

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

* * * * *

BOUNDARY CHANNEL DRIVE AT I-395
Interchange Improvements
In Arlington County

Virtual Public Hearing

Thursday, November 5, 2020
7:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
Virtual Public Meeting
via WebEx

P R E S E N T

CHRIS BARKSDALE, PE

Virginia Department of Transportation
Project Manager, Location and Design

JOHN MCDOWELL, PE

Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP
Design Consultant

ANDREW BEACHER, PE

Preliminary Engineering Manager
Virginia Department of Transportation

NICHOLAS ROPER, PE

Northern Virginia
District Project Development Engineer
Virginia Department of Transportation

JOHN MUSE

District Environmental Manager
Virginia Department of Transportation

JON LAWLER, PE

Capital Project Manager
Arlington County Department of Transportation

P R E S E N T A T I O N

CHRIS BARKSDALE	Introduction	Page 4
DENIS LEACH	Overview	Page 4
CHRIS BARKSDALE	Project presentation	Page 6
JOHN MCDOWELL	Project presentation	Page 10
CHRIS BARKSDALE	Project presentation	Page 21
Q & A		Page 25
CHRIS BARKSDALE	Closing comments	Page 74

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. BARKSDALE: Good evening and welcome to
3 the Boundary Channel Drive at I-395 Interchange
4 Design/Build Project Public Hearing. My name is Chris
5 Barksdale and I'm the Project Manager and I'm one of the
6 presenters for tonight.

7 With me is John McDowell, the design
8 consultant with RK&K. We also have John Lawler, from
9 Arlington County; Nicholas Ropper, VDOT's Northern
10 Virginia District Engineer for Project Development; and
11 John Muse, the District's Environmental Manager, who will
12 be available to help answer questions.

13 In addition, Andrew Beacher, the District's
14 Preliminary Engineering Manager, will be tonight's
15 moderator during the question and answer period.

16 At this time I would like to offer an
17 opportunity to any Arlington County Representatives or
18 elected officials on the call who may have any remarks
19 before we get started with the presentation.

20 MR. LEACH: Good evening everyone. My name
21 is Denise Leach and I am Arlington's Director of
22 Transportation. I want to welcome everyone to this
23 virtual public hearing and I want to give you just a

1 brief background in terms of where this project came
2 from.

3 It originated out of the 14th Street Bridge-
4 EIS project that was conducted by Federal Highway
5 Administration and Arlington's interest was really in
6 expanding multimodal transportation connectivity in this
7 area as supported by the EIS, and Arlington undertook an
8 evaluation of alternatives for reconfiguring the
9 interchange to improve access by all modes by if you're
10 driving, walking or biking. That led to the production
11 of what's called an interchange modification report that
12 was ultimately approved by the Federal Highway
13 Administration in 2019.

14 A couple of other things to know, the design
15 that you will see tonight was the subject of substantial
16 community engagement and it reflects both community input
17 and the input of two of our adjacent stakeholders, the
18 Pentagon as well as National Park Service.

19 Some of the improvements called for have
20 already actually been implemented. Arlington went ahead
21 and realigned Long Bridge Drive leading up to the
22 interchange, undergrounded all the utilities.

23 So the first phase is actually done. That

1 work was completed in late 2018.

2 In 2020, Arlington made the decision to
3 actually transfer this project to VDOT for implementation.
4 And you may ask why transfer the project after we've
5 actually done the concept design work.

6 We felt that VDOT was in the best position
7 to deliver this project and it really builds on a
8 successful collaboration between Arlington and VDOT over a
9 number of projects, including one that just finished in
10 May of this year in Roslyn.

11 So with that, I'd like to turn it back to
12 Chris to go on with the presentation.

13 MR. BARKSDALE: Thank you Denis.

14 Are there any other elected officials on?

15 (No response)

16 Okay. I would like to add that this meeting
17 is being recorded and there is a court reporter present,
18 transcribing the meeting as well.

19 Moving on to slide two, today's meeting
20 agenda. For tonight's agenda we'll start off with the
21 meeting instructions. Since this virtual public hearing
22 approach may be new to some, we want to provide some
23 instructions on the different ways you can comment and

1 voice your opinion on the project.

2 Then we will discuss the project's delivery
3 method, purpose and need, objectives and overview, agency
4 stakeholder coordination, followed by the project's
5 funding and schedule.

6 This meeting will last until 8:30 with the
7 presentation taking about 30 minutes followed by question
8 and answer period.

9 Moving on to slide three, Virtual Design
10 Public Hearing in Response to COVID-19.

11 All of the information we would typically
12 present in an in-person meeting, including project
13 information, estimated schedule and cost, the process for
14 submitting comments and key contacts will be presented
15 here tonight, are made available on the project website.
16 For those who may be joining by phone, we will state the
17 slide number as we go through the presentation to help
18 you follow along.

19 Moving on to Slide No. 4, Meeting
20 Instructions.

21 During the presentation all participants will
22 be muted, however the chat box will be open throughout
23 the presentation for questions and comments only.

1 When using the chat box, please make sure
2 that the message is addressed to everyone and please be
3 polite as all questions will be recorded and included in
4 the official public hearing transcript.

5 For participants who called in, please dial
6 Star-3 to request to speak during the question and answer
7 period.

8 We will try to respond to as many questions
9 as we can tonight, but those that were not answered can
10 be emailed to meetingcomments@vdot.virginia.gov and in
11 doing so, please include Boundary Channel Drive at I-395
12 Interchange in the subject line.

13 If for some reason you get disconnected,
14 please attempt to rejoin this meeting. I will ask that
15 you please bear with us if there are any technical
16 difficulties throughout this presentation.

17 Moving on to Slide 5, Project Delivery Method.

18 VDOT and Arlington County have elected to
19 deliver this project utilizing the design/build method.
20 Under the traditional design/bid/build method, VDOT would
21 first contract with the designer to complete the design
22 plans, acquire any necessary rights of way and relocate
23 utilities prior to contracting with a construction

1 contractor separately to construct the project.

2 Under the design/build method, VDOT contracts
3 directly with the design/builder who is responsible for
4 completing the design, acquiring any necessary rights of
5 way, relocating utilities, and constructing the project
6 under a single contract.

7 Furthermore, under the design/build method,
8 these phases of project execution can be run concurrently,
9 which reduces the overall time necessary for the
10 completion of the project.

11 Due to the fact that utility relocations are
12 integrated into the construction phase, the design/build
13 method also reduces impacts to the traveling public
14 within the project area, whereas with the traditional
15 design/bid/build method, the design is finalized and
16 approved and utility relocations are complete prior to
17 construction.

18 So as you can see, there is a time savings by
19 utilizing the design/build method versus the traditional
20 design/bid/build method, but also there are fewer impacts
21 to the traveling public during the delivery of the
22 project.

23 Moving on to Slide Number 6, Project Purpose

1 and Need.

2 The purpose of this project is to enhance
3 multimodal options and connections for pedestrians and
4 bicyclists and to improve traffic operations and safety
5 along I-395, Boundary Channel Drive and Long Bridge Drive.

6 Looking at the yellow and green lines in the
7 graphic, you can see how the existing conditions make it
8 difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists to access
9 destinations such as the Pentagon, the Mount Vernon Trail,
10 Long Bridge Park, Long Bridge Aquatic and Fitness Center,
11 which is currently under construction, and Crystal City.

12 There are also multiple weaving sections
13 along I-395 which are shown in red, particularly in the
14 southbound direction between the on and off ramps for
15 George Washington Memorial Highway, Boundary Channel Drive
16 and Route 110.

17 The orange triangles represent access points
18 along Long Bridge Drive and Boundary Channel Drive that
19 cause confusion for motorists traveling to and from I-395
20 northbound and to address these issues, I now turn it over
21 to John McDowell, who will discuss the project objectives
22 and overview.

23 MR. MCDOWELL: Thank you, Chris.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Let me go onto Slide 7, Project Objectives and Overview.

As Chris pointed out, the purpose of this project is to reconfigure the Boundary Channel Drive interchange, to provide bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and it will also include some utility relocation and stormwater management strategies.

The reconfiguration of the Boundary Channel Drive interchange will include Roundabouts on both sides of I-395, it will close the ramps in the southwest quadrant, those ramps are the closest to the Pentagon power plant.

As far as the bicycle and pedestrian improvements, we will include a shared use path along the north side of the roadway that will extend up to the existing Mount Vernon Trail to the north of the project. We will add a sidewalk along the south side of the road, 10 foot wide, extending all the way from the Aquatics and Fitness Center over the Pentagon parking entrance.

Moving on to Slide 8, as noted, we are proposing to include a shared use path in this project. The image that you see here is actually a copy of the Bicycle Network Plan for Arlington County in the vicinity.

1 You'll see that there are several types of facilities
2 either existing or planned in this area, including offsite
3 trails, off street trails, protected bike lanes, in-street
4 bike lanes or Sharrows. Sharrows are pavement markings
5 with arrows on the pavement where bicycles and automobiles
6 share the road.

