

A G E N D A

MEETING OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

DIMON Corporation
Carrington Center
512 Bridge Street
Danville, Virginia
November 21, 1996
10:00 a.m.

1. Public Comment
2. Action on Minutes of Meeting of August 15, 1996
3. Action on Additions, Abandonments or Other Changes in the Secondary System from October 1, 1996 through October 31, 1996
4. Action on Discontinuances in the Secondary System: Fairfax County
5. Conveyances: Route 29 - Culpeper County
Route 464 - City of Chesapeake
Route 600 - Fauquier County
6. Action on Bids Received October 22, 1996
7. Consultant Agreement: Statewide Inventory and Inspection of
(A) Traffic Structures
Provide services for the inventory and
in-depth structural inspection services
for the estimated 2700 statewide traffic
structures
Collins Engineers, Inc.
- Consultant Agreement: Inspection of Highway Structures and
(B) Bridges on Regional Basis
Region I - Bristol, Lynchburg and Salem
Districts
Schwartz & Associates
- Consultant Agreement: Inspection of Highway Structures and
(C) Bridges on Regional Basis
Region II - Richmond, Fredericksburg and
Suffolk Districts
Clark Nexsen

Consultant Agreement: Maintenance and Repair Design for Highway
(D) Structures and Bridges on Regional Basis
Region I - Bristol, Lynchburg and Salem
Districts
Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc.

Consultant Agreement: Maintenance and Repair Design for Highway
(E) Structures and Bridges on Regional Basis
Region II - Richmond, Fredericksburg and
Suffolk Districts
SITE - Blauvelt Engineers

Consultant Agreement: Maintenance and Repair Design for Highway
(F) Structures and Bridges on Regional Basis
Region III - Culpeper, Staunton and
Northern Virginia Districts
Wilbur Smith Associates

Consultant Agreement: Schedule/constructability Studies
(G) Area 1 - Richmond, Fredericksburg, Culpeper
and Northern Virginia Districts
Alpha Corporation

Consultant Agreement: Schedule/constructability Studies
(H) Area 2 - Bristol, Salem, Lynchburg, Suffolk
and Staunton Districts
McDonough Bolyard Peck

Consultant Agreement: Two-year Statewide Survey Contract
(I) Provide services for all types of surveying
including photogrammetry and aerial
photography
Bengtson, Debell & Elkin, Ltd.

Consultant Agreement: Cedar Lane - City of Portsmouth
(J) Proj. U000-124-V04, PE101
Supplemental Agreement # 3 for revision
in scope of services
Patton Harris Rust & Associates

Consultant Agreement: Route 29 - Albemarle County
(K) Proj. 6029-002-F19, C502
Supplemental Agreement # 1 for revision
in scope of services
Frederic R. Harris, Inc.

Consultant Agreement: Route 58 - Grayson County
(L) Proj. 0058-038-E13,B613

Route 94 - Wythe County
Proj. 0094-098-V04,C501

Provide services for construction
inspection
KCI Technologies, Inc.

Consultant Agreement: Route 66 - Prince William County
(M) Proj. 0066-076-F06,C501,B622,B623,B624
Supplemental Agreement # 1 for revision
in scope of services
Louis Berger & Associates, Inc.

Consultant Agreement: Route 66 - Fairfax and Prince William
(N) Counties
Proj. 0066-076-F06,PE101
0066-029-F19,PE101
0066-029-F19,PE102
0066-029-F20,PE101
0066-029-F22,PE101
Supplemental Agreement # 7 for revision
in scope of services
Dewberry & Davis

Consultant Agreement: Route 81 - Town of Christiansburg
(O) Proj. 6460-154-F04,PE101,B604,B605,B606,
B607,B608,B611,B609,B610,B612,B613,B614,
B615
Provide service for subsurface exploration
and associated surveying, bridge design
and shop drawing review
David Volkert and Associates, Inc.

Consultant Agreement: Route 210 - Amherst County
(P) Proj. 0210-005-F02,B601

Route 29 - Campbell County
Proj. 6029-015-F15,B612,B623

Route 29 - City of Lynchburg
Proj. 6029-118-F07,B622

Route 29 - City of Lynchburg
Proj. 6029-118-F07,B613,B621

Provide services for complete bridge plans,
estimates and review of shop drawings
Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall

8. Location Route 58 (E28) - Lee County
 & Design: Proj. 6058-052-E28, PE101, RW201, C501
 Fr: 0.37 mile east of Route 752 (East of Dryden)
 To: 0.95 mile east of Route 620 (Lonesome Pine Road)
 at Olinger
- Location Route 70 - Lee County
 & Design: Proj. 0070-052-108, PE101, RW202, M502
 Fr: 1.6 miles south of Route 58
 To: Route 58
- Location Route 609 (Macedonia Road) - Caroline County
 & Design: Proj. 0609-016-188, C501
 Fr: Intersection Route 606 (Stonewall Jackson Road)
 To: 1.302 miles north Intersection Route 606
- Location Route 610 - Wise County
 & Design: Proj. 0610-097-194, M503
 Fr: 0.03 mile west of Route 612
 To: 0.12 mile west of Route 697
- Location Route 776 (Liberia Avenue Extension) - Prince William
 & Design: County and City of Manassas
 Proj. 0776-076-298, C501, D642
 Fr: Prince William Parkway (Route 3000)
 To: Dumfries Road (Route 234)
9. Through Truck Restriction: Route 734 - Loudoun County
 Through Truck Restriction: Route 6390 (Bennington Woods Road)
 Fairfax County
10. Industrial Access: Gloucester County
 Proj. 0780-036-148, C501
 Gloucester Business Park
11. Rail Industrial Access: Newport News Industrial Development
 Authority making application for
 Twinpak, Inc.
 City of Newport News
- Rail Industrial Access: Piedmont Rebar
 Washington County

12. Railroad Preservation Program: Buckingham Branch Railroad Company
Shenandoah Valley Railroad Company
Winchester and Western Railroad
Company
13. Supplemental FY 1997 Transportation Efficiency Improvement Fund
14. Rail Safety Oversight Program (49 CFR Part 659)
15. Northern Virginia Marketing Program
16. SOV Access - I-95 at Springfield Interchange
17. State Noise Abatement Policy
18. Action on Land Use Policy/Utility Accommodation
19. New Business
20. Adjourn

Addition to Item 6: Bids received September 10, October 3,
October 10 and October 18, 1996

MINUTES
OF
MEETING OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

DIMON Corporation
Carrington Center
512 Bridge Street
Danville, Virginia
November 21, 1996
10:00 a.m.

The monthly meeting of the Commonwealth Transportation Board was held in the Carrington Center of the DIMON Corporation, Danville, Virginia, on November 21, 1996, at 10:00 a.m. The Chairman, Dr. Robert E. Martinez, presided.

Present: Messrs. Gehr, Byrd, Cogbill, Grubb, Lee, Martin, Myers, Neale, Newcomb, Porter, Prettyman, Rich, Roudabush and White and Mrs. Lionberger.

The Chairman presented the Outstanding Public Transportation Achievement Awards. The awards are sponsored by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, in cooperation with the Virginia Association of Public Transit Officials. The awards program is designed to recognize outstanding achievements by public transportation professionals and transit systems.

The award for outstanding achievement by a small urban or rural transit system was presented to District Three Governmental Cooperative. Accepting the award was Jack Blevins, Operations Director for District Three Governmental Cooperative.

The award for outstanding achievement by an urbanized area public transportation system was presented to Virginia Railway Express. Accepting the award was Stephen T. Roberts, Director of Operations for Virginia Railway Express.

11-21-96

Item 2:

On motion of Mr. Byrd, seconded by Mr. White, the minutes of the meeting of August 15, 1996, were approved.

Item 3:

Moved by Mr. Porter, seconded by Mr. Byrd, that the Board approve Additions, Abandonments or Other Changes in the Secondary System from October 1, 1996, through October 31, 1996, inclusive.

Motion carried.

Item 4:

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Lee, that

WHEREAS, by proper resolution, the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County has requested that certain roads which no longer serve as public necessities be discontinued as part of the Secondary System of State Highways.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that pursuant to Section 33.1-150 of the Code of Virginia, as amended, the Commonwealth Transportation Board finds the following segments of roads are not required for public convenience and are hereby discontinued as part of the Secondary System of State Highways, effective this date.

Northern Virginia District

Fairfax County - Route 608 - Frying Pan Road
From Route 28 to 0.79 mile northwest Route 657
0.18 Mile

Total Mileage - 0.18 Mile

Motion carried.

**Report to the Commonwealth Transportation Board
Abandonments and Additions to the Secondary System of State Highways**

System Change	Project/Subdivision	Street Name	Route	From	To	Length Miles	Date BODS Reamarked	Effective
Abandonment	None	Tetba Lane	1104	0.06 Mile Southeast Route 631	Route 631	0.06	10/2/96	10/10/96
Addition	Bridgeport, Section 2	Acacia Drive	1019	0.13 Mile Southeast Route 1018	Route 1016	0.08	8/14/96	10/9/96
Addition	Bridgeport, Section 2	Boyington Boulevard	1016	0.21 Mile Southwest Route 1019	0.64 Mile Northeast Route 1019	0.25	8/14/96	10/9/96
Addition	Old Burnie, Section 4	Hunter Lane	1448	Route 1450	0.18 Mile South Route 1447	0.11	9/25/96	10/22/96
Addition	Old Burnie, Section 4	Lach Drive	1447	Route 1450	0.12 Mile South Route 1449	0.17	9/25/96	10/22/96
Addition	Old Burnie, Section 4	Woodvale Drive	1450	Route 613	0.15 Mile Southeast Route 613	0.15	9/25/96	10/22/96
Addition	Woods on Wigginton, Section 4	Maulberry Place	1213	0.07 Mile West Route 1213	Route 1212	0.07	10/15/96	10/1/96
Addition	Acrot Forest, Section B	Pemberton Road	4474	Route 4485	Route 4473	0.12	8/28/96	10/13/96
Addition	Acrot Forest, Section B	Kingsman Lane	4483	Route 4474	0.19 Mile East Route 4474	0.19	8/28/96	10/13/96
Addition	Acrot Forest, Section B	Old Church Lane	4472	Route 4483	0.09 Mile South Route 4470	0.03	8/28/96	10/13/96
Addition	Acrot Forest, Section B	Royal Mews Court	4484	Route 4483	0.07 Mile North Route 4483	0.07	9/28/96	10/13/96
Addition	Berley, Section 15	Aubrook Way	3435	Route 2637	0.08 Mile North Route 2637	0.08	8/28/96	10/4/96
Addition	Berley, Section 15	Walhalla Circle	3443	Route 2637	0.04 Mile North Route 2637	0.04	8/28/96	10/4/96
Addition	Berley, Section 15	Walhalla Drive	2637	0.08 Mile Northeast Route 2638	0.22 Mile Northeast Route 2638	0.14	8/28/96	10/4/96
Addition	Berley, Section 16	Aubrook Way	3439	0.11 Mile Northwest Route 2637	0.08 Mile Northwest Route 2637	0.03	9/28/96	10/7/96
Addition	Windsor Park, Section 3	Sylvan Ridge Court	4376	Route 4358	0.06 Mile North Route 4358	0.06	4/10/96	10/15/96
Addition	Windsor Park, Section 3	Sylvan Ridge Phase	4375	Route 4358	0.08 Mile North Route 4358	0.08	4/10/96	10/15/96
Addition	Windsor Park, Section 3	Sylvan Ridge Road	4358	0.38 Mile East Route 4356	0.12 Mile East Route 4356	0.26	4/10/96	10/15/96

