


## Significant Additions and Changes to The 2012 Update to the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan and the FY 2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program



### Significant Additions and Changes to the CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP


1. CREATE SOUTHEAST BOULEVARD FROM 11<sup>TH</sup> STREET BRIDGE TO BARNEY CIRCLE
2. BUS RAPID TRANSIT FROM VAN DORN METRO STATION TO PENTAGON METRO STATION
3. I-395 AUXILIARY LANE, NORTHBOUND FROM DUKE STREET TO SEMINARY ROAD
4. DATE CHANGE ON SEGMENTS OF I-495 HOT LANES AND AUXILIARY LANES (~~2030~~ 2013)
5. REMOVE WIDENING OF US 29 FROM US 50 TO EATON PLACE
6. MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK BYPASS

## 1. Create Southeast Boulevard from 11<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge to Barney Circle

Once the 11<sup>th</sup> Street SE Bridge fully connects I-695 (Southeast Freeway) and I-295 in both directions, the segment between 11<sup>th</sup> Street SE and Barney Circle/ Pennsylvania Avenue will become obsolete. This project proposes to convert that segment of the Southeast Freeway to an urban boulevard, connected to Barney Circle, with an at-grade intersection.

Complete: 2015  
Length: 0.5 mile  
Cost: \$80 million  
Funding: Federal, Local and Private

See the project description in Attachment A for more information.



## 2. Bus Rapid Transit from the Van Dorn Metro Station to the Pentagon Metro Station

This project will construct and operate a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service that will connect the Van Dorn Metro Station to the Pentagon Metro Station via the Mark Center. The line will split into two spurs at the Mark Center. The BRT spur will continue north on Beauregard Street, serving the Northern Virginia Community College at Braddock Road, turn east on S. Arlington Mill Drive to serve the Shirlington Transit Center, then continue on I-395 to the Pentagon. A separate rapid bus spur will travel on the I-395 HOV lanes from the Mark Center directly to the Pentagon.

The BRT alignment will operate in dedicated lanes where possible, and may include additional elements such as pre-board payment, transit signal priority, improved bus shelters/stops, and branded vehicles. The rapid bus alignment will contain some of the same features as BRT but will operate in shared lanes. Buses will run every 7.5 minutes during peak periods.

Complete: 2016  
Length: 6.5 miles  
Cost: \$100 million  
Funding: Federal, Local and Private

See the project description in Attachment A for more information.




### 3. I-395 Auxiliary Lane, Northbound from Duke Street to Seminary Road

This project will construct an auxiliary lane on northbound I-395 connecting the Duke Street on ramp to the off ramp at Seminary Road.

Complete: 2015  
 Length: 1 mile  
 Cost: \$20 million  
 Funding: Federal and state

See the project description in Attachment A for more information.




### 4. Date Change on Segments of I-495 HOT and Auxiliary Lanes

The 2011 CLRP includes the widening of the Capital Beltway to include a system of HOT lanes from the American Legion Bridge to the Backlick Road Underpass and a series of auxiliary lanes in each direction connecting the on and off ramps adjacent to the general purpose lanes. VDOT is proposing to advance the completion dates of multiple segments of this project as follows:

- a) HOT lanes from the American Legion Bridge to south of Old Dominion Drive – ~~2030~~ 2013
- b) Various segments of auxiliary lanes (see Air Quality Conformity Table for complete listing) – ~~2030~~ 2013

Length: 14 miles  
 Complete: 2013  
 Cost: \$1.619 billion  
 Funding: Federal, state, private, bonds



## 5. Remove Widening of US 29 from US 50 to Eaton Place

The 2011 CLRP includes the widening of US 29, Lee Highway from four to six lanes in the City of Fairfax between US 50 and Eaton Place. VDOT proposes to remove this project from the CLRP.

Complete: ~~2013, 2040~~  
 Cost: ~~\$30.2 million~~



## 6. Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass

This project will construct a four lane bypass for US 29 to the north of the Manassas National Battlefield Park. Two segments of the project are already included in the plan:

- a portion of the Tri-County Parkway (improvements to Pageland Lane),
- and widening of VA 234, Sudley Road.

The remaining portion will construct a new four lane facility from Sudley Road to east of the intersection of US 29 and Paddington Lane. Once the Bypass is complete, about four miles of US 29 and three miles of Sudley Road located inside the Park will be closed.