7 You see in the yellow highlighted area the
8 limits of the Boundary Channel project itself. As you can
9 see, with the green dotted line, that we are proposing an
10 off-street trail in accordance with this Bicycle Network
11 Connection map.

12 Moving on to Slide 9, this is an area rendered
13 image of what the proposed interchange will look like once
14 it's constructed.

15 As you can see, roundabouts on both sides of
16 the road, removal of the ramps in the southwest quadrant
17 near the power plant, as well as the trails and sidewalks
18 that we had discussed already.

19 Moving on to Slide 10, as Chris pointed out,
20 there are several weaving sections along I-395 between
21 mainline and the ramps to Boundary Channel Drive. By
22 removing the ramps in the southwest quadrant between
23 Boundary Channel Drive and I-395, we're able to eliminate

1 two of those weaving sections and by extending the
2 pavement through the closed -- that closed ramp area,
3 we can extend the auxiliary lane all the way from the
4 on-ramp from Boundary Channel Drive in the northwest
5 quadrant down to the interchange of Route 110.

6 Moving on to Slide 11, as mentioned we are
7 consolidating ramp access to 395, I-395 with two
8 roundabouts. Removing the ramps in the southwest
9 quadrant, the roundabout will actually convey traffic from
10 Boundary Channel Drive to and from the ramps from
11 southbound 395 in the northwest quadrant of the
12 interchange.

13 The connections up on 395 will remain as they
14 are today, but the ramps as you get down to the connection
15 with Boundary Channel Drive will be slightly realigned to
16 come into the roundabout.

17 On the east side of the roundabout, over by
18 the Aquatics and Fitness Center, Boundary Channel Drive
19 terminates into ramps from 395 as well as connections to
20 Long Bridge Drive and access to the Aquatics and Fitness
21 Center.

22 By building this roundabout, we're
23 consolidating those accesses, cleaning up the confusing

1 access points that occur between Long Bridge Drive,
2 Boundary Channel and the ramps to provide a consistent
3 and predictable movement through that section of the road.

4 Moving on to Slide 12, the shared use path, we
5 are provided a 10 foot wide shared use path to the north
6 side of this project, extending all the way from Long
7 Bridge Drive area over to the west side near the Pentagon,
8 but we're also extending that shared use path and will
9 align it where's there's not in existing trail today, but
10 it will extend up along the west side of I-395, connecting
11 to the stub -- to the Mount Vernon Trail that currently
12 exists on the NPS, National Park Service, property just
13 off the scene.

14 Moving on to Slide 13, as mentioned, we also
15 have continuous bike and pedestrians access between the
16 Pentagon and the Aquatics and Fitness Center, a 10 foot
17 wide a side walk is proposed along the south side of the
18 road through the project limits underneath the I-495
19 underpass connecting both sides of the interchange.

20 Moving on to Slide 14, as this project is
21 mostly work being done on Boundary Channel Drive, we're
22 improving the alignment, we're constructing the
23 roundabouts and actually improving the road underneath the

1 underpass for 395, but we are not doing any improvements
2 to the underpass structure itself.

3 So we are not impacting I-395 to a large
4 extent. The only place where we will actually be doing
5 work on I-395 is where we're closing the ramp connections
6 that we're taking away from the southwest quadrant and
7 extending that pavement through for the auxiliary lane.

8 So operations on I-395 essentially will be not
9 impacted and the 395 Express Lanes, since there is no
10 connection between I-395 Express Lanes and Boundary
11 Channel Drive, there is no impact to the I-395 Express
12 Lanes.

13 Moving on to Slide 15, this is a rendered
14 image of what the new roadway will look like if you're
15 standing at the west roundabout near the Pentagon looking
16 east through the underpass of I-395.

17 As you can see, we're reducing the existing
18 four lane section to two lanes for the roadway, which
19 allows us to put a shared use path and a wide sidewalk
20 along each side of the roadway.

21 Moving on to Slide 16, with this project we
22 undertook a Traffic Operations Analysis for the project,
23 evaluating the traffic growth and operations through the

1 design year of 2040.

2 As you can see from this table, very little
3 growth in traffic is expected along 395. There is
4 moderate growth expected along Boundary Channel Drive and
5 Long Bridge Drive into the design year 2040, however the
6 traffic operational analysis has demonstrated that the
7 two lane roadway, combined with the roundabouts as the
8 intersection control options of these ramps, provide
9 sufficient capacity for the roadways to operate within
10 acceptable limits.

11 Therefore, we believe that Boundary Channel
12 Drive and Long Bridge Drive can accommodate the future
13 traffic demand without any increase in capacity expansion.

14 Moving on to Slide 17, Stormwater Management
15 and Drainage. As with any roadway project we do in
16 Virginia, we have to meet the requirements of Virginia
17 Department of Environmental Quality Regulations related to
18 stormwater runoff.

19 With regard to stormwater quantity, the
20 project primarily outfalls into the Pentagon Lagoon and
21 because the drainage area of the project is very small
22 compared to the drainage area represented by the Pentagon
23 Lagoon and the associated water bodies, we do not have to

1 provide any stormwater attenuation. In other words, we
2 do not need to reduce -- take any measures to reduce the
3 peak flow of leaving the site from the project.

4 We do however have to address water quality
5 issues. The pollutants coming off the road from vehicles
6 and snow removal strategies are a pollutant that we do not
7 want to get into the water bodies, so we have evaluated
8 and looked for water quality treatment facilities along
9 the project as are represented by those blue and white
10 boxes. The boxes that we indicate there are places that
11 we have determined are suitable for the placement of
12 stormwater treatment facilities, however they -- some or
13 all of those may or may not be used.

14 It will be up to the design/builder ultimately
15 to determine which of those facilities to use, whether
16 they use those facilities or other facilities that meet
17 the design that they ultimately propose for the project
18 and it will be their responsibility to design and have
19 those improvements permitted.

20 With regard to the drainage, there's an
21 existing closed drainage system throughout this
22 interchange area. So we are taking and combining a series
23 of new and existing pipes to convey the drainage off of

1 the site and into the outfall areas.

2 Therefore, the existing drainage patterns are
3 pretty well preserved in the current conditions.

4 Moving on to Slide 18, this project has been
5 evaluated in accordance with the National Environmental
6 Policy Act of 1969. The NEPA Act is an umbrella act
7 encompassing a variety of legislation passed over the
8 years that is aimed at protecting environmental issues
9 such as air quality, noise, water quality, archaeological
10 and historical assets and numerous other issues.

11 Through NEPA (Audio lost for a few seconds)
12 individually or commutatively at a significant
13 environmental impact that would require environmental
14 assessment or environmental impact statement.

15 Therefore, this project qualifies for a
16 categorical exclusion level of NEPA documentation under
17 federal regulations. The categorical exclusion was
18 prepared and approved by the Federal Highway
19 Administration in January of 2018.

20 Moving on to Slide 19, here are some
21 highlights of the categorical exclusion. With regard to
22 the National Historic Preservation Act, the project will
23 not have an adverse effect on historic properties.

1 With regard to the Endangered Species Act,
2 the project will not impact any roosting or nesting
3 habitat for the Northern Longeared Bat or any other
4 federally listed threatened or endangered species.

5 With regard to the Clean Water Act, the
6 project will not impact streams or wetlands.

7 With regard to Section 4(f) of USDOT Act, the
8 project will not impact parklands.

9 Therefore, no environmental mitigation
10 measures were proposed or requested by the resource or
11 regulatory agencies during the NEPA process.

12 Moving on to Slide 20, Utility impacts.
13 Through our studies and analysis we have determined that
14 there are numerous utilities in the area, including a
15 dozen or more facilities ranging from electric to telecom
16 to gas and other features.

17 We have taken some measures to evaluate the
18 impacts to those utilities, however it will be the
19 design/builder's responsibility to identify, address and
20 resolve the utility conflicts to this project.

21 Moving on to Slide 21, Right of way
22 acquisition. Since this project falls largely within the
23 existing footprint of the interchange, there is no new

1 right of way proposed for the project. There will be no
2 private properties impacted and there will be no
3 relocations required.

4 There will be some adjustment needed to the
5 limited access line for the project. We have made an
6 initial estimate of what those adjustments need to be and
7 they can be seen on these plans, although I understand
8 it's a little difficult to see.

9 You can actually inspect the Design Public
10 Hearing plans to see the exact locations where we're
11 proposing limited access lane changes.

12 However, it will ultimately be the
13 design/builder's responsibility to develop the ultimate
14 changes to the limited access line and the design/builder
15 will need to work with VDOT to get approval of the changes
16 to the limited access line through the Commonwealth
17 Transportation Board.

18 With regard to access agreements and permits,
19 we will have to acquire a variety of special use permits
20 and access permits, including agencies like the Pentagon,
21 the National Park Service, WMATA, the Metropolitan
22 Washington Airport System and other agencies that have an
23 interest in this area.