**Report to the Commonwealth Transportation Board
Assignments and Additions to the Secondary System of State Highways**

System Change	Project/Subdivision	Street Name	Route	From	To	Length Miles	Date BCS Resolution	Effective
Addition	Springfield	Avenue Circle	1146	Route 1145	0.06 Mile Northeast Route 1145	0.06	12/6/95	10/21/96
Addition	Springfield	Avenue Circle	1146	Route 1145	0.06 Mile Northeast Route 1145	0.06	12/6/95	10/21/96
Addition	Springfield	Great Oak Court	1149	0.07 Mile Southwest Route 1148	Route 1148	0.07	12/6/95	10/21/96
Addition	Springfield	Springfield Terrace	1145	Route 645	0.29 Mile North Route 645	0.29	12/6/95	10/21/96
Addition	Springfield	Summerfield Court	1147	0.19 Mile Southwest Route 1145	Route 1145	0.19	12/6/95	10/21/96
Addition	Springfield	Winterview Drive	1148	0.24 Mile Northwest Route 1147	0.08 Mile Southwest Route 1147	0.32	12/6/95	10/21/96
Addition	Bellevue, Section 1	Ormsandy Drive	6490	0.13 Mile Southwest Route 4535	Route 4535	0.13	9/30/96	10/30/96
Addition	Bellevue, Section 1	Ormsandy Drive	6490	0.13 Mile Southwest Route 4535	Route 4535	0.13	9/30/96	10/30/96
Addition	Clayton's Grove	Clayton Court	7728	0.23 Mile Southwest Route 643	Route 643	0.23	9/29/96	10/31/96
Addition	Clayton's Grove	Wooden Spike Road	6846	Route 7728	0.03 Mile South Route 6412	0.03	9/29/96	10/31/96
Addition	Compton Valley Estates	Bay Valley Lane	8617	Route 658	0.07 Mile Southwest Route 6512	0.53	10/14/96	10/30/96
Addition	Divine Landing	Empire Lane	8143	0.13 Mile Southeast Route 690	Route 690	0.13	10/14/96	10/30/96
Addition	Dudrow	Dudrow Court	1638	Route 1297	0.09 Mile North Route 1297	0.09	9/20/96	10/30/96
Addition	Frying Pan Road Improvements	Frying Pan Road	668	Route 28	0.29 Mile Northwest Route 687	0.21	7/8/96	10/11/96
Addition	O. C. Dumas	Upper Wynwood Court	8139	Route 8290	0.08 Mile Northeast Route 8290	0.08	9/30/96	10/30/96
Addition	O. C. Dumas	Upper Wynwood Pass	8290	Route 669	0.11 Mile Northwest Route 669	0.11	9/30/96	10/30/96
Addition	Phyllis Addition to Avon Park	Lena Court	7716	Route 4382	0.07 Mile North Route 4382	0.07	10/14/96	10/30/96
Addition	Riverhead Knolls	River Park Drive	7076	0.46 Mile North Route 603	0.81 Mile North Route 603	0.35	9/29/96	10/27/96
Addition	Riverhead Knolls	River Park Lane	7849	Route 7076	0.09 Mile West Route 7076	0.09	9/29/96	10/27/96
Addition	Wolfpen Ridge	Annle's Way	6536	Route 696	0.06 Mile North Route 696	0.06	10/14/96	10/30/96
Addition	Woodland Heights	Woodland Heights Court	8007	Route 889	0.11 Mile North Route 889	0.11	9/30/96	10/30/96

**Report to the Commonwealth Transportation Board
Abandonments and Additions to the Secondary System of State Highways**

System Change	Project/Subdivision	Street Name	Route	From	To	Length Miles	Date BCR Resolution	Effective
Franklin Abandonment	0690-030-236, CS01 - Segment One	Beverly Mill Road	600	Defined in Project Sketch	Net Mileage Change Reported Defined in Project Sketch	0.25	10/13/96	10/23/96
Addition	0600-030-236, CS01 - Segment Two	Beverly Mill Road	600	Defined in Project Sketch	Defined in Project Sketch	0.26	10/13/96	10/23/96
Franklin Addition	Scenic River Estates	Scenic River Drive	1084	0.44 Mile Southeast Route 713	Net Mileage Change Reported None	0.44	10/15/96	10/21/96
Franklin Addition	None	None	960	0.18 Mile Northwest Route 662	Net Mileage Change Reported None	0.02	9/20/96	10/23/96
Franklin Addition	Pine Point	Pine Point Place	1035	0.17 Mile Southwest Route 652	Net Mileage Change Reported None	0.17	11/06/95	10/30/96
Franklin Addition	Gulberg Estates	Lulus Drive	1296	Routes 1295	Net Mileage Change Reported None	0.07	9/23/96	10/4/96
Addition	Gulberg Estates	Lulus Ridge Road	1294	0.25 Mile Southwest Route 1296	Route 1296	0.25	9/23/96	10/4/96
Addition	Gulberg Estates	Majl Drive	1297	0.15 Mile Northwest Route 1296	Route 1296	0.15	9/23/96	10/4/96
Franklin Addition	Hempport	Hempport Lane	1127	0.39 Mile South Route 743	Net Mileage Change Reported None	0.39	10/7/96	10/21/96
Franklin Addition	None	Staffer Road	1214	Route 1204	Net Mileage Change Reported None	0.12	9/9/96	10/8/96
Franklin Addition	Ashbury Place, Part 3	Kemper House Court	1623	0.08 Mile South Route 662	Net Mileage Change Reported None	0.08	10/1/96	10/23/96
Addition	Dale City, Sections 13 and 9G1, Part 1	Oaklawn Lane	2810	0.22 Mile West Route 2466	Route 2466	0.22	4/2/96	10/23/96
Addition	Dale City, Sections 13 and 9G1, Part 1	Oaklot Drive	2812	Route 2811	Route 2811	0.05	4/2/96	10/23/96

**Report to the Commonwealth Transportation Board
Abandonments and Additions to the Secondary System of State Highways**

System Change	Project/Subdivision	Street Name	Route	From	To	Length		Effective
						Miles	Date MOS Resolutions	
Addition	Dale City, Sections 13 and 9G1, Part 1	Camewood Drive	2466	0.08 Mile North Route 2462	0.19 Mile North Route 2462	0.11	4/2/96	10/29/96
Addition	Dale City, Sections 13 and 9G1, Part 1	Omega Drive	2814	Route 2810	Route 2811	0.09	4/2/96	10/29/96
Addition	Dale City, Sections 13 and 9G1, Part 1	Quist Court	2811	0.19 Mile Northwest Route 2810	Route 2810	0.19	4/2/96	10/29/96
Addition	Dale City, Sections 13 and 9G1, Part 1	Ozark Court	2813	0.07 Mile Northwest Route 2812	0.07 Mile Southeast Route 2812	0.14	4/2/96	10/29/96
Addition	Virginia Meadows Industrial Park	Trotwood Meadows Court	1683	0.04 Mile Northwest Route 1682	Route 1682	0.04	6/4/96	10/23/96
Addition	Virginia Meadows Industrial Park	Virginia Meadows Drive	1682	0.55 Mile Southwest Route 674	Route 674	0.65	6/4/96	10/23/96
Addition	Virginia Meadows Industrial Park	Willow Meadows Court	1684	Route 1682	0.10 Mile Southeast Route 1682	0.10	6/4/96	10/23/96
Revised Addition	Nelling Hills - Town of Centerville	Rogers Street	861	0.20 Mile Southwest Route 860	0.45 Mile South Route 860	0.25	9/16/96	10/4/96
Stock Addition	Town of Gate City	Park Drive	T-1422	0.02 Mile South Route T-763	Not Millable. City Has Resurveyed Route T-763	0.02	10/21/96	10/30/96
Addition	Town of Gate City	Park Street	T-763	0.18 Mile Southwest Route T-765	0.15 Mile Southwest Route T-763	0.03	10/21/96	10/30/96
Stock Addition	Rainier, Sections 6, 7	Cedar Cove	1831	Route 743	Not Millable. Engineer Negotiating	0.04	8/27/96	10/16/96
Addition	Rainier, Sections 6, 7	Leans Court	1834	0.11 Mile Northwest Route 743	0.04 Mile Southeast Route 743	0.11	8/27/96	10/16/96
Addition	Rainier, Sections 6, 7	Sumas Court	1831	Route 743	Route 743	0.04	8/27/96	10/16/96
Addition	Rainier, Sections 6, 7	White Pine Lane	1832	0.08 Mile West Route 743	Route 743	0.08	8/27/96	10/16/96
Addition	Rainier, Sections 6, 7	Willow Court	1831	0.09 Mile Northwest Route 743	Route 743	0.09	8/27/96	10/16/96
Addition	Winewood, Section 3	Ashwood Court	1606	Route 1605	0.08 Mile North Route 1603	0.08	8/27/96	10/10/96
Addition	Winewood, Section 3	Cherrywood Drive	1607	Route 1603	Route 1601	0.19	8/27/96	10/10/96

**Report to the Commonwealth Transportation Board
 Amendments and Additions to the Secondary System of State Highways**

01-Nov-96

5

System Change	Project/Subdivision	Street Name	Routes	From	To	Length Miles	Date BOS Resolution	Effective
Addition	Winewood, Section 3	Maplewood Drive	1603	0.20 Mile West Route 1605	0.03 Mile West Route 1603	0.17	8/27/96	10/10/96
Addition	Winewood, Section 3	Timberwood Road	1608	0.07 Mile West Route 1607	Route 1607	0.07	8/27/96	10/10/96
Addition	St. George's Estates	St. Lisa's Court	1519	Route 1518	0.08 Mile Northeast Route 1518	0.08	7/23/96	10/9/96
Addition	St. George's Estates	St. Phillipa Road	1517	Route 1518	Route 1523	0.06	7/23/96	10/9/96
Addition	St. George's Estates	St. Robert's Drive	1518	0.07 Mile Southeast Route 1517	0.25 Mile North Route 1517	0.32	7/23/96	10/9/96

11-21-96

Item 5:

Moved by Mr. Porter, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in connection with Route 29, State Highway Project 0029-023-101, C501, the Commonwealth acquired certain lands from John K. Plevakis and Elizabeth Plevakis by deed dated February 20, 1963, recorded in Deed Book 173, Page 121, in the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Culpeper County; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 33.1-148 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, the Commonwealth Transportation Board at its meeting held October 16, 1996, abandoned a section of old Route 29; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner has certified in writing that a portion of the lands containing 0.077 acre, more or less, and lying north of and adjacent to the north normal right of way line of Route 29, from a point approximately 30 feet opposite approximate Station 2260+60 (southbound lane centerline) to a point approximately 40 feet opposite approximate Station 2262+30 (southbound lane centerline), does not constitute a section of the public road and is deemed by him no longer necessary for the uses of the State Highway System; and

WHEREAS, the adjacent landowner has requested that the surplus lands be conveyed.

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the provisions of Section 33.1-149 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, the conveyance of said lands, so certified, is approved and the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner is hereby authorized to execute, in the name of the Commonwealth, a deed, without warranty, conveying the lands for a consideration satisfactory to the Director of Right of Way and Utilities, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed appropriate.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Porter, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in connection with Route 464, State Highway Project 0464-131-101, RW207, the Commonwealth acquired certain lands from Nettie Pritchard Kilian by instrument dated November 3, 1977, recorded in Deed Book 1793, Page 567, in the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of the City of Chesapeake; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner has certified in writing that a portion of the lands containing 1.7965 acres, more or less, shown on plat entitled "Plat Showing Property to be Acquired from State Highway Commissioner for Bryon Street Extension," dated September 5, 1996, was acquired incidental to the construction, reconstruction, alteration, maintenance and repair of Route 464 and does not constitute a section of the public road and is deemed by him no longer necessary for the uses of the State Highway System; and

WHEREAS, the City of Chesapeake has requested that the surplus lands be conveyed to it.

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the provisions of Section 33.1-149 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, the conveyance of said lands, so certified, is approved and the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner is hereby authorized to execute, in the name of the Commonwealth, a deed, without warranty, conveying the lands for a consideration satisfactory to the Director of Right of Way and Utilities, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed appropriate.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Porter, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in connection with Routes 29 and 600, State Highway Projects 1730-02, 1330-11, and 0600-030-236, C501, the Commonwealth acquired certain lands from Harold D. Kube, et al., by deed dated May 25, 1954, Deed Book 187, Page 444; W. Spencer Brenizer by deed dated February 17, 1954, Deed Book 186, Page 367; Harold D. Kube, et al., by deed dated September 3, 1952, Deed Book 182, Page 220; W. Spencer Brenizer, et al., by deed dated September 3, 1952, Deed Book 182, Page 220; and Fairview Farms, Ltd., by deed dated January 31, 1995, Deed Book 737, Page 1790; all being recorded in the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Fauquier County; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 33.1-155 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, a section of old Route 600, which was acquired for Route 600, was abandoned by the Board of Supervisors of Fauquier County by resolution dated October 15, 1996; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner has certified in writing that a portion of the lands containing 1.883 acres, more or less, and lying west of and adjacent to the west proposed right of way line of Route 600, from a point approximately 48.2 feet opposite approximate Station 434+44.80 (Route 29 existing southbound centerline) to a point approximately 22 feet opposite approximate Station 18+90 (Route 600 survey centerline), was acquired incidental to the construction, reconstruction, alteration, maintenance and repair of Route 600 and does not constitute a section of the public road and is deemed by him no longer necessary for the uses of the State Highway System and Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the adjacent landowner has requested that the surplus lands be conveyed.

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the provisions of Section 33.1-154 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, the conveyance of said lands, so certified, is approved and the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner is hereby authorized to execute, in the name of the Commonwealth, a deed, without warranty, conveying the lands for a consideration satisfactory to the Director of Right of Way and Utilities, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed appropriate.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Item 6:

Moved by Mr. Rich, seconded by Mr. Byrd, that the Board approve the bids received September 10, October 3, October 10, October 18 and October 22, 1996, listed for award on the attached sheets numbered 6 A through 6 P and authorize execution of contracts by the Deputy Commissioner or Chief Engineer, and approve rejection of those bids listed for rejection and authorize readvertisement.

Motion carried.