Complete: 2035  
 Length: 9 miles  
 Cost: \$305 million  
 Funding: Federal, state and local

See the project description in Attachment A for more information.

# **Attachment A: CLRP Project Descriptions**



# FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2040 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM



## 1. Create Southeast Boulevard from 11<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge to Barney Circle

### **BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Submitting Agency: DDOT
2. Secondary Agency:
3. Agency Project ID: New DC 4
4. Project Type:     Interstate    Primary    Secondary    Urban\_Bridge    Bike/Ped    Transit    CMAQ  
                            ITS    Enhancement    Other    Federal Lands Highways Program  
                            Human Service Transportation Coordination    TERMS
5. Category:         System Expansion;    System Maintenance;    Operational Program;    Study;    Other

6. Project Name: Barney Circle and Southeast Boulevard

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
7. Facility:				
8. From ( _ at):			11 <sup>th</sup> Street SE	
9. To:			Pennsylvania Avenue	

10. Description: Reuse of excess right-of-way when 11<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge connection to I-295 makes the SE/SW Freeway obsolete and reduces traffic from 11<sup>th</sup> Street to Barney Circle. Project reconfigures Barney Circle to L'Enfant vision with an at-grade intersection and converts SE/SW Freeway to an urban boulevard.

11. Projected Completion Date: 2015
12. Project Manager: Ravi Ganvir
13. Project Manager E-Mail: ravi.ganvir@dc.gov
14. Project Information URL: N/A
15. Total Miles: Less than 1 mile
16. Schematic: See below



# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

17. Documentation: N/A
18. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations:  Not Included;  Included;  Primarily a Bike/Ped Project;  N/A
19. Jurisdictions: Washington DC
20. Total cost (in Thousands): 80,000
21. Remaining cost (in Thousands): 80,000
22. Funding Sources:  Federal;  State;  Local;  Private;  Bonds;  Other

## **SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS**

23. 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.
    - Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue?  Yes;  No
    - If yes, 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.
  - Increase accessibility and mobility of **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**

24. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project?  Yes;  No
- 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

## **CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION**

25. Congested Conditions
- Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project or program?  Yes;  No
  - If so, is the congestion recurring or non-recurring?  Recurring;  Non-recurring
  - If the congestion is on another facility, please identify it:
26. Capacity
- Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other principal arterial?  Yes;  No
  - If the answer to Question 26.a was "yes", are any of the following exemption criteria true about the project? (Choose one, or indicate that none of the exemption criteria apply):  
 None of the exemption criteria apply to this project – a Congestion Management Documentation Form is required  
 The project will not use federal funds in any phase of development or construction (100% state, local, and/or private funding)



## CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

- The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than one 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, such as a transit, bicycle or pedestrian facility, will not allow private single-occupant motor vehicles
  - The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
  - The construction costs for the project are less than \$10 million.
- c. If the project is not exempt and requires a Congestion Management Documentation Form, click here to open a blank Congestion Management Documentation Form.

### **INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS**

27. 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
- a. 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
- b. Under which Architecture:
- DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture
  - WMATA Architecture
  - COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture
  - Other, please specify:



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



## 2. Bus Rapid Transit from Van Dorn Metrorail Station to Pentagon Metrorail Station

### BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency: City of Alexandria
2. Secondary Agency:
3. Agency Project ID:
4. Project Type:  Interstate  Primary  Secondary  Urban  Bridge  Bike/Ped  Transit  CMAQ  
 ITS  Enhancement  Other  Federal Lands Highways Program  
 Human Service Transportation Coordination  TERMS
5. Category:  System Expansion;  System Maintenance;  Operational Program;  Study;  Other
6. Project Name: Van Dorn-Pentagon BRT

	Prefix	Route Name	Modifier
7. Facility:		Van Dorn-Pentagon BRT	
8. From ( _ at):		Van Dorn Metrorail Station	
9. To:		Pentagon Metrorail Station	

10. Description: This would build a bus rapid transit service from the Van Dorn Metrorail Station to the Pentagon Metrorail Station using Van Dorn, Sanger, Beauregard, Mark Center Drive, Southern Towers Drive, Beauregard, Walter Reed, Arlington Mill, and I-395. This service will initially have 7.5 minute peak hour headways and 15 minute off-peak headways. The preliminary alignment and amount of dedicated lanes were determined in a study which was ratified by the Alexandria City Council on September 17, 2011. This project was awarded \$800,000 of FTA Section 5339 funds and \$200,000 of local matching funds to perform an Alternatives Analysis study of the alignment. This project has been assigned funds from the 2.2 cent property tax increment adopted by Alexandria City Council in May, 2011 to fund transportation improvements. These funds, together with developer contributions should fund this new service.