1 Moving on to Slide 22, I will now turn it over
2 to Chris Barksdale. Chris.

3 MR. BARKSDALE: Thanks, John.

4 Slide 22, Agency Stakeholder Coordination, as
5 you can see there are a lot of agencies we will need to
6 continue coordinating with during the design and
7 construction of this project.

8 In addition to Arlington County and the
9 Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, there are
10 multiple federal agencies (audio lost)

11 Moving on to Slide 23, Arlington County
12 transportation projects. This slide shows the Arlington
13 County transportation projects (technical difficulty)
14 Boundary Channel Drive project which is shown in the pink
15 hatching in the north.

16 We're also aware of the Pentagon's ongoing and
17 upcoming projects (audio lost) I'm sorry.

18 Let me start this slide over. Arlington
19 County Transportation Projects. This slide shows the
20 Arlington transportation projects located within a half
21 mile of the Boundary Channel Drive project, which is shown
22 in the pink (audio feedback - audio lost)

23 We'll move on to Slide 24. Project cost and

1 funding. The total cost for this project is 20.4
2 million, which is broken down into 600,000 for
3 preliminary engineering, 400,000 for right-of-way, and
4 19.4 million for construction.

5 This project is currently financed with
6 Arlington County, Northern Virginia Transportation
7 Authority and state, including revenue sharing funding and
8 is being developed as a federally eligible project for
9 future funding considerations.

10 Moving on to Slide 25. Project Schedule, to
11 give you an idea of where we are schedule-wise, last
12 December Arlington County held a public information
13 meeting showing the design concept for this project.
14 Since then, this project has been handed over to VDOT to
15 administer, using the design/build method and we have been
16 working towards the developing plans for the realize of
17 the RFQ, which is request for qualifications which was
18 released on October 21st.

19 The purpose of the RFQ is to solicit
20 information from design/builders to help determine who is
21 best suited to execute the design and construction of this
22 project.

23 The next step following tonight's design

1 public hearing is to release the RFP, which is request
2 for proposals to the top three suitable design/builders
3 on February 17th.

4 Award contract is then scheduled for the
5 summer of 2021 and construction is anticipated to begin in
6 the spring of 2022.

7 The anticipated construction end date is fall
8 of 2023.

9 Moving on to Slide 26, How to submit your
10 comments. As we conclude this presentation and get into
11 the question and answer period, I wanted to mention the
12 different ways you can submit your comments by November
13 16th as illustrated on this slide.

14 You can email us at
15 meetingcomments@vdot.virginia.gov. In doing so, please
16 reference Boundary Channel Drive at I-395 Interchange in
17 the subject line.

18 You can leave a voice mail at 703-259-3750.
19 Again that number is 703-259-3750.

20 Or you can mail your comments directly to me
21 at 4975 Alliance Drive, Fairfax, Virginia 22030.

22 In a moment you will be given the opportunity
23 to comment tonight orally or via the chat box. We're also

1 offering the opportunity for an in-person meeting at the
2 district office during business hours and to make an
3 appointment please call 703-259-2768. Again, that number
4 is 703-259-2768.

5 Moving on to Slide 27, Availability of Public
6 Hearing Materials. The Environmental Document and the
7 Design Plans are available on the project website and if
8 you would like -- if you would like to view hard copies
9 of these documents you can visit either VDOT's Northern
10 Virginia District Office or Arlington County's
11 Transportation Office during normal business hours.

12 To make an appointment at the District Office
13 please call 703-259-2768. Again, that number is 703-259-
14 2768. Or you can call 703-228-5000, again that number us
15 703-228-5000 to make an appointment at Arlington County's
16 Transportation Office.

17 Moving on to Slide 28, Tips for using WebEx.
18 As we now get into the question and answer period, here
19 are some tips.

20 The chat box should only be used to ask
21 questions or to provide a comment and when using it, make
22 sure the message is addressed to everyone and to ask an
23 oral question please click the hand icon next to your name

1 to raise your hand and when called upon by the moderator
2 be sure to unmute your microphone by clicking the
3 microphone icon and restate your name for the record
4 before proceeding with your question or comment and when
5 finished click the hand icon again to lower your hand and
6 click the microphone icon to mute your microphone.

7 For participants who dialed in, please press
8 Star-3 on your phone to request to speak. Once you have
9 completed your question, press Star-3 again to lower your
10 hand. And in an effort to get to as many comments as
11 possible tonight, we ask that you please try to limit your
12 comments to three minutes if possible and if for some
13 reason you get disconnected, please attempt to rejoin the
14 meeting.

15 All questions and comments will be recorded
16 and included in an official public hearing transcript and
17 this meeting will end at 8:30, but the questions in which
18 we have not answered tonight, please submit your question
19 or comment either by voice mail, email or by regular mail.

20 The question and answer period will be
21 moderated by Andrew Beacher and with that said, I'll turn
22 it over to him.

23 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Thank you, Chris.

1 As you stated, we'll be taking questions
2 through several different methods this evening. We'll
3 start out with questions, just a handful that we received
4 by email, then we'll proceed to questions submitted
5 through the chat function and we'll conclude with an
6 opportunity for verbal questions.

7 Chris, the first email that we have has a
8 series of environmental questions related to the
9 Categorical Exclusion and these questions were submitted
10 by Ms. Suzanne Smith-Thumberg [ph] and the first question
11 that she had was, again related to the Categorical
12 Exclusion, under water and wetlands there is a question
13 about 402 of the Clean Water Act.

14 The response says that the project falls
15 within the disturbed area of larger Route 1 improvements
16 at a Fort Belvoir project currently under construction,
17 that this project in Arlington is probably 20 to 30 miles
18 from Fort Belvoir.

19 Would you please explain why a project at Fort
20 Belvoir obviates the need to meet Section 402 of the Clean
21 Water Act for a project in Arlington?

22 MR. BARKSDALE: Thank you, Andy.

23 John Muse, can you answer this question?

1 MR. MUSE: Sure. Apparently this was an
2 error made by Federal Highway Administration when they
3 were preparing the Categorical Exclusion. We did bring it
4 to their attention. We'll be coordinating that with
5 public involvement to make some corrections.

6 This project still has to meet the
7 requirements for Section 402 Clean Water Act. Basically
8 what this means is that if there's an exceedence of one
9 acre you require a construction (Unintelligible) permit
10 and the project would be submit to meeting the
11 requirements for erosion and sediment control and
12 stormwater management as a result.

13 But like I said, this is just a correction
14 that would need to be made and we're coordinating with
15 Federal Highway to determine whether that would be in the
16 form of an errata or maybe an addendum.

17 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Thank you, John.

18 The next question that she asked was, Under
19 Section 4F I see that this question, is there a Section 4F
20 property in the study answer and the answer was yes, but
21 the section below says that (Unintelligible) continue
22 remains blank.

23 Would you please explain why there is no

1 explanation for this item even though it appears to be
2 necessary? Also would you please tell me which of the
3 boxes should have been checked and why.

4 MR. MUSE: Okay. This was an oversight again
5 by Federal Highway Administration. I don't know why it
6 wasn't filled out. What I can say is that there's
7 actually three Section 4F properties within the project
8 study area. Two in parklands, one is Long Bridge Park,
9 the other one is George Washington Memorial Parkway and
10 then George Washington Memorial Parkway is also a historic
11 property which is it's own Section 4F use for 4F
12 protection.

13 Under Section 106, the project will have no
14 adverse affect upon the historic property and then also
15 with respect to parkland, the project won't affect or
16 impact any of the parklands, if anything it will providing
17 some connectivity between the two areas through a shared
18 use path for the interchange.

19 Any way, again, VDOT will continue to
20 coordinate with Federal Highways to make this correction
21 on the (Unintelligible)

22 MR. BEECHER: Thank you, John.

23 The next question, Despite what the exclusion

1 form states, this area does appear to be within a flood
2 plane. Would you please explain how a trail with 10 foot
3 width impervious surface in a flood plane meets Executive
4 Order 119888 Flood Plane Management?

5 MR. MUSE: Well, the 10 foot wide shared use
6 path would be located on the FEMA special flood hazard
7 area limits, the trail and the project as a whole will not
8 increase the base flood elevation to be consistent with
9 the Executive Order.

10 More refinement will be undertaken during
11 final design, right now it's being presented tonight on
12 more of a conceptual base, but as more details between
13 like utilities and stormwater come together, we'll have a
14 better idea about the alignment of the shared use path
15 outside the flood plane to the extent feasible.

16 MR. BEECHER: All right. Thank you.

17 And the last question from this email, Despite
18 what the exclusion forms states, there obviously will
19 definitely be vegetation that will be removed in a flood
20 plane.

21 Would you explain why the exclusion form
22 incorrectly states that no vegetation will be removed when
23 clearly the wider and paved trail connection to the Mount

1 Vernon Trail will require substantial removal of
2 vegetation and trees?

3 MR. MUSE: Again, I'm not sure what
4 (Unintelligible) by Federal Highways. There will be some
5 vegetation and trees removed to align the shared use path
6 - excuse me - the shared use trail with the existing
7 alignment of the trail that's on the GW Memorial Parkway.