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 21, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
1 261-96A	MS1-095-112CSM CONSTRUCTION FLUORIS	95	Interchange 149 & 34 (Bypass)	AWARD	THE RICHARDSON-WAYLAND ELECTRICAL CORPORATION ROANOKE, VA.	4	\$738,547.40
	DM-095-1(223)		GREENSVILLE CO. Interchange Lighting				
2 3717	PA00-944-101.5766; M/C 94-7ES-004 CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE FUNDS	1-64 & 36	Various Locations BENECIA NEW KENT COS. & CITY OF HENRISWELL Road Signs and/or Signs, Sign Overlay & Replacement	AWARD	L. S. LEE, INC. RICHMOND, VA	5	\$117,777.00

Included 2 Estimate Projects @ \$576,314.40

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 22, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
1 28-96A	8199-002-103CS96 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	199	From: 0.241 MI. E. Rte. 9 To: 0.004 MI. S. Rte. 819 JAMES CITY CO. 1.363 MI. Crick, Drain, App. Cons. Pave., Inlets, Signs, Signals, S.W.M. & Stormwater	AWARD	HENRY S. BRANSCOME, INC. WILLIAMSBURG, VA.	3	\$6,581,102.17
3 218-96A	8966-006-F11C307, 8962-0603 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	360	From: 0.18 MI. E. Courthouse Rd. To: 0.89 MI. W. Walnutley Blvd/Gruba Rd. CHESTERFIELD CO. 2.02 MI. Crick, Drain, App. Pave., Inlets, Signs, Util. & Elec. (2)	AWARD	ASSOCIATED MARION, INC. & MARION CONTRACTING CO., INC. ASHLAND, VA	3	\$7,352,704.80
3 219-96A	8005-006-F11C308 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	3	From: 1.075 MI. E. Int. Rte. 2837 (at intersection) To: 0.273 MI. S. ECL. Mountain WESTMORELAND CO. 2.682 MI. Rt. 2 to 4 Lane, Inlet, Crick, Drain, App. Pave., Inlets, Pave. Mark, Pave., Drain, of Bridge & 19724	AWARD	STANLEY CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. ASHLAND, VA.	2	\$3,740,572.64
4 219-96A	6296-006-F11C309 CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE FUNDS	29 88L	From: 0.153 MI. N. of S. Fork Barbours Rd. To: 0.129 MI. S. of S. Fork Barbours Rd. ALBEMARLE CO. 0.784 MI. Crick, Drain, App. Pave. & Drain. R.	AWARD	BURLINGH CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. CONCORD, VA.	2	\$400,909.10

6
ED

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 22, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
----------	-------------	----------	------------------------	----------------	------------	--------	-----

PRIMARY

4	281-86A	0001-081-705, 14400; 8001-081-705, 14400; 8001-081-707, 14400; 8001-081-708, 14400; 8001-081-709, 14400; CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE FUNDS	Var. Various Locations ROCKBRIDGE CO.	AWARD	CHARLES W. BAISGER & SON CONSTR. CO., INC. LEXINGTON, VA.	7	\$245,402.00
---	---------	---	--	-------	---	---	--------------

28-048-(1119);
28-049-(1116);
28-045-(1114);
28-041-(1129);
28-803-(1162)

0.317 MI. S.M.E. CORROSION INHIBITOR
Grads, Asp. Pave., Overlay & Inlets

6	281-96A	8025-076-115, 1501 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	28 From: 8.103 MI. W. Ruckelshy Rd. (Sta. 782) To: 0.120 MI. E. Ruckelshy Rd. (Sta. 782)	AWARD	FORT MYER CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION WASHINGTON, DC.	7	\$592,437.85
---	---------	---	---	-------	--	---	--------------

FORTNER WILLIAM CO.
6.343 MI. W.M.; Inclusion Cracks,
Drain, Asp. Pave., Riprap, Sight &
Sign.

7	3379	0001-087-7701, 831 MAINTENANCE FUNDS	21 From: 0.22 MI. S. Rte. 600 (Top Paved) Valley Mt. To: 0.48 MI. S. Rte. 610 WHEEL CO. Inlet Chain Link Wire on Run of Rock Cr.	AWARD	SUMMERS-TAYLOR, INC. ELIZABETHTON, TN.	1	\$667,337.90
---	------	---	---	-------	---	---	--------------

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 21, 1998

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
8	0024-03-0073001 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	28	Route 1221 M. R. R. No. 623 (Wampod Rd.) The 0.837 MI. N. Rte. 623 (Wampod Rd.) LIGERON CO. Drain, Pipe, Ditch & Install.	AWARD	THE LANE CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION MIDDLETOWN, CT.	1	\$288,679.00
9	01-50-026-1143001 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	158	6.4 MI. S. Rte. 366 EBL CHESTERFIELD CO. Install 12 inch 20 lb. Cast. Pipe	AWARD	D.L.R. INC. HELLSVILLE, VA.	2	\$86,061.00
10	003-410-1073000 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	33	Int. Rte. 2631 in Wood Field KING WILLIAM CO. Night Time Lane, Inside & Outside Signs & Markings	REJECT	BLAZEMORE CONSTR. CORP. RICHMOND, VA.	1	\$310,872.00
11	008-004-0010001 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	38	Route 1819 M. R. R. No. 1000 The 0.884 MI. S. Int. Rte. No. 146 AMELIA CO. 0.134 MI. Const. Drain, App. Pipe, or Overlay, Reinforcing Wall & Bridge.	REJECT	ALLIED CONSTR. CO., INC. AMHERST, VA.	3	\$292,576.45

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 22, 1996

Job Des.	Project No:	Rec. No:	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
----------	-------------	----------	------------------------	----------------	------------	--------	-----

52 3772	8603-800-108 (2000); 8603-504-162 (2001) CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	1	Industry Dr.	REJECT	ROCK & BAINES CONSTRUCTION CO., INC UNBORNVILLE, VA.	3	\$77,549.08
---------	--	---	--------------	--------	--	---	-------------

PRIMARY

CULPEPER CO.
Contract Right Term Lease

Awarded \$ Primary Projects @ \$20,145,205.20 & Rejected 3 @ \$681,097.85

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 23, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rta. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
1	223-96A 0613-026-204,CS02 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	613	From: 0.315 MI. N. E. Rte. 779 To: Int. Rte. 60 CHESTERFIELD CO. 1.486 MI. Grady, Davis, App. Pave., Signal, Pave. Marks., Drain. of Bldgs. & (S&L)	AWARD	APAC-VIRGINIA, INC. RICHMOND, VA	4	\$4,446,198.46
2	231-96A 8609-084- 131,CS01,081E CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	608	From: 0.80 MI. S. Rte. 623 To: 0.90 MI. E. Rte. 623 SCOTT CO. Br. & Approaches	AWARD	KEN CONSTL. CO., INC. LEBANON, VA.	7	\$394,668.23
3	243-96A 0609-043-079,0501 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	609	From: Int. Rte. 612 To: Int. Rte. 624 HANOVER CO. 1.591 MI. Grady, Davis & App. S.T. Pave.	AWARD	KEY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INCORPORATED CLARKSVILLE, VA.	7	\$467,500.25
4	243-96A 0600-026-148,CS01 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	600	From: 0.889 MI. S. Int. Rte. 514 To: 0.817 MI. N. Rte. 615 WESTMORELAND CO. 0.549 MI. Grady, Davis & App. Pave.	AWARD	KEY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INCORPORATED CLARKSVILLE, VA.	6	\$391,553.50

RECOMMENDATION

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 24, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rtr. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
----------	-------------	----------	------------------------	----------------	------------	--------	-----

SECONDARY

5	245-96A	0113-012-104,CS03 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	712 From: 1.129 KM S. Rte. 632 To: E 2700 EDYS St. 635 R MILBURNVILLE CO. 2.12 KM Gravel, Drain & Asp. Pave.	AWARD	RISHOP & SETTLE CONSTR. CO., INC. ALBION, VA.	4	\$698,372.50
6	246-96A	084-015 21L,CS01,RS02 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	644 From: In. Rte. 671 To: R 2012M. E. Rte. 634 CAMPELL CO. 0.312 MI. Gravel, Drain, Asp. S.T. Pave., Drain of Bldg. & Dr.	AWARD	C. E. WHITE CONSTR. CO., INC. AFFANATTOX, VA.	4	\$784,942.15
7	248-96A	0110-009-104,CS02, 0511,CS03 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	630 From: 0.713 MI. E. Rte. 644 To: S 0209 MI. W. Rte. 631 CALBERT CO. 2.309 MI. Gravel, Drain, Asp. Pave. Asp. Driveway, Paving, Drain, Dr. & Dr.	AWARD	WALKERS CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. AMHERST, VA.	3	\$1,144,319.93
8	254-96A	0411-003-053,RS01, 018A-002-053,RS01 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	641 Rte. 641 - From: Rte. 646 W. To: Rte. 710 Rte. 700 - From: Rte. 640 To: Rte. 641 LEWIS CO. 1.48 MI. Gravel, Drain & Asp. S.T. Pave.	AWARD	PATRICK CONSTRUCTION, INC. ST. PAUL, VA.	6	\$226,003.50

6
6

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 22, 1996

Job Des.	Project No:	Rte. No:	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
9 255-96A	8674-004-799-2602 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	674	Route: 0.25 MI. N. Rte. 19 To: Rte. 677 MUSSELL CO. 1.10 MI. Grady, Davis & Asp. Twn.	AWARD	B. S. JONES AND ASSOCIATES, INC. ABERDEEN, VA.	1	\$199,084.80
10 255-96A	8673-004-728-1954 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	673	From: Rte. 672 To: Rte. 908 SCOTT CO. 1.307 MI. Grady, Davis & Asp. S.T. Twn.	AWARD	PATRICK CONSTRUCTION, INC. ST. PAUL, VA.	1	\$252,791.00
11 257-96A	8654-004-494-3382 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	654	From: 0.43 MI. E. Rte. 23 To: 1.60 MI. E. Rte. 23 SCOTT CO. 1.174 MI. Grady, Davis, Bush & Asp. S.T. Twn.	AWARD	PATRICK CONSTRUCTION, INC. ST. PAUL, VA.	3	\$205,355.50
12 268-96A	8662-004-605-2505 MAINTENANCE FUNDS	663	Davis, Ford Rd. over Occoquan Cr./G.S. MI. W. Rte. 618 FRANCE WILLIAM CO. Dr. Superior, Right-of-Way & Approach Work	AWARD	A & W CONTRACTING CORPORATION LORTON, VA.	4	\$810,414.90

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 22, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
----------	-------------	----------	------------------------	----------------	------------	--------	-----

SECONDARY

13 264-86A 8024-011-200,882,828 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS 634 Rte. 631 over Casey Cr. CLINE M. Rte. AWARD ELK RIVER, INC. PENNINGTON GAP, VA. 1 \$199,348.84

8805-081-1(001) FLOYD CO. Dr. Replacement & Approaches

14 3723 8621-017-303,865 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS 683 Pines Rte. 507 AWARD J & D CONSTR. CO., INC. HILLSVILLE, VA. 3 \$254,517.75
 1.00 MI. South, Drain, Pave. & Inside

CARROLL CO.

1.00 MI. South, Drain, Pave. & Inside

15 3724 8624-020-050,051 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS 634 Pines Rte. 656 AWARD KEY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INCORPORATED CLARKESVILLE, VA. 5 \$251,790.50
 The E. Rte. 4

FLYNNVA CO.

0.20 MI. W. of Van Dusen Hwy. Drain
 South, Ty. 1, No. 31A w/1/2 mi South
 Seagrave, Bl. 3.C. Ty. D, Surf.,
 Gravel, Drain. & Inside.

16 268-86A 8734-041-200,051,052 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS 754 Pines: 0.159 MI. S. of North Fork Cr. REJECT M. C. CONSTRUCTION, INC. SOUTH BOSTON, VA 4 \$392,620.15
 The: 0.211 MI. N. of North Fork Cr.

HALIFAX CO.