11. Projected Completion Date: 2016
12. Project Manager: Jim Maslanka
13. Project Manager E-Mail: Jim.Maslanka@alexandriava.gov
14. Project Information URL:
15. Total Miles: 6.5
16. Schematic:
17. Documentation: City's Master Transportation Plan
18. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations:  Not Included;  Included;  Primarily a Bike/Ped Project;  N/A
19. Jurisdictions: City of Alexandria
20. Total cost (in Thousands): \$100,000
21. Remaining cost (in Thousands): \$38.500
22. Funding Sources:  Federal;  State;  Local;  Private;  Bonds;  Other

The City will provide \$17.700 million from a 2.2 cent property tax increment for transportation improvements. We are also receiving \$44.0 from private developers to cover construction and right-of-way acquisition. The City will request \$38.5 million from the FTA's Section 5309 (Small Starts of

# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

## SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS

23. 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. If yes, 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

24. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project?  Yes;  No

a. 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

## CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

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

a. If so, is the congestion recurring or non-recurring?  Recurring;  Non-recurring

b. If the congestion is on another facility, please identify it:

c. What is the measured or estimated Level of Service on this facility? \_\_\_\_ ;  Measured;  Estimated

26. 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

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

b. 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, such as a transit, bicycle or pedestrian facility, will not allow private single-occupant motor vehicles.
- The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
- The project will not use federal funds in any phase of development or construction (100% state, local and/or private funding).
- The construction costs for the project are less than \$10 million.

# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

## INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

27. 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
28. 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
29. Under which Architecture:
- DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture
  - WMATA Architecture
  - COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture
  - Other, please specify:



# FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2040 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM



## 3. I-395 Auxiliary Lane, Northbound from Duke Street to Seminary Road

### **BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION**

12/16/11 Draft
----------------

1. Agency Project ID: New 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: NB I-395 Auxiliary Lane (Duke St. to Seminary Road) UPC 102437

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:		I-395	Shirley Memorial Highway	
5. From ( _ at):		236	Duke Street	
6. To:		420	Seminary Road	

7. Jurisdiction(s): City of Alexandria
8. Description: Provide final design and construction of auxiliary lane and noise walls (if required) on northbound I-395 between northbound Duke Street on ramp and Seminary Road off ramp.
9. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations:  Not Included;  Included;  Primarily a Bike/Ped Project;  N/A
10. Total Miles: 1.1 miles
11. Project Manager: Susan Shaw 12. E-Mail:
13. Project Information URL:
14. Projected Completion Year: 2015
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): \$20,000,000
18. Remaining cost (in Thousands): \$20,000,000
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

# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

- 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:

X 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.
- 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? TBD

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

- 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; X 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: This project was identified as a potential mitigation improvement within the I-95 HOT lanes Interchange Justification Report





# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

There are several major transportation investments that are being considered by the state and the counties in the vicinity of the project including the construction of the Tri County Parkway (aka Rte. 234 Bypass Extension), improvements to I 66 and the I 66/US 29 interchange at Gainesville.

The DEIS evaluated land use changes associated with the construction of the Battlefield Bypass. The Final EIS for in anticipated to include aspects that will the Park from any adverse impacts of development in the vicinity. Additionally the National Park Service has been working with VDOT and other stakeholders as part work on the Tri-County Parkway on this issue. VDOT has agreed to work toward the purchase of conservation easements on properties within the Tri-County Parkway corridor as mitigation for the construction of the Tri-County Parkway. The NPS has also been working with other stakeholders such as the Piedmont Environmental Council, the Coalition for Smarter Growth, the National Parks Conservation Association, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Civil War Trust to keep them abreast of the status of the Manassas Battlefield Bypass and the NPS involvement in the Tri-County Parkway.

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

10. Total Miles: 8.9 miles

11. Project Manager: Ed Clark

12. E-Mail: ed\_w\_clark@nps.gov

13. Project Information URL: <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/mnbb>

14. Projected Completion Year: 2035

15. Actual Completion Year:

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

17. Total cost: \$305 million

While the cost estimate for the entire project is \$305M, about a third of this project (Battlefield Bypass) is collocated with Virginia's Tri County parkway project which is already in the CLRP. The cost of the collocated portion of the project is about \$122M and as such the cost estimate for the balance portion of the Battlefield Bypass is \$183M.