8 So yes, there will be some removal, but it
9 won't be substantial, not in the context or significant is
10 probably the better word as defined by NEPA. But again,
11 there will be some. I'm not sure why Federal Highways
12 checked that off, but just as a correction, there will be
13 some removal, but it won't be substantial.

14 And like I said, most of the trail will be
15 outside of the special flood hazard area and there may be
16 some impact within the flood plane, but it won't -- it's
17 being raised -- the base flood elevation by any more than
18 -- probably less than a foot, which is consistent with the
19 Executive Order.

20 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Thank you, John and
21 that's it for that email.

22 We have one other email --

23 MR. MUSE: Good questions, thank you.

1 MR. BEECHER: -- that has a question - yes,
2 sir. We have one other email that asks a question related
3 to operations with respect to the project before we
4 transition to questions entered in the chat forum, and the
5 gist of this question is that this individual is concerned
6 and believes it is wrong to limit the roadway in terms of
7 the road diet portion, making it smaller and making
8 traffic worse for folks driving their vehicles.

9 This person indicates that they are also
10 handicapped and a senior citizen.

11 So Chris, would you like to address that
12 question?

13 MR. BARKSDALE: Sure, thank you, Andy.

14 To address that question, based off what we
15 presented tonight, just like John McDowell had said, even
16 though traffic along Long Bridge Drive and Boundary
17 Channel Drive does increase in the design year 2040,
18 Boundary Channel Drive still doesn't meet the threshold to
19 require a four lane roadway. So a two lane roadway is
20 sufficient for this location.

21 Also, with the removal of the ramps and John
22 McDowell, if you can go back to one of those slides that
23 shows the project? (Slides were changed) Yeah, this one

1 is fine.

2 With the removal of the two ramps in the
3 southwest quadrant, we are getting rid of the weaving
4 issues along I-395 southbound and on Boundary Channel
5 Drive right now the off ramp from southbound I-395 onto
6 Boundary Channel Drive, there's currently a stop sign and
7 so right now there is a four leg intersection at the
8 intersection of Boundary Channel Drive and Connector Road,
9 which has the potential to backup traffic along that off
10 ramp, and so with the construction of this roundabout we
11 not only eliminate that fourth leg coming into that
12 intersection, but we also eliminate conflict points, one
13 of the conflict points at that intersections, vehicular
14 conflict points in particular, and another -- another
15 improvement for vehicular traffic as well is on Long
16 Bridge Drive where the off ramp from northbound I-395
17 comes into Boundary Channel Drive and Long Bridge Drive,
18 there's another stop sign there, so with that removal,
19 that does improve traffic operations since, like I
20 mentioned in the presentation, there are some access
21 points that cause confusion for motorists who are trying
22 to get through this area.

23 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Thank you, Chris.

1 And now as I said we'll transition to the
2 questions submitted through the chat feature and we'll go
3 through these in the order that they were received.

4 The first question that we have in here
5 related to the project is from Dana Bres and she is
6 asking, What agency will own and maintain the shared use
7 path connecting to the Mount Vernon Trail and will that
8 include snow removal?

9 MR. BARKSDALE: At this time we are still
10 coordinating this effort. This effort will have to be
11 coordinated with the Pentagon, Arlington County, National
12 Park Service as well since a portion of this trail is
13 technically on federal land.

14 So right now we're still in the process of
15 coordinating this effort.

16 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you.

17 Our next question is from Kelly Alvore and
18 Kelly is asking, Since the final design will be completed
19 by the design/builder, do you anticipate significant
20 changes from this initial concept and map layout presented
21 tonight? And how can we stay up to date on any changes?

22 MR. BARKSDALE: Right now we don't anticipate
23 any significant changes for this concept. This area is

1 kind of constrained, well constrained to the point that
2 we are working with the Pentagon on federal property, so
3 right now, like I said, we don't anticipate any
4 significant changes.

5 As far as how you can stay up to date, you can
6 always visit our project website, we'll keep that up to
7 date, so that the public will know any project milestones
8 or anything that comes up with the project.

9 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you.

10 Our next question another from Dana Bres, and
11 Dana is asking, Has the Arlington County experience with
12 utility impacts during construction of Long Bridge Drive
13 been considered in the decision to leave it to the
14 design/build contractor? As she recalls, the Long Bridge
15 Drive construction experienced significant impacts due to
16 unforeseen utility impacts.

17 MR. BARKSDALE: To my knowledge there weren't
18 any challenging utility impacts during the Phase 2 of the
19 Long Bridge Drive project, so at this point I really don't
20 know, but I know that Jon Lawler is on with the county, if
21 he can chime in.

22 MR. LAWLER: Yeah, Chris. You know, for the
23 Phase 2 to the Long Bridge Drive realignment where we

1 realigned the road to the east so that it would approach
2 the roundabout at a better angle, we didn't experience
3 any, you know, unforeseen utility impacts when we were
4 doing the utility underground in there.

5 The first phase of Long Bridge Drive, that was
6 built back in 2013, so I'm not sure if they had any
7 utility issues on that, but we didn't experience anything.

8 MR. BEECHER: Okay.

9 The next question is from Ken Briggs and Ken
10 states that, You mentioned that no right of way was
11 needed, however you have 400,000 for right of way in the
12 estimate.

13 Can you elaborate on that, Chris?

14 MR. BARKSDALE: Yes, that's correct. So that
15 400,000 that is mentioned in the right of way estimate,
16 also includes utility relocations.

17 In addition, we -- there is -- we do have
18 additional money in there to coordinate with the Pentagon
19 and National Park Services to acquire the necessary
20 permits and access agreements as well and since we will
21 need to upgrade -- to update the existing perpetual
22 easement on Pentagon property, that cost is also included
23 in that 400,000.

1 MR. BEECHER: All right, thank you.

2 We have a question from Bob Gronenberg and Bob
3 is stating, It is an excellent project, but in the interim
4 why no -- why not improve the signage at the east end of
5 Boundary Channel Drive? I've been driving here for 40
6 years and still can't figure out which lane and which turn
7 to take. Clearer signage would be helpful in the interim.

8 MR. BARKSDALE: That one I would have to turn
9 back over to Jon Lawler since Boundary Channel Drive is
10 owned and maintained by them.

11 MR. LAWLER: Yeah, that's a great comment. I
12 agree, yeah, it's really confusing (Audio lost) how you
13 get to I-395 northbound, yeah, something. The county took
14 over the maintenance of Boundary Channel Drive only last
15 summer, the summer of 2019, so you know, we're still kind
16 of working it out. So I'll pass this on to our traffic
17 operations team so they can look at any kind of signage
18 improvement before construction starts in 2022.

19 MR. BEECHER: Thank you, John.

20 The next question is from Chris Slatt, What
21 will be done to ensure the safety of trail users when the
22 shared use path crosses highway on and off ramps? These
23 at-grade crossings appear to have the potential to be

1 very unsafe.

2 MR. BARKSDALE: To help with the safety as
3 pedestrians and bicyclists cross over the highway ramps,
4 we will provide adequate signage as well as from a
5 recommendation from Arlington County was to look into
6 providing the rectangular rapid flashing beacons and also
7 proper pavement markings as well.

8 MR. BEECHER: And Chris, perhaps for those
9 who aren't familiar, maybe you could elaborate on what
10 rectangular rapid flashing beacons are?

11 MR. BARKSDALE: Yeah, so these beacons will
12 allow -- so when a vehicle approaches the crosswalk, the
13 beacons will flash to let them know that pedestrians are
14 potentially in the crosswalk or beginning to cross.

15 So it's more so an advance warning system for
16 vehicular vehicles.

17 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you.

18 Our next question is from Judd Isbell, and
19 Judd is asking What changes were made to the concept
20 design presented tonight based on feedback from the public
21 meeting last year?

22 MR. BARKSDALE: If we can go back to one of
23 the design layouts again? (Slides were changed) This one

1 is fine.

2 So the previous concept that was presented
3 back in December, if you recall, some of the crosswalks
4 leading -- going across the on and off ramps were more so
5 at a 90 degree and didn't have any radiuses on them and
6 Arlington County did receive multiple comments on this
7 issue, so what we did was we included radii on these, on
8 the shared use path leading up to the crosswalk to help
9 smooth that out.

10 But other than that, the concept is pretty
11 much the same as what was presented back in December.

12 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Moving on to our next
13 question from Eric Brenner. Eric states that he's glad to
14 hear of the support for this project from the Pentagon.
15 With the inevitable increase in bicycle and pedestrian
16 visitors traveling to the 9/11 Memorial on the other side
17 of the Pentagon, are Pentagon officials planning to
18 improve access via something like a shared use path from
19 where this new project passed by the Pentagon parking
20 entrance?