0.150 MI. South, Drain, App. RT.
 Pave. & Drain. St.

Revised 15 Secondary Projects # \$10,636,531.63 & Rejected 1 # \$392,620.15

BID CONSULTS

OCTOBER 22, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
1 281-66A	1000-13A-FR-CONS CONSTRUCTION FURNISH	No.	Various Locations CITY OF NORFOLK Adv. Comp. Traffic Signals & Traffic Management System	AWARD	TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES, INC. ALTA MONTE SPRINGS, FL.	3	\$4,545,454.54
2 281-66A	040-945(489)		CURB AND BOULEVARD FROM 1st TO 11th ST. IN TO: 1st High Street Blvd	AWARD	FOUNTAIN CONSTR. CO., INC. SUFFOLK, VA.	3	\$2,400,877.08
3 281-66A	1000-14B-FR-CONS CONSTRUCTION FURNISH		CITY OF FORTSMOUTH & CHESAPEAKE 0.600 MI. W. & R. 100 Includes Gravel, Daily, App. Fees, Lands, Signals, Trns. Mater. & Util.	AWARD	PATRICK CONSTRUCTION, INC. ST. PAUL, VA.	4	\$794,846.15

awarded 3 Urban Projects @ \$7,700,877.75

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 22, 1996

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
1	264-96A	GR40-96B-102,N101 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	Vic. From: Rockledge-Bowman Cl. To: Rockledge-Aurora Cl. STANTON DISTRICT General Safety Project	AWARD	MAKCO, INC. CHARLOTTEVILLE, VA.	2	\$464,872.50
2	269-96A	GR40-96B-102,N102 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	Vic. Various Locations STANTON DISTRICT General Safety Project	AWARD	MAKCO, INC. CHARLOTTEVILLE, VA.	1	\$777,639.25
3	270-96A	GR40-96B-102,N103 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	Vic. Various Locations STANTON DISTRICT General Safety Project	AWARD	MAKCO, INC. CHARLOTTEVILLE, VA.	2	\$774,734.50
4	303A	M.E.Y.-96-789-607 CONSTRUCTION FUNDS	Vic. Various Locations PITTSBURGH, VA. Replaces earlier Award Signs, Etc. & Fountains	AWARD	SOUTHERN SIGNS, INC. ROMANOVA, VA	2	\$184,757.50

MISCELLANEOUS

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 24, 1986

Job Des.	Project No.	Rub. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
5 364	82-085-04 MAINTENANCE FUNDS	Var.	Various Locations	AWARD	ARTHUR CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. HERNDON, VA.	6	\$153,096.00
MISCELLANEOUS							
			ALLINGTON CO. R. John Rapizo				
5 3715	7850-944-181-2011; 1050-044-104-2012; 185C-36-785-065 CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE FUNDS	Var.	Various Locations	AWARD	BARBOUR COMPANY LEBANON, OH.	3	\$253,489.67
			VARIOUS Small Baled Pans, Mats. & Less Replacement				

Awarded 6 Miscellaneous Projects @ \$2,614,149.42

BID RESULTS

SEPTEMBER 10, 1996

CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG

Job Des.	Project No.	Rte. No.	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of Bids	Bid
1	BM96-11-918.C301		Rehabilitation of Railroad Station	AWARD	JOHN D. CLAYBORNE, INC. FALLS CHURCH, VA	3	\$597,000.00

MISCELLANEOUS

CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG

TEA-9111(109)

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 1A, 1996

BY TOWN OF CLIFTON

Job Desc.	Project No:	Alt. No:	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
	EM94-994-V23125W1	605	Mish Bent	AWARD	MDCI CLIFTON, VA		\$23,770.01

MISCELLANEOUS

TOWN OF CLIFTON
Production and Bicycle Plans

TEA-5194(102)

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 16, 1996

BY CITY OF FAIRFAX

Job Des.	Project No:	Rte. No:	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
	1066-111-007,CS1	123	From: auxiliary drive To: University Drive	AWARD	PAUL J. MENOLA ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC. FAIRFAX, VA	1	\$136,146.00

MISCELLANEOUS

CITY OF FAIRFAX
Roadway Lighting

TEL-4401912

BID RESULTS

OCTOBER 3, 1996

BY TOWN OF MARION

Job Des.	Project No:	Rfd. No:	Location and Work Type	RECOMMENDATION	Contractor	No. of	Bid
	0496-115-MELISSA, 2004		Bridge over Holly Creek on Melissa Drive	AWARD	KEN CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. LEBANON, VA	2	\$128,098.00

URBAN

TOWN OF MARION
Replace Existing Bridge on Melissa
Drive over Holly Creek

TEA-6106(10)

11-21-96

Item 7:

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services for the inventory and in-depth structural inspection of the estimated 2700 statewide traffic structures, it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division, Traffic Engineering Division and Materials Division staffs; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, a firm proposal has been received from Collins Engineers, Inc. to perform the engineering services; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and just compensation has been established for these services and are set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes execution of the Agreement with the firm of Collins Engineers, Inc. which establishes a compensation of \$5,560,474.00 for services and expenses, plus a net fee of \$108,093.00, making the maximum total compensation not to exceed \$5,668,567.00.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services in connection with the inspection of Highway Structures and Bridges for projects located in Region I consisting of Bristol, Lynchburg and Salem Districts, it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division staff; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, an Agreement for Region I is being entered into with Schwartz and Associates, Inc. to perform the engineering services for a three year period; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and hourly rates by classification, overhead rates, direct reimbursable expenses and profit have been established for these services and are set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board authorizes the execution of an Agreement with the firm of Schwartz & Associates, Inc. which establishes a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$2,000,000.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services in connection with the Inspection of Highway Structures and Bridges for projects located in Region II consisting of Richmond, Fredericksburg and Suffolk Districts, it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, an Agreement for Region II is being entered into with Clark Nexsen to perform the engineering services for a three year period; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and hourly rates by classification, overhead rates, direct reimbursable expenses and profit have been established for these services and are set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

11-21-96

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board authorizes the execution of an Agreement with the firm of Clark Nexsen which establishes a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$2,000,000.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services in connection with the preparation of Maintenance and Repair Design Plans for Highway Structures and Bridges located in Region I consisting of Bristol, Lynchburg and Salem Districts, it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, an Agreement for Region I is being entered into with Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc. to perform the engineering services for a two year period; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and hourly rates by classification, overhead rates, direct reimbursable expenses and profit have been established for these services and are set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of an Agreement with the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc. which establishes a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$3,000,000.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services in connection with the preparation of Maintenance and Repair Design Plans for Highway Structures and Bridges located in Region II consisting of Richmond, Fredericksburg and Suffolk Districts, it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, an Agreement for Region II is being entered into with SITE - Blauvelt Engineers to perform the engineering services for a two year period; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and hourly rates by classification, overhead rates, direct reimbursable expenses and profit have been established for these services and are set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of an Agreement with the firm of SITE - Blauvelt Engineers which establishes a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$3,000,000.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services in connection with the preparation of Maintenance and Repair Design Plans for Highway Structures and Bridges located in Region III consisting of Culpeper, Staunton and Northern Virginia Districts, it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division staff; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department Policy and State Procurement procedures an Agreement for Region III is being entered into with Wilbur Smith Associates to perform the engineering services for a two year period; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and hourly rates by classification, overhead rates, direct reimbursable expenses and profit have been established for these services and are set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of an Agreement with the firm of Wilbur Smith Associates which establishes a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$3,000,000.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for providing schedule/constructability studies in Area 1 consisting of Richmond, Fredericksburg, Culpeper, and Northern Virginia Districts, for a period of three (3) years, it is necessary to supplement its staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, a firm proposal has been received from Alpha Corporation, for said services; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and just compensation has been established for these services and is set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

11-21-96

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of the Agreement with the firm of Alpha Corporation for services for three (3) years, with a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$1,000,000.00.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for providing schedule/constructability studies in Area 2 consisting of Bristol, Salem, Lynchburg, Suffolk and Staunton Districts for a period of three (3) years, it is necessary to supplement its staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, a firm proposal has been received from McDonough Bolyard Peck, for said services; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and just compensation has been established for these services and is set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of the Agreement with the firm of McDonough Bolyard Peck for services for three (3) years, with a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$1,000,000.00.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for all types of surveying, including photogrammetry and aerial photography, statewide, it is necessary to supplement its staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, a firm proposal has been received from Bangtson, DeBell & Elkin, Ltd., for said services; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and just compensation has been established for these services and is set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of the Agreement with the firm of Bangtson, DeBell & Elkin, Ltd., which establishes a maximum total compensation not to exceed \$5,000,000.00.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, the Department currently has a Memorandum of Agreement with the firm of Patton, Harris, Rust & Associates, P.C., and it has been determined that a change in the scope of services is necessary to perform redesign of West Norfolk Road and Village Street and to develop conceptual sequence of construction plans for one way and two way traffic for Cedar Lane, for Projects U000-124-V05, PE-101; U000-131-V13, PE-101; U000-124-V04, PE-101, located in the cities of Portsmouth and Chesapeake; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, after careful review of the additional services required, a firm proposal has been received and just compensation for these additional services has been established and is outlined in this Supplemental Agreement No. 3.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of this Supplemental Agreement and it shall become a part of the Original Agreement, and previous Supplemental Agreements, which currently has a maximum compensation of \$1,637,490.00.

This Supplemental Agreement No. 3 is in the amount of \$125,846.00 for services and expenses, plus a net fee of \$10,503.00, making the total for this Supplement \$136,349.00. The total maximum compensation of the Agreement, including all supplements, is now \$1,773,839.00.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, the Department currently has a Memorandum of Agreement with the firm of Frederic R. Harris, Inc., and it has been determined that a change in the scope of services is necessary because of additional work by the way of change order (including a small piece of a secondary improvement, over 4 miles of sidewalk and traffic signal pre-emption devices) thus requiring this supplement for Project 6029-002-F19,C-502, located in Albemarle County; and

WHEREAS, after careful review of the additional services required, a firm proposal has been received and just compensation for these additional services has been established and is outlined in this Supplemental Agreement No. 1.

11-21-96

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of this Supplemental Agreement and it shall become a part of the Original Agreement, which currently has a maximum compensation of \$939,196.61.

This Supplemental Agreement No. 1 is in the amount of \$271,975.48 for services and expenses, plus a net fee of \$1,548.00, making the total for this Supplement \$273,523.48. The total maximum compensation of the Agreement, including all supplements, is now \$1,212,720.09.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for providing construction inspection services for Projects 0058-038-E13, C-502, B-613 and 0094-098-V04, C-501; in the Bristol District, it is necessary to supplement its staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, a firm proposal has been received from KCI Technologies, Inc., for said services; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and just compensation has been established for these services and is set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorize the execution of the Agreement with the firm of KCI Technologies, Inc., which establishes a compensation of \$1,697,329.16 for services and expenses, plus a net fee of \$110,784.99, making the maximum total compensation not to exceed \$1,808,114.15.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, the Department currently has a Memorandum of Agreement with the firm of Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., and it has been determined that a change in the scope of services is necessary because of plan revisions that affected the contractor's critical path schedule which adversely affected the normal production for this project, thus requiring this supplement, for Project 0066-076-F06,C-501,B-622, B-623 and B-624; and

WHEREAS, after careful review of the additional services required, a firm proposal has been received and just compensation for these additional services has been established and is outlined in this Supplemental Agreement No. 1.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of this Supplemental Agreement and it shall become a part of the Original Agreement, which currently has a maximum compensation of \$1,720,626.64.

This Supplemental Agreement No. 1 is in the amount of \$297,176.80 for services and expenses, plus a net fee of \$27,973.22, making the total for this Supplement \$325,150.02. The total maximum compensation of the Agreement, including all supplements, is now \$2,045,776.66.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, the Department currently has a Memorandum of Agreement with the firm of Dewberry & Davis, and it has been determined that a change in the scope of services is necessary to provide design services for the replacement of existing substructure and piers for the existing EBL and WBL I-66 bridges over Compton Road, revisions to Monument Drive HOV Ramp typical section and incorporation of the TMS, design modifications to Stringfellow Road, additional interchange lighting design, preparation of exhibits for Environmental Assessment and 6(F) documents, and revisions to the pavement design due to subsurface drainage conditions for Projects 0066-076-F06, PE-101; 0066-029-F19, PE-101; 0066-029-F19, PE-102; 0066-029-F20, PE-101 and 0066-029-F22, PE-101; and

WHEREAS, after careful review of the additional services required, a firm proposal has been received and just compensation for these additional services has been established and is outlined in this Supplemental Agreement No. 7.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of this Supplemental Agreement and it shall become a part of the Original Agreement and Supplemental Agreements No.'s 1,2,3,4, 5 and 6, which currently have a maximum compensation of \$6,810,403.00.

This Supplemental Agreement No. 7 is in the amount of \$148,963.00 for services and expenses, plus a net fee of \$14,838.00, making the total for this Supplement \$163,801.00. The total maximum compensation of the Agreement, including all supplements, is now \$6,974,204.00.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services in connection with the design of bridges and related subsurface explorations for Project 6460-154-P04, PE101, B604, B605, B606, B607, B608, B611, B609, B610, B612, B613, B614, B615 Bridges at Route 460/I-81 Interchanges located in the Town of Christiansburg it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division and Materials Division staffs; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, a firm proposal has been received from David Volkert and Associates, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and just compensation has been established for these services and is set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board authorizes the execution of the Agreement with the firm of David Volkert and Associates, Inc. which establishes compensation of \$1,452,648 for services, expenses and contingency, plus a net fee of \$70,392, making the maximum total compensation not to exceed \$1,523,040.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger,
that

WHEREAS, in accordance with its needs and schedules for implementing its program objectives, the Department has determined that in order to perform the necessary activities to meet those objectives for engineering services on Projects 0210-005-F02,B601; 6029-015-F15,B612,B623; 6029-118-F07,B622; and 6029-118-F078,B613,B621 (Madison Heights Bypass) located in Lynchburg District, Amherst and Campbell Counties and the City of Lynchburg, it is necessary to supplement its Structure and Bridge Division staff; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Department policy and State procurement procedures, a firm proposal has been received from Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall to perform the engineering services; and

WHEREAS, careful review and consideration has been made of the scope of work and services required and just compensation has been established for these services and are set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the execution of the Agreement with the firm of Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall which establishes a compensation of \$1,422,908 for services and expenses plus a net fee of \$108,132 making the maximum total compensation not to exceed \$1,531,040.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Item 8:

Moved by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Grubb, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia and policies of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, a Combined Location and Design Public Hearing was held in the Dryden Primary School, on Route 726 just north of Route 58 Alternate, Dryden, on August 1, 1996, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., for the purpose of considering the proposed location and major design features of Route 58 from 0.37 mile (0.59 kilometer) east of Route 752 (East of Dryden) to 0.95 mile (1.53 kilometer) east of Route 620 (Lonesome Pine Road) at Olinger in Lee County, State Project 6058-052-E28, PE-101, RW-201, C-501; and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given in advance, and all those present were given a full opportunity to express their opinions and recommendations for or against the proposed project as presented, and their statements being duly recorded; and

WHEREAS, the economic, social, and environmental effects of the proposed project have been examined and given proper consideration, and this evidence, along with all other, has been carefully reviewed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the location and major design features of this project be approved in accordance with the plan as proposed and presented at the said Location and Design Public Hearing by the Department's Engineers.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Grubb, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia and policies of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, a Combined Location and Design Public Hearing was held in the Jonesville Middle School, located on Route 58, Jonesville, on July 11, 1996, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., for the purpose of considering the proposed location and major design features of Route 70, from 1.6 miles south of Route 58 to Route 58 in Lee County, State Project 0070-052-108, PE-101, RW-202, M-502; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, proper notice was given in advance, and all those present were given a full opportunity to express their opinions and recommendations for or against the proposed project as presented, and their statements being duly recorded; and

WHEREAS, the economic, social, and environmental effects of the proposed project have been examined and given proper consideration, and this evidence, along with all other, has been carefully reviewed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the location and major design features of this project be approved in accordance with the plan as proposed and presented at the said Location and Design Public Hearing by the Department's Engineers.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Grubb, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia and policies of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, a Combined Location and Design Public Hearing was held in the Virginia Department of Transportation, Bowling Green Residency, in Bowling Green, Virginia, on Wednesday, July 31, 1996, between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. for the purpose of considering the proposed location and major design features of Route 609, Macedonia Road, from the intersection of Route 606 (Stonewall Jackson Road) to 1.302 miles (2.095 km) north intersection Route 606, in Caroline County, State Project 0609-016-188,C-501; and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given in advance, and all those present were given a full opportunity to express their opinions and recommendations for or against the proposed project as presented, and their statements being duly recorded; and

WHEREAS, the economic, social, and environmental effects of the proposed project have been examined and given proper consideration, and this evidence, along with all other, has been carefully reviewed.