18. Remaining cost (in Thousands):

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

- Federal Share \$183M
- Non-Federal \$122M (towards Tri County Parkway).

In November 1988 the US Congress passed into law the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988 (herein referred to as Public Law 100-647). A copy of the public law document is provided as attachment B. This public law mandated (Sec. 10004.(a), (d) the provision of funds and the conduct of an environmental study for the Battlefield Bypass project including the closure of Rte. 29 and Rte. 234 within the limits of the park. The Public law also mandated the US Congress to provide part of the funds for the construction of the project. Specifically the law states: (Sec. 10004.(c)) *"The Secretary shall provide funds to the appropriate construction agency for the construction and improvement of the highways to be used for the rerouting of traffic now utilizing highways (known as routes 29 and 234) to be closed pursuant to subsection (b) if the construction and improvement of such alternatives are deemed by the Secretary to be in the interest of protecting the integrity of the park."* The DEIS has identified the proposed Bypass as the preferred alternative implying that the project is in the best interest of protecting the integrity of the park. Completing the Final EIS and securing its approval will allow the Secretary to formalize this finding and seek apportionment of the construction funding provided by Public Law 100-647.

The Law also states that no more than 75% of the total cost shall be provided by the Secretary of the Interior, with the balance funding derived from other non-federal sources. With the current planning level cost estimate (\$305M) this amounts to about \$228M in federal funds. The Collocation of the Battlefield Bypass with the Tri County Parkway means that some of the total cost will be borne by the Tri County Parkway. This is currently estimated to be about \$122M. This leaves a balance of \$183M needed to complete the Battlefield Parkway which is less that the amount authorized by Public law 100-647. Additionally it is likely that some construction funds could be acquired through a public /

# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

private partnership.

## **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
- The Battlefield Bypass will be a new 4-lane facility that will be replacing portions of two 2-lane facilities, Route 29 and Route 234 which will be closed to non-park traffic – and as such will not be adding new capacity. The closure will include about 4 miles of Route 29, from the bridge over Bull Run to Pageland Lane west of the park and over 3 miles of Route 234 from the southern Park boundary to the area known as Sudley Springs north of the park.
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.

# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

## ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

26. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project?  Yes;  No  
In January 2005, a FHWA approved Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was issued that identified five Candidate Build Alternatives with a modified version of Alternative D which was selected as the preferred alternative. In late 2005, the Boards of Supervisors in Prince William and Fairfax Counties voted to endorse Alternative D and in June 2006, Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) passed a resolution approving the location of the proposed bypass along the Modified Alternative D corridor. In 2008, the General Management Plan for Manassas was published which included the Battlefield Bypass as part of the preferred alternative. Preliminary mitigation measures have been identified for the areas listed Q 27.

The NPS will be working toward completing the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) over the next 12 months. The FEIS will undertake and complete a detailed analysis of the mitigation measures. The formal approval of the FEIS culminating with the issuance of a Record of Decision will be based on commitments made to implement any mitigation actions deemed necessary in the FEIS.

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  
 **Historic Preservation**


With the completion of the FEIS, Section 4(f) and NHPA Section 106 the NPS will be further developing and finalizing measures to mitigate impacts associated with the construction of the Battlefield Bypass.

## 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:

# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

## Attachment A – DEIS Proposed Alignment For Manassas Battlefield Bypass



(21) Item 907.69 (relating to sodium tartrate).

(22) Item 907.76 (relating to lactulose).

(23) Item 910.00 (relating to diamond tool and drill blanks).

(24) Item 911.50 (relating to unwrought lead).

(25) Item 912.13 (relating to certain power-driven flat knitting machines and parts thereof).

**(b) OTHER EXTENSIONS.—**

(1) Item 907.00 (relating to p-hydroxybenzoic acid) is amended by striking out "9/30/85" and inserting in lieu thereof "12/31/88".

(2) Item 907.22 (relating to caffeine) is amended by striking out "On or before 12/31/87" and inserting in lieu thereof "On or before the earlier of 12/31/92 or the date on which the rate of duty imposed by the European Communities on articles described in item 437.02 exceeds the rate of duty imposed by the United States on such articles that was in effect on 6/30/88"

Manassas  
National  
Battlefield Park  
Amendments of  
1988.  
Virginia.  
Conservation.  
16 USC 429b  
note.