21 MR. BARKSDALE: At this time I don't know the
22 answer to that, but I can bring it up in our next
23 coordination meeting with the Pentagon.

1 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Our next question, again
2 from Dana Bres, and Dana's asking Some of the turns for
3 the shared use path are pretty tight. What design
4 standards will be used for these paths?

5 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, do you want to
6 answer this one?

7 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. Alec, could you move back
8 to the exhibit? (Slides were changed) Okay, this is the
9 one.

10 So this was one of the changes that Chris had
11 mentioned from the concept from last year where
12 specifically where we come to cross the roundabout we have
13 changed from basically a hard turn to a - still a pretty
14 sharp curve.

15 The standards that we utilized for this
16 project, VDOT has shared use path standards that actually
17 requires a design speed for shared use path roadways. In
18 essence as though it were a roadway.

19 As we come up to these crossings of the ramps,
20 we particularly did not want to create a situation where a
21 bicyclist could feel like they could ride through there
22 unimpeded. There's going to be traffic coming off the
23 interstate, going onto the interstate that may not be

1 expecting a bicyclist to be there. So we're expecting
2 that to be stop and yield condition as we cross there,
3 which means a very slow speed and hence we were able to
4 put in tighter turning movements as we approach those
5 crossings.

6 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Thank you, John.

7 Our next question is from Mike Tinkosky [ph]
8 and Mike is asking, How will this project impact the
9 existing concrete plants/construction staging areas within
10 the northeast and southeast cloverleaves? Will revised LA
11 lines impact the potential use of these areas once the
12 project is complete?

13 MR. BARKSDALE: Alec, if you can go to the
14 stormwater management slide? (Slides were changed)

15 Okay. As you can see on this slide there is
16 some potential to impact those areas in the northeast and
17 southeast quadrant if the design/builder decides to put in
18 a stormwater management facility in these areas. And then
19 also with the addition of the roundabout and the shared
20 use path, there is potential for the fill and cut limits
21 to impact those areas as well, but other than that at this
22 time we don't see any impacts other than what I just
23 mentioned in those two areas.

1 As far as the LA lines, those LA lines will
2 not impact those two in-filled areas as well.

3 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Our next question from
4 Darren Buck is, Why does the trail follow the outer radius
5 of the western roundabout, the truck apron here reduces
6 the effective distance between people on the trail and the
7 tires of a 53 ton truck.

8 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, you want to
9 take care of this one?

10 (No response)

11 John McDowell?

12 (No response)

13 You're still muted.

14 MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, I was having trouble
15 moving my cursor.

16 Alec, can you get back to one of those
17 exhibits, please. (Slides were changed)

18 Okay. So your concern is following this
19 radius of the western ramp out there with the shared use
20 path? (Indicating)

21 MR. BEECHER: Yeah, the question again is, Why
22 does the trail follow the outer radius of the western
23 roundabout.

1 MR. MCDOWELL: So that would be this area here
2 (Indicating) is what I consider to be the western
3 roundabout. The trail is located so it's nominally the
4 required distance off the edge of the roadway per VDOT
5 standards and that is -- the typical distance is eight
6 feet.

7 So the trail itself follows around a radius
8 until it makes a turn, comes across and then back in. We
9 have not seen that there is a problem with the radius of
10 the trail and the impact that the truck apron has. But we
11 will go back and take a look at that and make adjustments
12 as necessary.

13 We appreciate your comment on that.

14 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you, John.

15 The next question, again from Dana, Is the 7
16 August 2020 drawings on the Arlington DES website the most
17 current set?

18 MR. BARKSDALE: The current plans that are on
19 Arlington County's website are RQ plans, which are dated
20 9/25/2020.

21 MR. BEECHER: All right. Thanks, Chris. The
22 next question is from James Harold and James is asking If
23 the redesigned interchange has lighting, will any effort

1 be made to fix the lighting on I-395 which at this time
2 is mostly not working?

3 MR. BARKSDALE: Okay. We can forward this
4 comment on to our maintenance folks to adjust the
5 lighting.

6 MR. BEECHER: All right. The next question
7 from Darren Buck, The 30 percent plans did not appear to
8 show level landings for accessibility going up and down
9 the five percent grade shown on the northern trail section
10 connecting to the Mount Vernon Trail. Is there a reason
11 why?

12 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, can you address
13 this question?

14 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. Would you state that
15 question? I'm trying to read it.

16 MR. BEECHER: Sure. The question asked, The
17 30 percent plans did not appear to show level landings for
18 accessibility going up and down the five percent grade
19 shown on the northern trail section connecting to the
20 Mount Vernon Trail. Is there a reason why?

21 MR. MCDOWELL: We did not specifically see a
22 need to put in level landings along that grade in order
23 to meet ADA standards. However, if some adjustments need

1 to be made during the final design, the design/builder
2 will need to complete his design that would make the
3 entire trail compliant with ADA regulation.

4 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you, John.

5 And we have another question from Darren, Why
6 are RRFD a breakable counter measure that requires user
7 intervention chosen in lieu of a raised crossing that
8 would slow drivers on the on/off ramps where the trail
9 crosses?

10 MR. BARKSDALE: From a safety -- from a
11 traffic safety standpoint, raised crosswalks on the on and
12 off ramps are not desired especially since this area would
13 have both truck and transit vehicles.

14 In addition, during snow events raised
15 crosswalk would pose a challenge to maintenance vehicles
16 trying to remove snow as well.

17 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you, Chris.

18 Our next question from Dana Bres, Will the
19 tighter turn radius for the shared use paths work with
20 longer bikes, such as tandems and cargo bikes? It does
21 not appear it will. Your decision is essentially putting
22 the burden of protecting the vulnerable trail users on
23 those users and not the motorists. The result is that

1 many cyclists will opt to take the lane rather than put
2 up with the tight turns.

3 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, can you address
4 this question?

5 MR. MCDOWELL: Will the tighter turning radius
6 is for shared use paths make it (Audio lost) The radii
7 that we propose in here are designed to accommodate the
8 average vehicle that's coming on that trail. Longer
9 bikes, tandems, cargo bikes, may have a little bit more
10 difficulty to transverse those trails.

11 I would suggest that we -- if you have
12 specific types of cycles that you're concerned about,
13 provide us some details on the length of those cycles and
14 we can take a look at that and offer some adjustments as
15 necessary to accommodate them.

16 We do -- we are very concerned though because
17 these ramps are ramps for interstate traffic coming off.
18 We do need to be able to accommodate traffic coming on and
19 off the interstate without impeding the mainline. It's a
20 tender balance between providing access for the cyclists
21 and other users of a facility besides the roadway and we
22 want to make sure that we limit and we don't encourage
23 people to make crossings in a hazardous fashion because

1 obviously when a bicycle and an automobile collide, the
2 cyclists is going to lose.

3 So part of our strategy is to slow vehicles
4 down as they go through, slow the bicycles down as they go
5 across the lanes in this area.

6 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you, John.

7 Our next question from Jenny Finley, Jenny is
8 asking, You mentioned coordination among VDOT, Arlington
9 County, the Pentagon, and National Park Service.

10 Which agencies will participate in design
11 reviews and provide comments.

12 MR. BARKSDALE: All of those agencies that are
13 listed in your comment will be involved in the design
14 review and they will provide comments.

15 MR. BEECHER: Okay. The next question from
16 Pamela Van Hine, How far does the sidewalk go on the
17 westside and where and how can pedestrians safely across
18 to the shared use path?

19 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, can you address
20 this one?

21 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. Alec, again, can you go
22 back to the exhibit? (Slides were changed)

23 So on the west side, the sidewalk on the

1 west side, you're referring to the one on the south --
2 when you say sidewalk I'm assuming you're talking about
3 the concrete sidewalk that will be on the south side
4 that's more focused on pedestrians than cyclists where the
5 shared use path would be on the north side.

6 As you can see from this exhibit, the proposed
7 sidewalk is going to continue through the west roundabout
8 and continue westward toward the Connector Road. The
9 essential limit of our project is right at the Connector
10 Road where we're tying into a facility that actually goes
11 into that parking (Unintelligible) So essentially at
12 Connector Road is where we terminate that sidewalk.

13 MR. BEECHER: Thanks, John, and she did
14 confirm south side.

15 Okay. Our next question from Darren Buck,
16 Does current accessibility design best practice recommend
17 a level landing every 100 feet of no more than 2 percent
18 in order to give an opportunity for rest for people with
19 mobility impairments?

20 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell?

21 MR. MCDOWELL: Yeah, the level landings can be
22 incorporated in a final design project. As this is a --
23 this really is a conceptual level plan, 50 percent plan,

1 there's a lot more details that will have to go into the
2 final design and level landings is recommended on best
3 practices. They are required to be incorporated into the
4 design as appropriate, into the final design as
5 appropriate.

6 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Chris and John, Pamela
7 has followed up just asking how do we cross to the north
8 side safely?