11-21-96

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the location and major design features of this project be approved in accordance with the plan as proposed and presented at the said Location and Design Public Hearing by the Department's Engineers, with modification in the final design phase to reduce the roadway design from 3.3 meter (11 foot) to 3.0 meter (10 foot) with the 1.5 meter (5-foot) shoulder, but not paving the 0.3 meter (1-foot) wedge.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Grubb, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia and policies of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, a Combined Location and Design Public Hearing was held in the Powell Valley High School, 1 Avenue of Champions, Big Stone Gap, on July 25, 1996, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., for the purpose of considering the proposed location and major design features of Route 610, from 0.03 mile (0.05 kilometer) west of Route 612 to 0.12 mile (0.19 kilometer) west of Route 697 in Wise County, State Project 0610-097-194,M-503, Federal Project STP-610-1(); and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given in advance, and all those present were given a full opportunity to express their opinions and recommendations for or against the proposed project as presented, and their statements being duly recorded; and

WHEREAS, the economic, social, and environmental effects of the proposed project have been examined and given proper consideration, and this evidence, along with all other, has been carefully reviewed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the location and major design features of this project be approved in accordance with the plan as proposed and presented at the said Location and Design Public Hearing by the Department's Engineers.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Rich, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia and policies of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, a Combined Location and Design Public Hearing was held in the Lake Jackson Volunteer Fire Co. #7, in the City of Manassas, VA on Monday, May 6, 1996 between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. for the purpose of considering the proposed location and major design features of Liberia Avenue Extension, Route 776 from Prince William Parkway (Route 3000), to Dumfries Road (Route 234), in the City of Manassas and Prince William County, State Project 0776-076-298, C-501,D-642; Federal Project STP-776-9 (001) and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given in advance, and all those present were given a full opportunity to express their opinions and recommendations for or against the proposed project as presented, and their statements being duly recorded; and

WHEREAS, the economic, social, and environmental effects of the proposed project have been examined and given proper consideration, and this evidence, along with all other, has been carefully reviewed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the location and major design features of this project be approved in accordance with the plan as proposed and presented at the said Location and Design Public Hearing by the Department's Engineers, with modification in the final design phase to incorporate the traffic signal at Lake Jackson Drive, designated crossover locations as approved by the Department and address the concerns raised by the Environmental Protection Agency Program Coordinator to the Federal Highway Administration.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Item 9:

Moved by Mr. Porter, seconded by Mr. Grubb, that

WHEREAS, in response to a formal request by the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors that Route 734 (Snickersville Turnpike) between Route 7 (Harry Byrd Highway) and Route 760 (Clayton Hall Road) be considered for restriction of through truck traffic pursuant to the provisions of Section 46.2-809 of the Code of Virginia, this matter has been carefully reviewed; and

WHEREAS, the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors has conducted a public hearing on this restriction; and

WHEREAS, the route in question traverses a predominantly non-commercial area; and

WHEREAS, a restriction on the proposed route would not present any undue hardship; and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given by posting signs and publishing notices advising the public of the proposed restriction and requesting written comments; and

WHEREAS, careful consideration has been given to the recommendations received, the available alternate routes and the past practices of the Department.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Route 734 (Snickersville Turnpike) between Route 7 (Harry Byrd Highway) and Route 760 (Clayton Hall Road) be restricted to through truck traffic in accordance with Section 46.2-809 of the Code of Virginia.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Moved by Mr. Porter, seconded by Mr. Grubb, that

WHEREAS, in response to a formal request by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors that Route 6390 (Bennington Woods Drive) between Route 606 (Baron Cameron Avenue) and Route 602 (Reston Avenue) be considered for restriction of through truck traffic pursuant to the provisions of Section 46.2-809 of the Code of Virginia, this matter has been carefully reviewed; and

WHEREAS, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors has conducted a public hearing on this restriction; and

WHEREAS, the route in question traverses a predominantly non-commercial area; and

WHEREAS, a restriction on the proposed route would not present any undue hardship; and

WHEREAS, proper notice was given by posting signs and publishing notices advising the public of the proposed restriction and requesting written comments; and

WHEREAS, careful consideration has been given to the recommendations received, the available alternate routes and the past practices of the Department.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Route 6390 (Bennington Woods Drive) between Route 606 (Baron Cameron Avenue) and Route 602 (Reston Avenue) be restricted to through truck traffic in accordance with Section 46.2-809 of the Code of Virginia.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Item 10:

Moved by Mr. Newcomb, seconded by Mr. White, that

WHEREAS, Section 33.1-221 of the Code of Virginia provides a fund to "...be expended by the Board for constructing, reconstructing, maintaining or improving access roads within counties, cities, and towns to industrial sites on which manufacturing, processing or other establishments will be built under firm contract or are already constructed and to publicly owned airports;" and

WHEREAS, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors has, by appropriate resolution, requested Industrial Access Funds to serve the Gloucester Business Park, located in Gloucester County, and said access is estimated to cost \$1,100,000; and

WHEREAS, it appears that this request falls within the intent of Section 33.1-221 and complies with the provisions of the Commonwealth Transportation Board's policy on industrial access.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that \$450,000 (\$300,000 unmatched and \$150,000 matched) of the 1996-97 Fiscal Year Industrial, Airport and Rail Access Fund be allocated to provide adequate access to the Gloucester Business Park, located in Gloucester County, Project 0780-036-148, C501, contingent upon:

1. all necessary right of way, environmental assessments, and utility adjustments being provided at no cost to the Commonwealth;
2. the execution of an appropriate contractual agreement between the County of Gloucester (County) and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), to provide for the design, administration, construction, and maintenance of this project;
3. the payment of all ineligible project costs, and of any eligible project costs in excess of this allocation, from sources other than those administered by VDOT;

11-21-96

4. the provision of an appropriate bond or other acceptable surety device by the County to VDOT, not to expire before December 21, 1999. Such surety device shall provide for reimbursement to VDOT of any expenses incurred by the Industrial, Airport and Rail Access Fund for this project's construction not justified by the eligible capital outlay of industries served by the project. If, by November 21, 1999, qualified industry has not expended at least \$6,000,000 of eligible capital outlay on parcels served exclusively by this project, then an amount equal to 10% of up to \$3,000,000 and 5% of between \$3,000,000 and \$6,000,000 of eligible capital outlay will be credited toward the project's allocation. This surety may be released at an earlier date if qualified industry, with an expenditure of at least \$6,000,000 in eligible capital outlay, is constructed on an eligible parcel;

5. provision by the County of the required \$150,000 in matching funds; and

6. VDOT determining eligible capital outlay in accordance with current policy and procedure.

Motion carried.

Item 11:

Moved by Mr. Newcomb, seconded by Mr. Rich, that

WHEREAS, Section 33.1-221.1:1 of the Code of Virginia declares it to be in the public interest that access railroad tracks and facilities be constructed to certain industrial or commercial sites; and

WHEREAS, the Newport News City Council has, by resolution, requested \$96,500 in Industrial Access Railroad Track funds for the Newport News Industrial Development Authority; and

WHEREAS, it appears that this request falls within the intent of Section 33.1-221.1:1 and is in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Transportation Board's policy on the use of Industrial Access Railroad Track funds; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, in accordance with the funding formula established by said policy, funding may be allocated to this project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 912, Item 505 A., of the 1996 Acts of the General Assembly, funding is provided for Industrial, Airport, and Rail Access projects; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that this project is for the common good of a region of the Commonwealth and serves a public purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board hereby approves that \$96,500 of the Industrial, Airport, and Rail Access Fund be provided to construct new track to serve the Oakland Industrial Park located in the City of Newport News contingent upon:

1. All necessary right of way and utility adjustments being provided at no cost to the Commonwealth.
2. All costs above \$96,500, which is allocated herein as an industrial rail access grant, being borne by the Newport News Industrial Development Authority.
3. Execution of an agreement acceptable to the Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

Motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Newcomb, seconded by Mr. Rich, that

WHEREAS, Section 33.1-221.1:1 of the Code of Virginia declares it to be in the public interest that access railroad tracks and facilities be constructed to certain industrial or commercial sites; and

WHEREAS, the Washington County Board of Supervisors has, by resolution, requested \$150,000 in Industrial Access Railroad Track funds for Piedmont Rebar; and

WHEREAS, it appears that this request falls within the intent of Section 33.1-221.1:1 and is in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Transportation Board's policy on the use of Industrial Access Railroad Track funds; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, in accordance with the funding formula established by said policy, funding may be allocated to this project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 912, Item 505 A., of the 1996 Acts of the General Assembly, funding is provided for Industrial, Airport, and Rail Access projects; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that this project is for the common good of a region of the Commonwealth and serves a public purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board hereby approves that \$150,000 of the Industrial, Airport, and Rail Access Fund be provided to construct new track to serve Piedmont Rebar located in Washington County contingent upon:

1. All necessary right of way and utility adjustments being provided at no cost to the Commonwealth.
2. All costs above \$150,000, which is allocated herein as an industrial rail access grant, being borne by Piedmont Rebar.
3. Execution of an agreement acceptable to the Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

Motion carried.

Item 12:

Moved by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mr. Newcomb, that

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth Transportation Board considers railways and rail corridors as an important element of the statewide transportation system; and

WHEREAS, three Class III railroads, the Buckingham Branch Railroad Company, the Shenandoah Valley Railroad Company and the Winchester and Western Railroad Company, suffered severe damages due to flooding caused by Hurricane Fran in September of 1996; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, the Buckingham Branch Railroad Company incurred \$67,225, the Shenandoah Valley Railroad Company incurred \$106,848, and the Winchester and Western Railroad Company incurred \$242,000 in damages to their railroads caused by the devastation of the recent flood and have requested consideration of funding to ensure the continuation of rail service to the localities; and

WHEREAS, the railroads were not declared eligible for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) assistance; and

WHEREAS, certain funds established by Item 517 of Chapter 912 of the 1996 Acts of the General Assembly remain to be allocated and this request is in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Transportation Board's policy and procedures for the use of such funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board believing that this expenditure of funds is for the common good of a region of the Commonwealth and serves a public purpose hereby approves that \$32,000 for the Buckingham Branch Railroad Company, \$52,000 for the Shenandoah Valley Railroad Company, and \$116,000 for the Winchester and Western Railroad Company for a total of \$200,000 of the Rail Development Programs Fund be provided to assist the parties for the emergency repairs which had to be undertaken contingent upon the execution of an agreement acceptable to the Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

Motion carried.

Item 13:

Moved by Mr. Cogbill, seconded by Mr. Newcomb, that

WHEREAS, Chapter 912, Item 516 of the Acts of the 1996 General Assembly provides state financial assistance for public transportation for fiscal year 1997 and this Chapter authorizes the Commonwealth Transportation Board to award grants for transportation demand management under a Transportation Efficiency Improvement Fund (TEIF); and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) has prepared a program of projects of fiscal year 1997 which is contained in the approved Fiscal Year 1996-97 Commonwealth Transportation Board Six Year Improvement Program as the Public Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, the TEIF portion of the fiscal year 1997 program of projects contains an unobligated balance of \$129,419; and

WHEREAS, an additional request for assistance grants under the TEIF program has been received from an applicant eligible to receive the funds and this request has been reviewed by DRPT and found to be reasonable and appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Board recognizes that these projects are appropriate for the efficient movement of people and, therefore, for the common good of the Commonwealth.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that DRPT is authorized to approve a state TEIF grant to the recipient in the amount shown below.