## TITLE X—MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK

**SEC. 10001. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the "Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988".

**SEC. 10002. ADDITION TO MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK.**

The first section of the Act entitled "An act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Virginia, the most important historic properties relating to the battle of Manassas, and for other purposes", approved April 17, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 429b), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "That"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b)(1) In addition to subsection (a), the boundaries of the park shall include the area, comprising approximately 600 acres, which is south of U.S. Route 29, north of Interstate Route 66, east of Route 705, and west of Route 622. Such area shall hereafter in this Act be referred to as the 'Addition'.

Real property.

"(2)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective on the date of enactment of the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988, there is hereby vested in the United States all right, title, and interest in and to, and the right to immediate possession of, all the real property within the Addition.

"(B) The United States shall pay just compensation to the owners of any property taken pursuant to this paragraph and the full faith and credit of the United States is hereby pledged to the payment of any judgment entered against the United States with respect to the taking of such property. Payment shall be in the amount of the agreed negotiated value of such property or the valuation of such property awarded by judgment and shall be made from the permanent judgment appropriation established pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1304. Such payment shall include interest on the value of such property which shall be compounded quarterly and computed at the rate applicable for the period involved, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities from the date of enactment of the Manassas

National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988 to the last day of the month preceding the date on which payment is made.

“(C) In the absence of a negotiated settlement, or an action by the owner, within 1 year after the date of enactment of the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988, the Secretary may initiate a proceeding at anytime seeking in a court of competent jurisdiction a determination of just compensation with respect to the taking of such property.

“(3) Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description and map depicting the boundaries of the Addition. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

Federal  
Register,  
publication.  
Public  
information.

“(c) The Secretary shall not allow any unauthorized use of the Addition after the enactment of the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988, except that the Secretary may permit the orderly termination of all operations on the Addition and the removal of equipment, facilities, and personal property from the Addition.”

#### SEC. 10003. VISUAL PROTECTION.

Section 2(a) of the Act entitled “An Act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Virginia, the most important historic properties relating to the battle of Manassas, and for other purposes”, approved April 17, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 429b-1), is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

“(2) The Secretary shall cooperate with the Commonwealth of Virginia, the political subdivisions thereof, and other parties as designated by the Commonwealth or its political subdivisions in order to promote and achieve scenic preservation of views from within the park through zoning and such other means as the parties determine feasible.”

#### SEC. 10004. HIGHWAY RELOCATION.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Secretary”), in consultation and consensus with the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Federal Highway Administration, and Prince William County, shall conduct a study regarding the relocation of highways (known as routes 29 and 234) in, and in the vicinity of, the Manassas National Battlefield Park (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “park”). The study shall include an assessment of the available alternatives, together with cost estimates and recommendations regarding preferred options. The study shall specifically consider and develop plans for the closing of those public highways (known as routes 29 and 234) that transect the park and shall include analysis of the timing and method of such closures and of means to provide alternative routes for traffic now transecting the park. The Secretary shall provide for extensive public involvement in the preparation of the study.

(b) **DETERMINATION.**—Within 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the study under subsection (a). The study shall determine when and how the highways (known as routes 29 and 234) should be closed.

(c) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary shall provide funds to the appropriate construction agency for the construction and improvement of

16 USC 429b  
note.

State and local  
governments.

the highways to be used for the rerouting of traffic now utilizing highways (known as routes 29 and 234) to be closed pursuant to subsection (b) if the construction and improvement of such alternatives are deemed by the Secretary to be in the interest of protecting the integrity of the park. Not more than 75 percent of the costs of such construction and improvement shall be provided by the Secretary and at least 25 percent shall be provided by State or local governments from any source other than Federal funds. Such construction and improvement shall be approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed \$30,000,000 to prepare the study required by subsection (a) and to provide the funding described in subsection (c).

Approved November 10, 1988.

---

**LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—H.R. 4333 (S. 2238):**

**HOUSE REPORTS:** No. 100-795 (Comm. on Ways and Means) and No. 100-1104 (Comm. of Conference).

**SENATE REPORTS:** No. 100-445 accompanying S. 2238 (Comm. on Finance).

**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 134 (1988):**

Aug. 4, considered and passed House.

Oct. 6, 7, S. 2238 considered in Senate.

Oct. 11, H.R. 4333 considered and passed Senate, amended.

Oct. 21, House and Senate agreed to conference report.