9 MR. MCDOWELL: I realize that I did not answer
10 all of her question the last time.

11 As the -- that sidewalk, again, Alec, please
12 go back to the exhibit. (The slides were changed)

13 As the sidewalk comes to the Connector Road on
14 the south side, there will be a crosswalk across the
15 Connector Road and there will be a accessible ramp on the
16 southwest quadrant basically under where the drive is for
17 Boundary Channel Drive.

18 However, this short section of sidewalk, you
19 will be able to traverse over to another accessible ramp
20 where you will cross Boundary Channel Drive right about
21 where the 'I' is in drive. You can actually see that
22 there's a sidewalk across that grass median area to allow
23 you to cross over to gain access to the shared use path.

1 I hope I -- oh, I'm sorry, and there are also
2 crossings on either side of the west roundabout in the
3 same fashion with the ramp and the crossings to the median
4 and to the north side on both sides of the west
5 roundabout.

6 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Thank you, John.

7 So I believe that is it for -- oops, we did
8 just get another chat question. As we get to the end of
9 these chat questions, we will provide an opportunity for
10 verbal questions, but we do have one more and this
11 question is from (Unintelligible), and their question is
12 Will there be a need for Arlington County Environmental
13 Services reviews?

14 MR. BARKSDALE: I would ask John Lawler, can
15 you address this one? If not, John Muse, can you?

16 MR. LAWLER: Yeah, I mean it's the guy's
17 impression that we will be reviewing all the design plan
18 submittals throughout the design/build process.

19 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you, John.

20 Our next question from Darren Buck, Have you
21 forecasted usage for the shared use trail in order to
22 compute trail LOS for the currently shown 10 foot width
23 trail and is the 10 foot trail sufficient for that

1 forecasted volume?

2 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell?

3 MR. MCDOWELL: We did not have sufficient
4 information on travel demand for bicycles through this
5 area to actually be able to compute a level of service for
6 that trail.

7 The 10 foot trail is a standard width trail.
8 I really can't give you a direct answer on whether or not
9 that's sufficient for what the forecasted volume is.

10 MR. BEECHER: Okay. Thank you, John.

11 Our next question from Judd Isbel, To the
12 question about bike lanes, I'm the president of the
13 Friends of the Mount Vernon Trail and regularly haul a
14 trailer with supplies for events.

15 The total length of my bike and trailer is 12
16 and a half feet and would appreciate the turns being able
17 to accommodate at least this length. Just a follow up
18 there from Judd.

19 We have another question from Dana Bres, Will
20 Arlington DES be installing trail counters on these shared
21 use paths?

22 MR. BARKSDALE: John Lawler, can you answer
23 this one?

1 MR. LAWLER: Yes, that's not currently part of
2 the scope of the project, however I think that's a great
3 idea and the county typically has trail counters at all
4 major trail heads, so I think that's definitely something
5 that we can try to incorporate in this project or install
6 upon completion.

7 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you, John. And we
8 have a comment from Chris Slatt, and his comment is that
9 You should be designing for tandems and cargo bikes, not
10 the average bike, in the same way that you design for
11 buses and trucks, not for passenger cars.

12 Cargo bikes and tandems are about 100 inches
13 long, unlike a typical road bike, which is more like 56
14 inches. This longer wheel base cannot handle the right
15 turn radii that are shown in the concept plans.

16 So more good information.

17 MR. BARKSDALE: All right. Thank you for the
18 comment.

19 MR. BEECHER: Okay. So at this point in time,
20 that is our last chat question. Shall we go ahead and
21 transition to allow some verbal questions?

22 (No response)

23 Again, if you would like to ask a question,

1 please feel free to raise your hand and we will call on
2 you as soon as we see your raised hand.

3 MR. MCDOWELL: We should remind the folks on
4 the phone that in order to request to speak, in other
5 words to raise your hand, you should dial star 3 on your
6 phone and that will indicate to us that you raised your
7 hand.

8 (Brief pause)

9 MR. BEECHER: I'm not seeing any raised hands
10 yet, but please feel free if you do have a question that
11 you would like to ask verbally, we can also take
12 additional chat questions as well if you would prefer to
13 use the chat feature.

14 (Brief pause)

15 MR. BARKSDALE: Andy, there is a raised hand
16 there.

17 MR. BEECHER: Okay, yes. I do see that. It
18 looks like Eric Brenner, you have your hand raised. Eric,
19 please go ahead and ask your question.

20 MR. BRENNER: Yeah, I just wanted to make a
21 quick comment. I think you guys are going to be stunned
22 how popular this is. I know you haven't done the
23 estimates yet, but for a whole variety of reasons, this

1 is going to get heavy use right away.

2 So that while I hadn't thought about it early
3 on, the comments about the tight turning radiuses and the
4 number of bikes that will be just tempted to get right on
5 the road, you know, will use the shortcut from Mount
6 Vernon Trail, but if it looks like it's going to really
7 slow 'em down and there's so many times a day and then on
8 the weekends when the traffic isn't bad, you know, I don't
9 think you guys want to encourage folks to do that, but I
10 think that will probably be the result if it really slows
11 folks down on the trail, but, you know, perfect project,
12 but just sort of keep that in mind as the process rolls
13 along.

14 MR. BARKSDALE: Thank you.

15 MR. BEECHER: All right, thank you, Eric.

16 And Eric, feel free to lower your hand unless
17 soon as you have any additional questions.

18 Anyone else?

19 MR. BARKSDALE: And Andy, before we go to the
20 next one, I just wanted to mention that Senator Favola is
21 actually on the call as well.

22 Senator Favola, did you have any remarks on
23 the project?

1 (No response)

2 MR. MCDOWELL: Is the Senator muted?

3 (No response)

4 MR. BEECHER: I'm not sure the Senator is
5 still on the call, Chris.

6 MR. BARKSDALE: Yeah, I think she might have
7 left.

8 MR. BEECHER: I'm not seeing her currently in
9 the participants list, unless she called back in.

10 MR. BARKSDALE: Okay.

11 MR. BEECHER: Okay. It does look like we have
12 a couple more chat comments or questions. So from Pamela
13 Van Hine we have a comment and Pamela states, Pedestrians
14 like me who enjoy walking and running along Boundary
15 Channel Drive are more likely to use the shared use path
16 than the sidewalk.

17 Okay, and then we also have another question
18 here from Dana Bres, Many trail users will use the shared
19 use path to head towards the Memorial Bridge, and I guess
20 this is more of a comment, but please do not assume every
21 cyclist will be turning to go between the lagoon and the
22 interstate.

23 MR. BARKSDALE: Okay.

1 MR. BEECHER: At the moment I'm not seeing
2 any additional hands raised. And again, feel free to ask
3 any verbal questions or questions in chat function if
4 you'd like.

5 (Brief pause)

6 Okay, I do see a comment from Chris Slatt.
7 Chris's comment is This trail, which connects a major
8 regional trail to a dense walkable neighborhood and a
9 major community facility and park, should not be designed
10 to the 10 foot minimum for a two way shared use path. It
11 should be wider.

12 Thank you, Chris, for your comment.

13 (Brief pause)

14 I'm not seeing any additional comments at the
15 moment, but please feel free if you do have any additional
16 comments let us know.

17 (Brief pause)

18 MR. BEECHER: Okay, we do have another
19 question from Chris Slatt. Can RRFBs be designed to
20 automatically act as (Unintelligible) for trail users
21 rather than requiring a button press?

22 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, can you answer
23 this one?

1 MR. MCDOWELL: I don't specifically know that
2 answer, but I hope that I will get a text back from my
3 traffic engineer (Unintelligible)

4 MR. BEECHER: Okay, if you didn't hear John he
5 said he's hoping to get a text back on that question, in
6 the meantime we can take additional questions.

7 MR. MCDOWELL: Okay, I did get an answer. The
8 RRFBS can be set to be auto activate. Auto being
9 automatically activated.

10 MR. BEECHER: All right. Thank you, John.
11 (Brief pause)

12 MR. BEECHER: Okay, another comment here from
13 Dana Bres and Dana is saying, If you're going to
14 incorporate trail counters, there will be a need for a
15 post between the trail and the roadway and the thermal
16 sensor.

17 Make sure you coordinate with DES to ensure
18 this is possible.

19 MR. BARKSDALE: Will do, thank you.

20 MR. BEECHER: Okay and we have a question
21 from Vickie Yu and she is asking, Could you describe the
22 traffic operations at the intersection of I-395 northbound
23 on-ramp at Long Bridge Drive/proposed county park

1 facility? It seems like the northbound left volume on
2 Long Bridge Drive is very high for one lane. Any concern
3 for queue and delay?

4 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, can you address
5 this one?

6 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. Alec, once again, back to
7 the exhibit please. (Slides were changed)

8 Yeah, okay, so the question as I understand
9 it, is this access between Long Bridge Drive and the
10 northbound ramp to 395. So the traffic that is coming
11 through this whole area, if you're accessing 395, if
12 you're coming up Long Bridge Drive, you'll be able to make
13 a left-turn to the on-ramp at the location where the D is
14 in the drawing.