TEIF Grant Recipient
City of Richmond

Project Description
Downtown Circular Trolley

Grant Amount
\$45,000

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Item 14:

Moved by Mr. Newcomb, seconded by Mr. Rich, that

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia desire to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to provide Rail Safety Oversight for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's Rail Fixed Guideway System which operates between metropolitan areas in the three designated jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the oversight responsibility will be a continuing process to ensure that safety and security practices are incorporated and followed as required by 49 CFR Part 659 under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA); and

WHEREAS, no federal funding for the oversight duties is presently being provided and therefore the jurisdictions are obligated to provide the funding necessary to perform the required responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, the funding for Virginia's share has been included in the FY 96/97 routine operations budget of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires that the Rail Safety Oversight requirements be accomplished to comply with 49 CFR Part 659 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Commonwealth Transportation Board authorizes the Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the designated representatives of the above referenced jurisdictions to undertake the said Rail Safety Oversight responsibilities.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Item 15:

Moved by Mr. Rich, seconded by Mr. Neale, that

WHEREAS, in a resolution dated December 12, 1992, the Commonwealth Transportation Board authorized the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) to execute a four-year contract with Siddall, Matus and Coughter, Inc., for services necessary to support the Northern Virginia HOV/Ridesharing marketing program and the cost was not to exceed \$3,000,000; and

WHEREAS, the consultant was instructed by DRPT to undertake additional tasks closely related to the contract scope of work but outside of the original work plan and budget in support of I-66 HOV marketing and Guaranteed Ride Home program research and development; and

WHEREAS, certain critical elements of the original project work plan have been unavoidably delayed by circumstances outside of the control of DRPT or the consultant and these elements will be ready for implementation in January, 1997; and

WHEREAS, the inclusion of the additional tasks and the delays to the original project work plan have necessitated exceeding the four-year time limit and \$3,000,000 authorization limit of the original contract; and

WHEREAS, funding is available for these additional tasks.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Commonwealth Transportation Board authorizes the Department of Rail and Public Transportation to extend the Siddall, Matus and Coughter, Inc., consultant contract through December, 1997 and to expend up to \$3,750,000 on the combined tasks for the purpose of assisting in the planning, budgeting and marketing of HOV/Ridesharing systems in Northern Virginia.

Motion carried.

11-21-96

Item 16:

Moved by Mr. Lee, seconded by Mr. Rich, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with the statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia and policies of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, a Location Public Hearing was held on January 25, 1994 for the purpose of considering the proposed location features of the I-95/395/495 Interchange Improvement in Fairfax County, State Project 0095-029-F20, PE-101, C-501; Federal Project IR-95-2 (354)174; and

WHEREAS, the location of this project was approved on June 23, 1994, by the Commonwealth Transportation Board in accordance with the plan as proposed and presented as Alternative 12; and

WHEREAS, the Board stipulated in part that the Virginia Department of Transportation "... pursue access approval for Single Occupancy Vehicles between I-95 and the Franconia-Springfield Parkway"; and

WHEREAS, an Interchange Justification Report examining Single Occupancy Vehicle access has been prepared and a determination made that this connection would provide a 5% reduction in traffic on Old Keene Mill Road in the A.M. and a 10% reduction in traffic on Old Keene Mill Road in the P.M., at a cost of approximately 61 million dollars.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the reconstruction of the I-95/395/495 interchange be designed and constructed to not preclude the future construction of the Single Occupancy Vehicle access between I-95 southbound to the Franconia-Springfield Parkway westbound and the Franconia-Springfield Parkway eastbound to I-95 northbound at a currently estimated cost of approximately 21 million dollars.

Motion carried; Mr. Newcomb voted no.

11-21-96

Item 17:

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Cogbill, that

WHEREAS, the State Noise Abatement Policy was adopted by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, effective January 1, 1989; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of policy was to establish criteria for providing noise protection in conjunction with proposed highway projects in Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the policy has been applied statewide for more than seven years and has aided in the construction of more than 100 sound barriers; and

WHEREAS, the policy has been a source of considerable experience and valuable feedback from citizens and elected officials; and

WHEREAS, on the strength of this experience and feedback, the Commonwealth Transportation Board decided to evaluate the policy and determine whether changes are warranted; and

WHEREAS, the evaluation has indicated the need for revisions to the policy, and proposed changes have been incorporated in a revised policy; and

WHEREAS, careful consideration has been given to the proposed changes to the policy.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the revised State Noise Abatement Policy be approved by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, and that such policy be effective on January 1, 1997.

Motion carried.

INTRODUCTION

The State Noise Abatement Policy was adopted by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), effective January 1, 1989. The purpose of the policy was to establish criteria for providing noise protection in conjunction with proposed highway projects in Virginia. The policy has been applied statewide for nearly eight years and has aided in the construction or construction approval of more than 100 sound barriers. It has been a source of considerable experience and valuable feedback from citizens and elected officials. On the strength of this experience and feedback, the CTB decided to evaluate the policy and determine whether changes are warranted.

The evaluation indicated the need for revisions to the policy, and as a result, a number of changes were made and incorporated in a revised policy. The revised State Noise Abatement Policy was approved by the Commonwealth Transportation Board on November 21, 1996 and will become effective on January 1, 1997.

The major source of information utilized in the evaluation was a survey of 15 state DOTs. The states surveyed were Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia. This group includes states in this FHWA region, neighboring states, and states along the Atlantic Seaboard.

The evaluation was performed by VDOT's Environmental Division with assistance from the Transportation Research Council as well as the Transportation Planning, Policy Analysis, and Urban divisions.

CHANGES TO THE STATE NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY

1. Change format to make the policy more user friendly.
2. Add a section on Type II (Retrofit) defining Type II noise abatement and stating specifically that VDOT does not participate in Retrofit noise abatement. **page 1**
*This change is actually only a clarification, since VDOT has never participated in Type II noise abatement.
3. Revise one definition of noise impact reflecting a FHWA mandate. Change from "equal or exceed the NAC" to "approach (reach one decibel less than) or exceed the NAC". **page 2**
*This change has been in affect since December 1993.
4. Change cost-effectiveness ceiling from \$20,000 per protected receptor to \$30,000 per protected residential property. The proposed change results from a survey of 15 states in the eastern part of the country. Only one of the states has a lower ceiling than VDOT, and the average is \$32,000. VDOT's ceiling has not changed since 1987. **page 2**
*The new ceiling will apply to any project for which the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (P,S&E) assembly has not been submitted to the FHWA by January 1, 1997.
5. Add procedure for making cost-effectiveness determination for noise abatement for non-residential properties. **page 2**
*This procedure is currently in use but is not spelled out in the existing policy.
6. Add third party funding element, including the cut-off date for receipt by VDOT of third party share of cost (prior to submittal of P,S&E assembly). **page 3**
*This policy element is already in effect but is not addressed specifically in the existing policy.

**STATE NOISE
ABATEMENT POLICY**

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**Approved November 21, 1996
Effective January 1, 1997**

AUTHORIZATION

**The state noise abatement policy is adopted pursuant to the authority of
Section 33.1-12 of the Code of Virginia.**

STATE NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY

It is the policy of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to employ the following criteria and procedures in determining the need for and the reasonableness and feasibility of noise abatement measures along Virginia's highways. The U. S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 772 (23 CFR 772) will be the guiding document for the analysis and abatement of highway traffic noise .

TYPE I PROJECTS

A Type I project involves the construction of a highway on new location or the physical alteration of an existing highway which significantly changes the horizontal or vertical alignment or increases the number of through traffic lanes. When the abatement criteria contained in this policy are satisfied in conjunction with a Type I project, noise abatement must be provided.

TYPE II PROJECTS (RETROFIT)

A Type II or retrofit project involves the construction of noise abatement along an existing highway when not in conjunction with an improvement for that highway. VDOT does not participate in Type II or retrofit noise abatement.

NOISE IMPACTS

A. Noise impacts occur when the projected highway noise levels:

- 1. Approach (reach one decibel less than) or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) contained in 23 CFR 772, or**
- 2. Exceed existing noise levels by a substantial amount (10 decibels or more).**

B. Noise impacts beyond 1000 feet (305 meters) from the roadway will not be considered in determining the need for noise abatement.

ABATEMENT CRITERIA

- A. A noise abatement measure will be considered cost effective if the cost of the measure per protected residential property does not exceed \$30,000. Each residential (dwelling) unit will be considered as a single residential property.**
- B. The cost-effectiveness determination for non-residential properties will be handled on a case by case basis and will include, in addition to the abatement cost, the type and duration of the activity taking place, the size of the affected area, the severity of the impact, and the amount of noise reduction to be provided.**

- C. To be protected, a property must be impacted and receive a minimum of 5 decibels of noise reduction.
- D. Extenuating circumstances will be considered on a case by case basis.

THIRD PARTY FUNDING

- A. When the cost of a noise abatement measure exceeds VDOT's cost-effectiveness ceiling but the measure otherwise satisfies the criteria contained in this policy, the measure can still be constructed, provided
 - 1. A third party funds the amount above the cost ceiling and,
 - 2. VDOT receives the third party share prior to the date of submittal of the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (P,S&E).
- B. If a third party requests the use of VDOT right of way for the construction of a noise abatement measure deemed unnecessary by VDOT, the request can be granted, provided:
 - 1. The third party assumes 100% of the abatement cost including, but not limited to, preliminary engineering, construction, and maintenance and,
 - 2. VDOT's material, design, and construction specifications are met.

STATE FUNDED NOISE ABATEMENT

For state funded projects that meet the FHWA Type I project definition, VDOT will consider and, if reasonable and feasible, construct and maintain noise abatement measures, provided the local jurisdiction through which the project traverses:

1. Agrees to assume 50% of the abatement cost and,
2. Has an ordinance requiring developers to include noise abatement in their plans for residential and other noise sensitive developments adjacent to existing highways and future highway alignments previously adopted by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

The abatement measures constructed by developers will ensure compliance with the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria, where these criteria can be reasonably achieved, but will at the minimum provide 5 decibels of noise reduction for each property to be protected. The abatement measure can be located in total or partially on VDOT right of way, provided:

- a. The developer complies with VDOT's design, construction, and materials specifications and,
- b. The local jurisdiction is responsible for maintaining the abatement measure.

UNDEVELOPED LAND

In assessing the noise impacts and evaluating noise abatement measures associated with a highway project, undeveloped lands will be treated as developed lands, if and only if a proposed land use development plan has been approved by the local jurisdiction prior to the date of approval of the project alignment by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The final decision concerning noise abatement for a proposed development will be conditioned on two points:

- 1. The noise barrier will not be constructed until the portion of the development to be protected by the barrier is completed to the satisfaction of VDOT, and**
- 2. When there is a substantial time lapse between the final decision and the date the development is completed, the noise barrier analysis will be updated and the decision will be reconsidered.**

DECISION AUTHORITY

- A. For federal aid projects, the joint FHWA-VDOT Noise Abatement Committee will have the responsibility for assembling all relevant information and developing noise abatement related recommendations. On non-federal aid projects, the Committee's function will be carried out by its VDOT members.**
- B. The Chief Engineer, on behalf of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, will make the final determination on all noise abatement related issues.**

11-21-96

Item 18:

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mrs. Lionberger, that

WHEREAS, in accordance with §33.1-12 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, the Commonwealth Transportation Board is responsible for establishing policies concerning all aspects of the Systems of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the State Highway and Transportation Commission, predecessor to the Commonwealth Transportation Board, has previously adopted General Rules and Regulations for said System of State Highways and Section 2 of said Rules and Regulations provide that "No work of any nature shall be performed on any real property under the ownership, control or jurisdiction of the Commission, including but not limited to the right of way of any highway in the system of State Highways until written permission is first obtained from the Commissioner. Written permission, under this section, is granted by way of a permit except that the letting of a contract by and between the Department and any other party grants to that party automatically the permission referred to in this section for the area under contract, unless otherwise stated in the contract. The Land Use Permit Manual shall set forth specific requirements of such permits"; and

WHEREAS, by resolution dated August 11, 1983, the State Highway and Transportation Commission, under authority granted in §33.1-12(3) "Traffic Regulations" adopted the January 1983 revision of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation's Land Use Permit Manual, which included its policy on the accommodation of utilities on certain highway rights of way; and

WHEREAS, the enactment of the Telecommunication Act of 1996; other changes in the utility industry, such as of wireless technology and the development and deployment of VDOT's Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) devices has prompted a review of said manual and policy by the Department; and

11-21-96

WHEREAS, the Department has determined that some changes may be appropriate and has drafted proposed changes in the Utility Accommodation Policy, including a shared resources provision.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board directs the Department to initiate the process of developing changes to the Land Use Permit Manual, and to circulate the draft of the proposed Utility Accommodation Policy, for the purpose of securing public participation and comments and after having considered and incorporated the appropriate changes, to submit the results and recommended changes to policies, rules, and/or regulations to the Board for further consideration.

Motion carried. The Board takes no approval/disapproval action with regard to the Draft Policy.

