field.

Environmental Update

- Previous WG meeting: NEPA Updates, Public Hearing, Army Corp of Engineers letter
- Follow-up coordination with Army Corp: agreed to do revised EA, to attempt to address the Army's concern, hope to get a response back to them and have it finalized before RFP
- Working on: shifting Stormwater Management Facility out of wetland areas further than previously, working on refining analysis and shaping the ponds around the wetlands,
 - Working on shrinking typical section to reduce footprint
 - i. Retaining walls replace 2:1 slope
 - Equestrian connection (instead of cross county trail) is looking at using woodchips instead of pavement
 - o Straight channel: how will that control the sheet flow and the flooding issues?
 - i. Energy dissipater
 - o The 20' shift north pulls the project out of the wetlands significantly.
 - o Articulated concrete blocks will protect relocated stream from erosion.
 - i. Concern about velocity as it goes towards Difficult Run step pools (energy dissipaters) proposed to reduce velocity
 - o 100 yr. storm will still overtop Route 7
 - o For a 25 year storm, Route 7 is protected.
 - o Raising the grade of the road and realigning the culvert so that Colvin Run is not being aimed towards Route 7.
 - Extending the bottom of the channel to be wider so that it will be less like barrel of a rifle analogy
 - Could we go back from woodchip path to concrete path? Drop in a bucket as far as Stormwater impact?
 - i. Regulators would prefer the woodchip method (non-permanent impact)

Confidential Information

- VDOT has advertised the RFQ
- Requirements in RFQ any information that any contractor/people are requesting must come through ASD VDOT person.
- Direct to William or direct to POC directly.
- Have to control information that we put out there so that we don't jeopardize the procurement.

- Some information needs to stay inside of this room that is discussed. Perhaps a precursor before sensitive information.
- RFQ has been posted
 - o Information meeting the 23rd anyone who is planning on soliciting for this project will attend, 1st half about project, 2nd half about procurement. 2nd half, POC issue is discussed. 2nd meeting will be for RFP, to remind everyone.
- Not limited to contractors, but also news organization
- RFQ request for qualifications
 - o Not looking for designs, looking for teams to be qualified
 - i. Challenges, scope, overall complexity. Nothing is final; no plan is definite at this point.
 - ii. Will select three teams for short list (those people are qualified)
- Then put out RFP
 - o That will put out more details
- We can provide link to process for evaluations/scoring
- Three teams from RFQ will be given RFP
- For example, would Colvin Run info be confidential? At this time, not to share.
- Design won't be final until sometime next year.
- As Design Builders move through their design, they need to work with Stakeholders. That is part of the contract (requirements).

Prescriptive Items

- Shall, will or must descriptions
- This project will contain many "shall" items, which must be carried out. That is due to Wg feedback.
- If DB wants to deviate, must submit that to VDOT.
- List of entities/organizations that will need to be consulted about deviations. This is to ensure that the DB must reach back out and cannot change things that communities want. We have identified how the DB would reach out to these entities though.
- How often does the WG want to meet with Design Build team?
 - O At a minimum quarterly. Perhaps monthly at the beginning of the design process (dependent upon changes/progress on the project)
 - o Making sure there are tangible differences in order to make sure a meeting is worth it.
 - o Milestones? 30% design?
- DB projects are typically broken up into segments, to move certain parts along faster than others.

- Don't need to meet on certain sections once they are complete, meet on issues that need it (meet on hot button topics more often than agreeable topics).
- Working Group would like to be informed about any changes in execution of contract/concept by DB.
- Could DB send people to monthly HOA meetings? We would like to continue meeting with this group here.
- How would information be disseminated throughout construction:
 - o Updates to project website
 - o Twitter
 - o Traffic alerts
 - o News channel
 - o Message boards ahead of time
 - o Emails out to WG a few weeks in advance of

Project Status

- Schedule
 - Bumping RFP back to January 2018 due to NEPA Document l issues: getting Finding of No Impact from FHWA
- DB Procurement

Open Discussion

• October for next meeting.