15 You do actually have an alternative to
16 continue up and go through the roundabout and go 360
17 degrees around the roundabout and come back and make a
18 right, which that movement, if you're coming from the
19 east, from Boundary Channel Drive, would be the move you
20 would make to get to 395.

21 Through our traffic analysis we did not find
22 any issue with the queuing and delay for that approach of
23 the traffic, particularly coming northbound from Long

1 Bridge Drive.

2 MR. BEECHER: Thanks for the question, Vickie.

3 Okay, we have another question from Judd
4 Isbel, Has there been any consideration of the new
5 Virginia law requiring cars to stop for pedestrians in a
6 crosswalk in this design?

7 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, you want to
8 take a crack at this?

9 MR. MCDOWELL: Yeah, well Virginia law will
10 definitely require cars to yield to pedestrians in a
11 crosswalk. The crosswalks being where they are, would
12 subject the vehicle to require they yield to that
13 passenger or to that pedestrian.

14 What the law is and what practicality is, is
15 that we want to make sure that the pedestrians and
16 bicyclists are given the safest opportunity to cross the
17 road in the event that a car fails to yield for that
18 pedestrian.

19 MR. BEECHER: Yeah and Judd has just followed
20 up stating that it requires them to stop.

21 The next question from Darren Buck, Why is
22 the exit from the east roundabout to go south on Long
23 Bridge so much wider than other roundabout legs? Is this

1 a two lane crossing and does it set up a multiple threat
2 crash risk?

3 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell?

4 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. Again, Alec.

5 So you're speaking about, let me make sure I
6 understand this correctly, the exit from the east
7 roundabout to go south on Long Bridge Drive, it's a little
8 bit to do with the vehicle path and the way it would
9 proceed down Long Bridge Drive as opposed to the option of
10 making the right turn on the ramp to go to 395 north.

11 The configuration of that is merely
12 geometrics, it's something that will be evaluated during
13 final design and tightened up as much as possible, we'll
14 shorten the crossing length for the pedestrians and cross
15 that leg of the intersection of the roundabout.

16 It is not a two lane crossing.

17 MR. BEECHER: Okay, thank you, John.

18 Our next question, Vickie is asking, Will the
19 Pentagon's thermal energy storage tank project schedule
20 still overlap with this project?

21 MR. BARKSDALE: We are currently coordinating
22 with the Pentagon. Like I said earlier, we are aware of
23 their upcoming and ongoing projects. So that's just

1 something that we will have to continue to coordinate
2 with them on the schedule for the construction of the
3 thermal energy storage tank.

4 MR. BEECHER: Thank you, Chris.

5 All right. We do still have a few minutes
6 left. So if someone wd still like to make a verbal
7 question, please feel free to raise your hand.

8 It looks like we do have one more chat
9 question from Gillian Burgess, and she just, okay, she's
10 asking about just the process for asking questions and so
11 to answer your question, Gillian, you can type your
12 question or you can raise your hand to ask a verbal
13 question if you'd like to do that. Typing questions is
14 fine, so please feel free to go ahead and do that.

15 For our next question in line, this is from
16 Julia Semo [ph], Julia is asking, Will there be lighting
17 under the bridge as shown in the renderings and will this
18 require any bridge rating modifications?

19 MR. BARKSDALE: So there is currently existing
20 lighting under the bridge. So yes, lighting will be
21 available for the shared use path and the crosswalk. As
22 far as if this will require any bridge rating or
23 modifications, at this time we don't think that any

1 lighting will require any modifications to the existing
2 bridge.

3 MR. MCDOWELL: Chris, if I may, there is an
4 existing lighting under the bridge that includes conduit
5 and lighting fixtures. It's unclear to us whether it's
6 actually operational at this time, but the intent would
7 be to restore the lighting to a working mode with the
8 fixtures that are located on the bridge now. So there
9 would not be any bridge rating modifications to the
10 project.

11 MR. BEECHER: Okay. It looks like we do have
12 a request for a verbal question from Gillian, Gillian's
13 raised her hand.

14 So, Gillian, if you'd like to go ahead and ask
15 your question.

16 MS. BURGESS: Great. Thank you so much and my
17 question is going to refer to the map that you had up just
18 a few minutes ago, if you could go back to that and while
19 you're navigating, I want to thank you all for doing this,
20 for listening to the public on these very important plans
21 and for doing this project.

22 I think this project, along with the other
23 projects that Arlington is doing in this part of the

1 county are going to have a huge positive impact on our
2 quality of life and on our environment and these are
3 great, we need to see more of these and also a big thank
4 you for making public input happen, even though it's a
5 pandemic, in a safe way. Really appreciate that you guys
6 have put this together.

7 So my question is, on the crossings that
8 involve the roundabout - well I have two questions. First
9 of all, what is the design vehicle for all of the
10 bike/pedestrians infrastructure? Are you looking at just
11 a normal size bike for designing all of the turns, all of
12 the radiuses that people will have to navigate or are you
13 taking into consideration the kinds of ways -- the kind of
14 things that people use now, including cargo bikes and
15 bikes with trailers, which we see increasingly in our area
16 and which are longer and so if you have an angle that's
17 too tight, like you aren't actually able to navigate past,
18 that's the first question.

19 And then the second question, which is
20 related, in all of the places where there's a crossing
21 around a ramp, a roundabout where there's sort of two
22 stages, there's the crossing into -- into a median and
23 then out of the median, it looks like the path through

1 the median is not a straight line and in particular on
2 the ones that are east and west of the western roundabout
3 and west of the eastern roundabout. It looks like there's
4 a bend in there.

5 Such a bend is problematic for two reasons,
6 one if you're on a longer bicycle or if you have a
7 stroller, if you're not just a person walking, the exact
8 geometry of that bend can mean it's just not possible to
9 navigate the crossing or that particular sidewalk, so it
10 can be very challenging.

11 And two, because a person on wheels changes
12 direct, that can actually be confusing for the drivers
13 because it looks like, depending on the exact geometry, it
14 can look like a person on wheels is going in the same
15 direction as the driver and then bend to cross the
16 driver's path and then the driver isn't expecting that
17 crossing.

18 It seems like on the outer path, a lot of that
19 has been corrected, but on those inner paths I just worry
20 about those geometries.

21 MR. BARKSDALE: John McDowell, can you address
22 this question?

23 MR. MCDOWELL: Yeah, Gillian, bear with me. I

1 hope I can answer all your questions, both of your
2 questions.

3 The type of bicycle, the length of bicycle
4 used, I think before you joined the call a very similar
5 question was raised and we were provided some information
6 on longer bikes like the cargo bikes and tandem bikes that
7 should be considered and we will take that under
8 consideration and revisit our design to make sure that we
9 make appropriate accommodations for those, that's
10 something that, I, as a design consultant, have to work
11 with VDOT and Arlington County to make sure we come up
12 with a perfect solution to that.

13 With regard to your question about crossing
14 paths in the median, we really looked at the bicycle paths
15 being on a shared use path side of our project, which is
16 essentially the orange lines in this exhibit are the
17 shared use path. The crossing in the west roundabout,
18 which is the ramps to 395, I see your point, there is
19 somewhat of a bend in there that we can iron out and
20 straighten out.

21 With regard to the other crossings of the
22 roundabout in that area though, you can see that they are
23 crossing over to more of the pedestrian sidewalk on the

1 other side. That's part of the reason why we weren't as
2 concerned about that path, but we'll take your concerns
3 under consideration and consider the -- how that impacts
4 it.

5 We do appropriate your comments and insight
6 and let me know if I did not answer all your questions.

7 MR. BEECHER: Thanks, John. And Gillian just
8 followed up in an text box to say that, If I may suggest
9 Bike Arlington is a great resource on the various types of
10 bicycles and I'm sure would be willing to help out and she
11 also thanks us.

12 Let's see, we have one additional chat
13 question, that question again is from Vickie Yu, and
14 Vickie is asking did MW Cogg model, was that used for the
15 traffic forecast? Did it include the I-395 express lanes?

16 MR. MCDOWELL: We did use the regional model
17 for the traffic forecasting and when we did the initial
18 traffic study some five years ago for Arlington County,
19 the Express Lanes were not open yet, but we updated it
20 with the update design this year which did include the
21 Express Lanes (Unintelligible), the Express Lanes
22 (Unintelligible) in the modeling.

23 MR. BEECHER: All right, thank you, John.

1 It is just now 8:30 and I'm just giving one
2 last check to see if there's any additional hands raised
3 and I'm not seeing any.

4 I believe we've addressed Gillian's questions.
5 I see your hand is still raised, Gillian.

6 Okay, Gillian did ask one more question in the
7 chat feature, On the southeastern corner of the project
8 what is the path that bicycles will take from the path of
9 the bike lane on Long Bridge Drive?