DRAFT

DRAFT

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

UTILITY ACCOMMODATION POLICY

1.00 Purpose.

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has the responsibility to maintain the highway right of way under its jurisdiction and to preserve the operational safety, integrity, and function of the highway facility. Since the manner in which utilities cross or otherwise occupy highway right of way can materially affect the safe operation, maintenance and appearance of the highway, it is necessary that such use and occupancy be authorized and reasonably controlled. In Section 33.1-12 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, authority has been granted to the Commonwealth Transportation Board to adopt policies, rules, and regulations relating to the system of state highways.

This policy sets forth the terms and conditions for accommodating and controlling access of utility facilities to the right of way, including those relocated or modified with transportation projects. It is the Intent of this policy to provide appropriate opportunities to all public or private utilities, in a non-discriminatory manner, and not to impose any unreasonable restrictions on the utility's ability to expand its facilities to provide utility services nor discourage economic development.

2.00 Applicability.

This policy applies to all rights of way controlled by VDOT, including both fully controlled and partially controlled access facilities.

37 A

DRAFT

DRAFT

This policy applies to public or private utilities and includes the following circumstances:

- (a) New utility installations within the right of way.
- (b) Utilities which may be permitted to cross the right of way.
- (c) Existing utility facilities which are to be retained, relocated, or adjusted within the right of way of active transportation projects under development, in accordance with an agreement, or construction. When existing utility installations are to remain in place without adjustments on such projects, VDOT and the utility are also to enter into an appropriate agreement.

For those highways where the right of way is prescriptive (mostly older secondary roads), VDOT does not own the underlying fee simple property interest. Because of VDOT's prescriptive rights, a utility must obtain VDOT's concurrence in any accommodation which would be within the prescriptive right of way. Any permit issued only grants permission to use whatever rights the Commonwealth Transportation Board and VDOT have in the right of way and no more. It is the obligation of the utility to secure any other release or permission that may be needed in order to perform the work.

3.00 Definitions.

For the purpose of this policy, the following definitions shall apply:

- (a) *Accommodation* - the use of right of way, with permission, when the requisite criteria are met and under specific terms and conditions.
- (b) *Boring* - a method of installation which is done underground and by which a carrier or casing is jacked through an oversize bore. The bore is carved progressively ahead of the leading edge of the advancing pipe as soil is mucked back through the pipe. (Direction drilling, coring, jacking, etc., are other methods to accomplish the same purpose.)

37 B

DRAFT

DRAFT

- (c) *Class G Utility* - all city, county, town, public utility district, public utility authority, or other political subdivision of the Commonwealth, owned and operated utility facility, except where they are providing telecommunication services.
- (d) *Class P Utility* - all owners and operators of a utility facility, except those that are providing telecommunication services, not meeting the definition of a *Class G Utility*, as defined herein, to include all privately, investor, and cooperatively owned entities.
- (e) *Class T Utility* - all owners and operators of a telecommunication facility which have been authorized by the State Corporation Commission to provide telecommunication services.
- (f) *Clear recovery area* - that portion of the roadside, within the highway right of way, free of nontransversable hazards and fixed objects. The purpose of such areas is to provide drivers of errant vehicles which leave the traveled portion of the roadway a reasonable opportunity to stop safely or otherwise regain control of the vehicle. The clear recovery area will vary with the type of highway, terrain traversed, roadway geometrics, and operating conditions.
- (g) *CFR (Code of Federal Regulations)* - the regulations promulgated by the administrative and regulatory agencies of the federal government.
- (h) *Commissioner* - the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner as provided for in Title 33.1 of the Code of Virginia, as amended.
- (i) *Controlled access* - the condition where the right of owners or occupants of abutting land or other persons to access—light, air, or view—in connection with a highway is fully or partially controlled by public authority.
- (j) *Crossing* - any utility facility which is installed across the roadway, either perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the roadways or at no more than 60° skew to the roadway.
- (k) *Encasement* - a structural element surrounding a carrier or encasement pipe.

37 C

DRAFT**DRAFT**

- (l) *Encasement pipe (casing)* - a larger pipe or conduit enclosing a carrier pipe or cable.
- (m) *Freeway* - a divided highway with full control of access.
- (n) *Full control of access* - the authority to control access is exercised to give preference to through traffic by providing access connections with selected public roads only by prohibiting crossings at grade or direct authority.
- (o) *Highway, street, or road* - a general term denoting a public way for purposes of vehicular travel, including the entire area within the right of way.
- (p) *Longitudinal installations* - any utility facility which is installed parallel to the centerline of the roadway or at a skew of less than 60° to the roadway centerline.
- (q) *ITS - Intelligent Transportation Systems.*
- (r) *Manhole* - an opening in an underground system which workers may enter for the purpose of making installations, removals, inspections, repairs, connections, and tests.
- (s) *Median* - the portion of a divided highway separating the traveled ways for traffic in opposite directions.
- (t) *Open-cut* - a method of installation where the surface is excavated along with the sub-soil to the depth of the proposed facility and is then restored through backfilling.
- (u) *Partial control of access* - the authority to control access is exercised to give preference to through traffic to a degree that, in addition to access connections with selected public roads, there may be some crossings at grade and some driveway connections.
- (v) *Permit or Agreement* - a document between VDOT and a utility which states the terms and conditions under which a utility may locate and maintain their facilities within the right of way.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- (w) *Private lines* - privately owned facilities which convey or transmit the commodities outlined in paragraph (kk) of this section, but devoted exclusively to private use.
- (x) *Residue property* - property which was acquired incidental or in addition to highway construction purposes or use, such as a "whole take" where part of the take was actually needed. It is not considered to be part of the operating right of way.
- (y) *Right of way* - that property within the system of state highways that is open or to be opened for public travel in the Commonwealth. The property includes the traveled portion and associated boundary lands.
- (z) *Roadside* - the area adjoining the outer edge of the roadway. Extensive areas between the roadways of a divided highway may also be considered roadside.
- (aa) *Roadway* - the portion of a highway, including shoulders, for vehicular use. A divided highway has two or more roadways.
- (bb) *Service connections* - a utility facility which connects the premise on private property to the distribution main of a utility.
- (cc) *Shared resource* - a situation where VDOT has determined a need for a utility service in connection with the operation of the transportation facility and where a public or private utility needs to install and maintain a similar utility within the right of way.
- (dd) *Structure* - that portion of the transportation facility which spans space, supports the roadway, or retains soil. This includes, but is not limited to, bridges, tunnels, drainage structures, retaining walls, sound walls, signs, traffic signals, etc.
- (ee) *Telecommunications* - the transmission, between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user's choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received.
- (ff) *Telecommunication service* - the offering of telecommunications for a fee directly to the public or to private, investor or cooperatively owned entities.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- (gg) *TMS* - Traffic Management System.
- (hh) *Transportation facility* - all elements of a facility constructed to allow public conveyance from place to place, including, but not limited to, the highway roadway and all incidental facilities necessary for the operation and maintenance of said highway roadway or facility.
- (ii) *Transportation project* - a public project being developed to construct a new transportation facility or to improve or maintain the existing system of state highways.
- (jj) *Traveled way* - the portion of the roadway for the movement of vehicles, exclusive of shoulders and auxiliary lanes.
- (kk) *Utility* - privately, publicly or cooperatively owned line, facility, or system for producing, transmitting, or distributing telecommunications, cable television, power, electricity, light, heat, gas, oil, petroleum products, water, steam, waste, storm water not connected with highway drainage, or any other similar commodity, including any fire or police signal system.
- (ll) *VDOT* - the Virginia Department of Transportation; the Commissioner or a designated representative

4.00 Policy.

All utility accommodations allowed under this policy must comply with the terms and conditions and general requirements stated herein and with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual.

Requests for accommodations within the right of way shall be submitted to and reviewed by a designated VDOT representative, who shall determine compliance with the prevailing policy, rules, regulations, and procedures. Said designated representative shall also be responsible for enforcing the terms and conditions as empowered in section 7.00 (Compliance and Liabilities) hereof.

37 P

The following utility accommodations may be allowed under the appropriate circumstances and conditions:

1. Crossings

Overhead or underground utilities may be installed across any highway or street by any utility under a permit arrangement, subject to the availability of space, the general requirements contained herein, and in accordance with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual.

2. Longitudinal installations on all non-controlled access highways, except in scenic areas

(a) Overhead or underground utilities may be installed by a Class G or Class P utility under a permit arrangement, subject to the availability of space within the right of way, the general requirements contained herein, and in accordance with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual.

(b) Overhead and underground utilities may be installed by a Class T utility under an agreement providing for either a shared resource arrangement or other appropriate compensation, subject to the availability of space within the right of way, the general requirements contained herein, and in accordance with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual.

3. Longitudinal installations on controlled access highways

(a) Overhead or underground utilities may be installed by either a Class G, Class P or Class T utility under an agreement providing for a shared resource arrangement, subject to VDOT's need for the shared resource, the availability of space within the right of way, the general requirements contained herein, and in accordance with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- (b) An exception for a non-shared resource arrangement, under strictly controlled conditions, may be granted by the Chief Engineer. He must determine it to be in the public's interest, and the utility must show the following:
 - (i) that the accommodation will not adversely affect the safety, design, construction, operation, maintenance or stability of the highway.
 - (ii) that any accommodation which must be constructed or serviced by direct access from the through traffic roadways or connecting ramps will be safe and efficient in the movement of traffic.
 - (iii) that the accommodation will not interfere with or impair the present use or future expansion of the highway.
 - (iv) that any alternative location would be contrary to the public interest. This determination would include an evaluation of the direct and indirect environmental and economic effects which would result from the disapproval of the use of such right of way for the accommodation of such utility.
- (c) A new utility will not be allowed to be installed on a bridge or other structure across a major valley or river after the project is completed, unless the utility can demonstrate that the installation and maintenance methods will not require access from the roadway or interfere with roadway traffic.
- (d) Where practicable, utilities installed under the circumstances outlined in 3.(b) above shall be located in a utility area established along the outer edge of the right of way. A utility access control line will be established between the proposed utility installation and the through roadway and ramps. Service connections to adjacent properties shall not be permitted from the controlled access right of way.

37 H

4. *Communication Towers and Small Site Installations*

Communication tower structures and other types of surface mounted or underground utility facilities not associated with a longitudinal installation may be installed under the following circumstances:

(a) **Non-Controlled Access Highways**

(i) May be installed by a Class G or Class P utility under a permit arrangement, subject to the availability of space within the right of way, the general requirements contained herein, and in accordance with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual.

(ii) May be installed by a Class T utility under an agreement providing for either a shared resource arrangement and/or appropriate compensation, subject to the availability of space within the right of way, the general requirements contained herein, and in accordance with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual.

(b) **Controlled Access Highways**

(i) May be installed by a Class G, Class P or Class T utility only under an agreement providing for a shared resource arrangement and appropriate compensation, subject to the availability of space within the right of way, an acceptable access point, the general requirements contained herein, and in accordance with the applicable provisions of VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual. An exception may be granted for a non-shared resource arrangement only when the same conditions outlined in section 3(b) are shown.

5. Installations in scenic areas

New utility installations, including those needed for transportation purposes, such as for highway lighting, are not permitted on right of way or other lands which were acquired or improved with Federal-aid or direct federal highway funds and are located within or adjacent to areas of scenic enhancement and natural beauty. Such areas include public parks and recreational lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, historic sites as described in 23 U.S.C. 138, scenic strips, overlooks, rest areas and landscaped areas.

VDOT will consider exceptions provided the following conditions are met:

- (a) New overhead or underground installations may be permitted only when they do not require extensive removal or alteration of trees or terrain features visible to the highway user or impair the aesthetic quality of the lands being traversed.
- (b) New overhead installations may be permitted only when:
 - (i) other locations are not available or are unusually difficult and costly, or are less desirable from the standpoint of aesthetic quality,
 - (ii) placement underground is not technically feasible or is unreasonably costly, and
 - (iii) the proposed installation will be made at a location, and will employ suitable designs and materials, which give the greatest weight to the aesthetic qualities of the area being traversed. Suitable designs include, but are not limited to, self-supporting armless, single-pole construction with vertical configuration of conductors and cable.

5.00 General Requirements.

The accommodation of utilities on highway rights of way shall only be considered after viable alternatives have been exhausted and, in the case of a controlled access facility, only under a shared resource arrangement or after an exemption, as provided for herein, has been granted.

A guarantee fee, irrevocable letter of credit, or surety bond shall be required during the construction of a new utility installation. (See the VDOT Land Use Permit Manual for additional details on each method.)

The following criteria are applicable relative to the design, construction, and review of requested accommodations within the right of way. Where a federal or state law, rule, or regulation requires more restrictive conditions, then the most restrictive condition shall prevail.

1. Safety

- (a) Highway and traffic safety are of paramount, but not of sole, importance when accommodating utility facilities within highway right of way. Most utilities provide a service to the general public and traditionally, utilities have been allowed to use the public right of way for transmitting and distributing their services. However, due to the nature and volume of highway traffic, the effect of such joint use on the traveling public must be carefully considered before approval of utility use of the right of way is given. The possibility of this joint use should be a consideration in establishing right of way requirements for transportation projects.
- (b) The design, location, and manner in which utilities use and occupy the right of way must conform to the clear recovery area policies for the highway involved and otherwise provide for a safe traveling environment. The clear recovery area shall be as specified in

DRAFT

DRAFT

VDOT's Road Design Manual, and in that manual it is referred to as the Clear Zone Policy.

