

WIN-FRED METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Frederick County ❖ City of Winchester ❖ Town of Stephens City



103 East 6th Street, Front Royal, Virginia 22630
 Phone: 540-636-8800 ❖ Fax: 540-635-4147
www.winfredmpo.org

Win-Fred Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee Minutes – July 13, 2010 – 10 a.m.

Frederick County Administrative Offices
 First Floor Conference Room

Win-Fred MPO Technical Committee Member Jurisdiction Representatives					
	Frederick County		VDRPT		Staff
✓	Patrick Barker		Kenneth Pollock	✓	Chris Price
✓	John Bishop		Winchester Airport		Karen Taylor
✓	Eric Lawrence		Serena 'Renny' Manuel	✓	Tiffany Tran
✓	Kris Tierney		Winchester Transit		Others
	Stephens City		Renee Wells	✓	Winchester Star
✓	Brian Henshaw		Winchester	✓	TV-3 News
	VDOT	✓	Jim Deskins		
✓	Jerry Copp	✓	Perry Eisenach		
✓	Terry Short	✓	Tom Hoy		
✓	Ed Carter	✓	Tim Youmans		

**Winchester -Frederick County ("Win-Fred") MPO
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE Meeting Minutes**

July 13, 2010 - 10:00 a.m.

Frederick County Administrative Offices – Frederick County Planning Conference Room

1. Administrative Items:

- a) Welcome and Introductions – Chairman Youmans welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- b) Review and Approval of the June 1, 2010 and July 6, 2010 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes - **A motion was made by Mr. Lawrence approving the minutes. Motion seconded by Mr. Tierney. Motion carried.**

2. Public Comment Period – None reported.

3. Millwood Avenue Study

Mr. Price discussed the results of the consultant interviews that were conducted on July 7th. He stated that the Project Steering Committee had decided on a consensus for Gorove/Slade and had some contention over an alternate if negotiations with Gorove/Slade were to fall through. He asked TAC to recommend Gorove/Slade to the Policy Board at the meeting scheduled for July 21st with authorization for Mr. Chris Price to draft a contract and negotiate the price.

Chairman Youmans made a note that the proposal and scope of work for the project should include the multimodal analysis as it is an important aspect for the University and students. Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Bishop mentioned a bicycle and pedestrian study done by Toole Design Group. They suggested that the consultant should review if they include this analysis. Mr. Price reminded TAC that bicycle and pedestrian counts were conducted by Shenandoah University students as in-kind services to help abate some of the cost for the study.

Mr. Tierney asked what criteria did the Project Steering Committee choose Gorove/Slade. Mr. Price stated that their presentation had the strongest stakeholder participation process and they made a point to recognize the University as a unique animal and thus need to be treated as one. He stated that their relevant project experience with other university traffic studies also were in their favor with the reasonable quote they gave in the proposal.

Mr. Price stated that references were checked for the top two consultants and Gorove/Slade received very strong and positive reviews from an MPO, local jurisdiction, and university that they had done work for in the past.

Mr. Lawrence asked if the consultant will be required to also assist in the implementation of the plan and not leave it on the "shelf" like studies in the past. Mr. Price ensured that TAC and Project Steering Committee will provide quality checks to make sure there is some sort of implementation to the recommendations in the final plan

Mr. Tierney and Mr. Barker asked about the cost of the project and whether there was an explanation for not taking the lowest proposal. They both stated that it did not bother them whether one consultant cost more, but they felt that there needs to be some acknowledgement of the cost being more than what was proposed by some of the other proposals. Mr. Price explained that quotes were only asked in the proposal to make sure the budget was consistent with the \$75,000 allotted in the UPWP but that they can provide some justification to the Policy Board if necessary.

Mr. Short and Mr. Copp stated that VDOT had conducted their own cost proposal for the study with some departments in Richmond and they came up with the \$75,000 as well, feeling it was an adequate number as a high cap for the project but recognizing that the total cost may not reach that total.

Mr. Deskins commented that engineers should not be rated based on their price but based off State procurement laws. He also stated that discussion about the consultants have been consistent with Shenandoah University. Mr. Bishop felt that the University should be more involved since the study began between them and the City. Mr. Price mentioned that they would feel required to ask other business owners and stakeholders in the area for their input in the selection process as well. He stated that their exclusion provides a more impartial selection.

Mr. Barker and Mr. Lawrence mentioned that instead of a qualitative evaluation of consultants that there should be an evaluation matrix with scoring to provide some quantified justification for selection. Mr. Eisenach said that the City would be glad to provide a template matrix for future use.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Mr. Eisenach to recommend Gorove/Slade to the Policy Board. Motion seconded by Mr. Deskins.**

Discussion continued.

The question of proposal cost was brought up for discussion by Mr. Tierney. It was noted that the reason for choosing Gorove/Slade despite other consultants quoting lower prices will be mentioned at the July 21st Policy Board meeting.

Mr. Bishop voted Nay. Motion carried.

4. Other Business

Mr. Deskins brought up for discussion, the current issues with the Route 522 Corridor Study. Mr. Price explained that Clarke County and Frederick County Transportation Committee found some errors in the design standards despite jurisdictions' input and the exclusion of the Tevis Street flyover and the I-81 bridge over Russell 150. The consultants are currently taking comments and revising the rough draft.

Mr. Deskins brought up for discussion the TIGER II projects and in particular asked why the I-81 bridge over Russell 150 project had not been recommended due to its poor condition. Mr. Copp stated that it had been submitted in TIGER I but was not approved and that they feel the two projects recommended (Exit 313 interchange and Route 37 extension) would help in the future when maintenance and repair work for that bridge would begin, providing traffic diversion from the bridge.

Meeting adjourned at 10:43 a.m.