10 MR. MCDOWELL: I'm sorry, go ahead.

11 MR. BEECHER: And she also asks, And will
12 Arlington County mark that in a future project?

13 MR. MCDOWELL: What is difficult to see from
14 this alignment is Long Bridge Drive has on road bike lanes
15 and as it comes up into the roundabout area, we have
16 created a slip ramp to take traffic off of the road and
17 onto the shared use path, which is roughly in that
18 location here. (Indicating)

19 So as you're coming north on Long Bridge
20 Drive, you could exit the road and onto the shared use
21 path at that point. We do have a short section of shared
22 use path on the other side that - let me refer to my notes
23 (Unintelligible) - the cyclist would actually move onto

1 the -- if they're using that as -- actually the final
2 design includes that more of a sidewalk than anything, the
3 shared use path at that point, but the bike lane starts
4 picking up just as you're crossing the ramp from -- the
5 ramp to northbound 395 to get into the bike lanes on Long
6 Bridge Drive.

7 MR. BEECHER: Okay. And she's just following
8 up, So will bikes heading north to the Aquatic Center/New
9 Long Bridge go up on the path along the words Long Bridge
10 and then cross over LBD, Long Bridge Drive?

11 MR. MCDOWELL: So you're speaking of the Long
12 Bridge Drive label that we have --

13 MR. BEECHER: Correct.

14 MR. MCDOWELL: The bikes headed north, north
15 to the aquatic center. So I'm a little bit confused by
16 your question because I would say if a bicycle was coming
17 up Long Bridge Drive, it would turn into the driveway for
18 the aquatic center. That turn out across from I-395 ramp
19 is actually the entrance to the aquatic center. So if a
20 cyclist is bond for aquatic center, I would expect that
21 they would turn in there before they actually got onto the
22 shared use path.

23 MS. BURGESS: Is it okay for me to just speak?

1 MR. MCDOWELL: Sure.

2 MS. BURGESS: So are you expecting -- there's
3 going to be cyclists in the bike lanes, so they're going
4 to be on the right side of the road.

5 MR. MCDOWELL: Correct.

6 MS. BURGESS: Is there going to be a bike box?
7 Are they going to be expected to merge left and take a
8 left, a vehicular left? That's what I -- I'm asking that
9 very specific question of how you get from the right side
10 of the road, the bike lane that's on the right side of the
11 road to the shared use path that is on the left side,
12 because that's going to be the path that eventually
13 connects to Long Bridge, though I would expect a ton of
14 bike traffic to do that exact movement.

15 MR. MCDOWELL: I have to understand your
16 question a little bit more, because I wouldn't -- I guess
17 my expectation is, is that a bike would stay to the right
18 and utilize the shared use path that's on the right that's
19 continuing to take you across I-395, across the west
20 roundabout about connect to the shared use path that would
21 take you (Unintelligible)

22 I really don't see much reason why a bicyclist
23 would cross to the left side of the road at that point.

1 MS. BURGESS: Because eventually Long Bridge,
2 being the new bridge, there's going to be a new
3 pedestrian/bike bridge along with Long Bridge, and it's
4 going to end at the aquatic center.

5 MR. MCDOWELL: Right, uh-huh.

6 MS. BURGESS: And so you're going to be able
7 to bike on that eastern side, right, the path that is on
8 the eastern most side of this map where you see all the
9 construction vehicles parked?

10 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.

11 MS. BURGESS: That path is eventually going to
12 go around the aquatic center onto a bridge and into DC and
13 Arlington --

14 MR. MCDOWELL: I apologize, I'm apparently
15 having trouble understanding the gist of your question
16 because Long Bridge itself is on the east side of 395.

17 MS. BURGESS: There's going to be a new rail
18 bridge connected - constructed and when they construct the
19 new rail bridge, they're going to construct a pedestrian
20 bridge.

21 MR. MCDOWELL: Understand, I understand that.

22 MS. BURGESS: And that's going to connect here
23 to basically the aquatic center.

1 MR. MCDOWELL: Basically at the aquatic
2 center, but that is still on the east side of the
3 roundabout.

4 MS. BURGESS: Oh, yeah, yeah, this is --

5 MR. MCDOWELL: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I don't
6 mean to be argumentative with you, I'm just trying to
7 understand how your question --

8 MS. BURGESS: Yeah, so you're coming north on
9 Long Bridge Drive, you need to get east of Long Bridge
10 Drive.

11 MR. MCDOWELL: Uh-huh.

12 MS. BURGESS: Right, to that path that's east,
13 that's on the eastern side of this map.

14 MR. MCDOWELL: Right.

15 MS. BURGESS: And so you can -- I'm just --
16 I'm just trying to understand why - you know, how it is
17 expected that a person biking in the bike lane on the far
18 side of the road, on the right side of the road, gets
19 over left into that trail onto the path that's on the left
20 side of everything.

21 MR. MCDOWELL: I think you really need to
22 study where the path from the Long Bridge connects --

23 MS. BURGESS: I'm sorry, I'm backwards. I'm

1 talking about -- I am in Europe right now, I'm in England
2 right now.

3 MR. MCDOWELL: Oh, okay.

4 MS. BURGESS: I should be saying southbound
5 bikes crossing the other way.

6 MR. MCDOWELL: Southbound bikes.

7 MS. BURGESS: Southbound bikes coming off of
8 the eastern path. I am so sorry. Southbound bikes coming
9 off of the eastern path, how do they cross to the west
10 side of the road to go south on Long Bridge Drive?

11 MR. MCDOWELL: So you're asking about a
12 cyclist that's coming off the Long Bridge bike trail?

13 MS. BURGESS: Right.

14 MR. MCDOWELL: And comes to Long Bridge Drive,
15 they would have to cross over the intersection to get to
16 the bike path heading southbound.

17 MS. BURGESS: And --

18 MR. MCDOWELL: I'm not sure -- I don't know
19 exactly where that Long Bridge path ties in. I'm assuming
20 it ties in near that driveway.

21 MS. BURGESS: I'm fairly certain it ties in to
22 the path that you see, that you have, that you have marked
23 here.

1 MR. MCDOWELL: Oh, okay.

2 MS. BURGESS: Like it will be north, that's
3 what Arlington has said before is that it will sweep down
4 and connect to this orange trail, so --

5 MR. MCDOWELL: Does John Lawler have
6 information on that? Is John still with us?

7 MR. LAWLER: Yeah, so basically if you're
8 going to the new Long Bridge there's a loop trail along
9 the aquatic center, so you would use one of the roundabout
10 crosswalks if you're going southbound on Long Bridge Drive
11 and then get over to the east side and then use that
12 connector to the loop trail to get to Long Bridge.

13 MS. BURGESS: So the problem with that is that
14 you would cross probably south of the eastern roundabout
15 coming south and then you'd have to cross the on ramp to
16 395 again to go south. I don't think anybody in practice
17 is going to do that and I don't think safety wise that's
18 what we want people to do, because that's an on ramp to a
19 highway, right?

20 I think in practice people will stay on the
21 trail and they'll end up at that intersection right there
22 that's the driveway to the aquatic center and they're just
23 going to diagonally come across that intersection.

1 MR. MCDOWELL: Gillian, would you mind marking
2 up a drawing and emailing that to us with what your
3 concerns are so we can address that?

4 MS. BURGESS: Yeah, I'd be happy to. I've got
5 to figure out how, but I'll be happy to do that.

6 MR. MCDOWELL: I think before we get done here
7 we can put up the screen that says how to make comments
8 and there's an email address.

9 MS. BURGESS: I very much appreciate you
10 sticking with me late at night, even when I forget what
11 country I'm in.

12 MR. MCDOWELL: Okay.

13 MR. BEECHER: Sure. Thank you, Gillian.

14 We did get one other question, which I think
15 is related to Gillian's comment. This is from Dana Bres
16 as well.

17 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.

18 MR. BEECHER: Describing how cyclists on
19 Boundary Channel heading south will get onto Long Bridge
20 Drive safely. So that's something that we will need to
21 take into consideration as we move forward.

22 MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.

23 MR. BEECHER: We are at about 8:40, so I want

1 to be respectful of everyone's time. I don't think we
2 have any additional questions or hands raised at this
3 point. So I think it's appropriate now to turn it back
4 over to you, Chris and John.

5 MR. BARKSDALE: Thanks, Andy.

6 Thank you everyone for joining this Virtual
7 Design Public Hearing for the Boundary Channel Drive -
8 I-395 Interchange Improvements Project.

9 Like I mentioned earlier, if we didn't -- if
10 we weren't able to answer any of your questions or
11 comments tonight, please utilize one of the three other
12 methods of sending us your comments, either by email,
13 voice mail or by direct mail. And with that, thank you.

14

15

16

* * * *

17

18

19

20

(Whereupon, at approximately 8:43 o'clock,
p.m., the meeting was concluded)

21

22

23

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION

I, JUDY F. HENDERSON, do hereby certify that I produced this transcript from digital recordings provided to me, that the foregoing is a true record of the recordings received by me; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were held; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

JUDY F. HENDERSON