2. Overhead Lines

- (a) Above ground utility installations, where accommodated, shall be located as far from the traveled way as possible, preferably along the right of way line. New above ground utility installations are not to be allowed within the established clear recovery area of the highway. Exceptions may be considered for situations where it is essential to locate such above ground utility facilities within the established clear recovery area of the highway and only after a determination has been made that placement underground is not technically feasible or is unreasonably costly and there are no feasible alternate locations, consideration should be given to using appropriate countermeasures to reduce hazards. Countermeasures include placing utility facilities at locations which protect or minimize exposure to out-of-control vehicles, using breakaway features, using impact attenuation devices, using delineation, or shielding.
- (b) No poles shall be located in the highway median. Exceptions may be considered when the median is greater than 20 meters (65+ feet) in width.
- (c) New above ground installations shall not be allowed where they would parallel an existing above ground installation on the same side of the highway. While not recommended, additional poles may be placed in an existing overhead line in order to facilitate the shorter span length requirements of another utility.
- (d) The minimum vertical clearance for overhead lines above the highway and right of way shall be at least 8.4 meters (21 feet) on

37 L

interstate highways and at least 5.5 meters (18 feet) on primary and secondary roadways.

- (e) A guy wire and anchor is considered to be a fixed object and no guy wire and anchor or push pole shall be installed on the roadway side of a pole, unless it would be located outside of the clear recovery area.
- (f) Any exception requested in accordance with sections (a) or (b) above shall be fully documented as to the reason for such a request. The approval of the Chief Engineer shall be required on a controlled access highway or the Resident Engineer for all other highways.

3. Underground Lines

- (a) New longitudinal underground installations shall be placed on a uniform alignment and as near to the right of way line as practicable in order to preserve space for future highway improvements or other utility installations.
- (b) The minimum depth of cover, on either a longitudinal installation or crossing, shall be 0.9 meter (36 inches) below the lowest point of the cross section of the existing roadway and right of way or below the proposed finished grade of a transportation project.
- (c) The minimum separation between utility facilities shall be as specified in Section 56-257 of the Code of Virginia, as amended.
- (d) Any manholes necessary for an underground utility shall be located in a manner that shall cause the least interference to other utilities and future highway expansion. Where possible, manholes should not be located in the pavement area and every effort should be made to avoid placement in an intersection that would effect two roadways. When manholes are located in a non-paved area, the

DRAFT

DRAFT

cover should be depressed a minimum of 50 mm (2") below the normal elevation.

- (e) Any fire hydrant, cabinet, pedestal, or other above ground appurtenance associated with an underground installation shall be located outside of the clear recovery area unless it has breakaway features. Access to any such facility shall be prescribed as a condition of the permit.

4. Crossings

- (a) In addition to the vertical clearance and depth of cover requirements specified in sections 2 and 3 above, crossings shall be made as perpendicular to the roadway centerline as possible.
- (b) Any longitudinal segment of a crossing which extends a length greater than 30 meters (98 feet) from the alignment break of the crossing shall be considered to be a separate longitudinal accommodation.

5. Attachment to Bridge Structures

- (a) All requests for attachment of utilities to an existing bridge structure shall be subject to VDOT's determination of the structure's ability to accommodate the additional load and the potential risk for the damage to the facility for utilities subject to possible leaks.
- (b) Utility installations should be located beneath the structure's floor, between the girder or beams, and at an elevation above the bottom flange of the girder or beam. An exception may be made by the State Structure and Bridge Engineer for the attachment to the outside of the exterior beam or parapet, only where there are no other alternatives.
- (c) Transmission natural gas or petroleum pipeline may not be attached to bridge or other structure.

DRAFT

DRAFT

- (d) Detailed requirements for a bridge attachment shall be developed for each individual location and approved by VDOT.

6. Open-Cut or Boring

- (a) No open-cut of the pavement shall be allowed unless an exception is made by VDOT's Resident Engineer. Any exception allowed shall include specific terms and conditions relating to traffic control and restoration.
- (b) Any proposed boring within or under the right of way shall be by a method or technique approved by VDOT. Where soil conditions are in question, VDOT shall require the use of an encasement pipe or conduit and may restrict the types of boring equipment utilized.

7. Encasement Pipes

- (a) An encasement pipe may be required where VDOT determines that it is necessary for the stability of the roadway or where soil conditions are in question.
- (b) An encasement pipe shall be provided for any natural gas pipeline where the specified minimum yield strength (hoop stress) does not meet the minimum standards established by the U.S. Department of Transportation's Office of Pipeline Safety for uncased crossings.
- (c) An encasement pipe shall be provided for any crossing where the proposed carrier pipe has not been approved by VDOT for installation within the roadway prism.
- (d) An encasement pipe may be used to facilitate the insertion, removal, replacement, or maintenance of a carrier pipe crossing a roadway.

37 0

8. Preservation and Restoration

Whenever a utility accommodation is to be allowed within the right of way, the agreement or permit or shall specify the terms and conditions under which the utility will perform the work. Unless otherwise specified, the terms and conditions shall be as authorized in VDOT's Land Use Permit Manual with particular emphasis on the following:

- (a) Erosion and siltation control
- (b) Restoration
- (c) Drainage facilities
- (d) Cutting, trimming, or removing trees
- (e) Construction and/or maintenance traffic control

9. Installation

All work to be performed on the right of way shall be subject to review and inspection by VDOT. VDOT shall determine the level of inspection required and the utility shall pay costs sufficient to cover the full salary and expenses of assigned inspectors. When utility work is authorized, specific terms and conditions will be formalized and provided to the utility.

All actual construction work shall be performed in accordance with VDOT's Work Area Protection Manual and the approved plan, terms and conditions.

A trace wire shall be installed directly above any non-metallic utility buried within the right of way.

8.00 Use and occupancy agreements.

1. Prior to any utility occupying the right of way, the utility must submit and receive written authorization. This authorization may be issued in the form of a permit or an agreement.

The permit or agreement provides a legal contract between VDOT and the utility involving the installation of utility facilities on the right of way and becomes a permanent record indicating that the utility has permission to place its facility within, over, or across the right of way. The permit or agreement, if applicable, shall set forth the specific terms and conditions under which the utility is to cross or otherwise occupy the right of way and must include or incorporate by reference the following:

- (a) VDOT's general requirements and standards for accommodating utilities. Since all of the standards will not be applicable to each individual utility installation, the use and occupancy permit or agreement must, as a minimum, describe the requirements for location, construction, protection of traffic, maintenance, access restriction, and any special conditions applicable to each installation.
- (b) A general description of the size, type, nature, and extent of the utility facilities being located within the right of way.
- (c) Adequate drawings or sketch showing the existing and/or proposed location of the utility facilities within the right of way with respect to the existing and/or planned highway improvements, the traveled way, the right of way lines and, where applicable, the control of access line and approved access point.
- (d) The liability and responsibilities associated with future adjustment of the utilities to accommodate transportation projects.
- (e) The action to be taken in case of noncompliance with these requirements.
- (f) Other provisions as deemed necessary to comply with laws and regulations.

DRAFT

DRAFT

2. One of the following types of documents will be utilized to authorize the use or occupancy of the right of way in accordance with the accommodations allowed in Section 4.00 (Policy).

(a) Permit

- (i) A permit, initiated by the utility, is required for all crossings of the right of way.
- (ii) A permit, initiated by a Class G or Class P utility, is required for any new longitudinal or small site occupancy of the right of way by a Class G or Class P utility, as allowed for in Section 4.00 (Policy), paragraphs 2, 4(a)(1) and 5.
- (iii) A permit, initiated by the utility, is required in all cases where utility installations are relocated or modified on the existing right of way in connection with a transportation project.
- (iv) A permit, initiated by the utility, is required for virtually all types of utility activities occurring in the rights of way. These activities include, but are not limited to, changes in voltage or pressure of an existing facility and maintenance activities affecting vehicle traffic.

(b) Blanket Permit

This type of permit, issued on an annual basis, is required to allow the utility to install and/or maintain lateral house services connections to its existing distribution line.

The right to occupy the right of way under a permit or blanket permit may be denied or revoked whenever VDOT determines that it is required to ensure the safety, use, or maintenance of the highway.

37.R

(c) Agreements

Except where a shared resource arrangement has been agreed upon between VDOT and the utility, a lease agreement shall be used.

(i) Lease Agreement

- a) A lease agreement is required for any new longitudinal occupancy of the right of way by a Class T utility, as allowed for in Section 4.00 (Policy), paragraphs 2(b) and 5.
- b) A lease agreement is required for any new communication tower or small site facilities installed on the right of way as allowed for in Section 4.00 (Policy), paragraph 4(a)(ii).

A master lease agreement may be entered into between a utility and VDOT to cover multiple installations. This type of agreement must have approved attachments for each specific location.

All agreements and/or attachments shall specify the terms and conditions required in conjunction with work performed on the right of way. All lease agreements shall provide for monetary compensation as may be deemed proper by the Commissioner for the privilege of utilizing the right of way. All agreements shall specify the initial and renewal terms of the lease. The initial term shall not exceed 15 years.

(ii) Shared Resource Agreement

When a shared resource arrangement has been agreed upon between VDOT and the utility, a shared resource agreement shall be used.

A shared resource agreement is similar to the lease agreement but allows the utility to occupy the right of way in exchange for the utility providing the needed VDOT facility or services. VDOT and the utility will agree upon the appropriate facilities or services to be provided and will establish the length of the initial term that will have been compensated through the Infrastructure needs as opposed to monetary compensation. Any shared resource agreement should provide for compensation as may be deemed proper by the Commissioner in any renewal term. The agreement shall specify the initial and renewal terms of the lease. The initial term shall not exceed 15 years.

In any situation where VDOT solicits an expression of interest for the provision of transportation facilities or services through a Request for Proposal, a shared resource arrangement will be used.

3. Compensation for the use of the right of way can be negotiated and agreed upon in several different ways. The options or forms of compensation are strictly barter, which includes provision of goods or services; cash only; or a combination of barter and cash. VDOT will ensure that the goods or services provided in any barter arrangement are equal to the monetary

DRAFT

DRAFT

compensation amount established for occupancy of the right of way by a Class T utility.

The Commissioner shall determine the proper compensation for the use of the right of way by a Class T utility and shall publish the compensation requirements on an annual basis. The Commissioner shall establish the proper compensation for a longitudinal occupancy on a linear foot basis for a specified time period and for a site occupancy on a per site basis for a specified time period. The compensation shall be the same for all occupancies of a similar manner, such as all longitudinal and all small sites. Whenever the size of the utility facility under a longitudinal occupancy requires the use, including separation clearances, of more than a six-foot width, the longitudinal compensation requirement shall be doubled.

Whenever compensation is provided for the use and occupancy of the right of way, the agreement shall provide for partial reimbursement should the utility be required to relocate, adjust, or remove its facilities as a result of the construction of a transportation project. Any agreement shall specify that for the first three years of an occupancy the utility will be entitled to reimbursement for 100 percent of the applicable relocation, adjustment, or removal cost as defined in 23 CFR §645.117. For the succeeding three years, the utility will be entitled to reimbursement for 50 percent of the applicable relocation, adjustment, or removal cost as defined in 23 CFR §645.117. After the end of the sixth year, the utility will be responsible for the cost of all required relocations, adjustments, or removals related to the transportation project construction.

37 U

DRAFT

DRAFT

7.00 Compliance and Liability.

Utility facilities placed on, above, or under the right of way in violation of a permit or agreement will be considered to be in violation of the General Rules and Regulations of the Commonwealth Transportation Board and shall be removed within 10 days after VDOT notification. Those facilities not removed within 10 days by the utility may be moved by VDOT at the utility's expense. Those facilities requiring immediate removal for public safety, use, or maintenance of any highway shall be moved by VDOT at the utility's expense.

Violation of any of the preceding shall make one civilly liable to the Commonwealth for expenses and damages incurred by VDOT. Violators shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be punished as provided for in Section 33.1-19 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. When a violation is discovered, VDOT will pursue a remedy as provided by law.

The Permittee or Lessee shall install, operate and maintain the utility facilities and occupy the right of way in a manner which shall comply with all federal, state and local regulations governing its installation and operation.

37 ▽

DRAFT

DRAFT

REFERENCES

1. VDOT. *Land Use Permit Manual - 1983.*
2. 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended.
3. Federal Highway Administration. *Code of Federal Regulations. Title 23, Part 645 - Utilities.*
4. U.S. DOT, Office of Pipeline Safety. *Code of Federal Regulations. Title 49, Parts 190-199.*
5. VDOT. *Road Design Manual(Imperial and Metric).*
6. VDOT. *Work Area Protection Manual.*

OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION

- AASHTO. *A Guide for Accommodating Utilities Within Highway Right-of-Way - 1994.*
- AASHTO. *A Policy on the Accommodation of Utilities Within Freeway Right-of-Way, 1989*
- Federal Highway Administration. *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, ANSI D6.1.*
- Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers. *National Electrical Safety Code. ANSI C2, Revised Edition.*
- VDOT. *Road and Bridge Specifications.*

11-21-96

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

The next meeting will be held on December 19,
1996, in Richmond, Virginia.

Approved:



Attested:

