

**MINUTES OF  
FAUQUIER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**July 27, 2016**

**5:00 P.M.**

*2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room – Warren Green Building*

*10 Hotel Street*

*Warrenton, VA 20186*

**Members Present:** Chair, Jim Stone, Vice-Chair, Matthew Sheedy, Adrienne Garreau, Peter S. Eltringham, Dave Newman, Rick Gerhardt, Mark Nesbit

**Members Absent:** Chris Butler, Patrick Mauney

**Guests Present:** Roy Tate, Virginia Department of Transportation  
Ben Davison, Virginia Department of Transportation  
Sheriff Robert P. Mosier, Fauquier County Sheriff's Office  
Sergeant Steven Lewis, Fauquier County Sheriff's Office

**Staff Present:** Marie Pham, Maureen Williamson

**1. Approval of May 25, 2016 Committee Meeting Minutes**

***ACTION: On a motion made by Adrienne Garreau and seconded by Peter Eltringham, it was moved to approve the May 25, 2016 meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously.***

**2. July 2016 – VDOT Monthly Report**

Mr. Mark Nesbit gave a brief overview of the July 2016 monthly report and touched upon the following highlights:

Ms. Garreau asked for an update on the Waterloo Bridge. Mr. Nesbit stated that at the April 14, 2016 meeting, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) initiated a resolution requesting the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) refrain from demolishing and replacing the Waterloo Bridge, but rather make every effort to save the existing bridge. He added that Culpeper County adopted a similar resolution supporting rehabilitation rather than replacement. There is no interest by the Counties in pursuing a revenue sharing application as each county will likely be asked to contribute in excess of one million dollars. However, he said that VDOT cannot fund the rehabilitation with state funds given that any work done with state funds must remove the structural deficiency rating of the bridge and this rehabilitation would not. There are no plans between the two Counties to meet again in the near future, but VDOT is willing to meet again should the Counties find the need.

Ms. Garreau shared that a joint session of the Fauquier County Planning Commission and the Culpeper County Planning Commission will take place in September. She added that among the topics of discussion will be the Waterloo Bridge and she extended an invitation to Mr. Nesbit to attend the joint session to take part in the discussion.

Mr. Eltringham asked Mr. Nesbit if the County should be aware of any safety challenges VDOT faces in the higher temperatures of summer months. Mr. Nesbit, said that other than concern for VDOT employees working in excessive temperatures, he is not aware of any heat related issues the County should be aware of within the Culpeper District.

Mr. Dave Newman asked for an update on the Kings Hill Road (Route 657) proposed project. Mr. Nesbit said that VDOT reviewed two alternatives which included a radius improvement to try to help the traffic moving in and out and the construction of a turning lane. VDOT is favoring a radius improvement adjustment and said restriping that approach will provide more room to make the turns. This will also help vehicles get a better angle going around the curves. VDOT believes this is a good first, low cost step which could be implemented fairly quickly. He added that the proposed project could be funded with the next County safety money cycle. VDOT will coordinate with County staff to discuss the proposed project and for the County's concurrence. If the work cannot be completed by November 1, 2016, it will be completed in the spring of 2017.

Mr. Newman asked for an update to Route 29 in Opal at the Quarles Truck Stop. Mr. Nesbit said that this project was the focus of the last quarterly meeting. VDOT has received advanced funding to improve the area from the signal north, for approximately one mile, which extends just past the Quarles Truck Stop. Median modifications will be made in that area to restrict some turning movements. A southbound acceleration lane on Route 29 will be added for traffic exiting the Quarles Truck Stop to allow traffic to pull out without having to stop. He added that traffic will have to watch for northbound vehicles, but will not enter the southbound through traffic until they get into an acceleration lane and can merge over. A survey team is currently working on the site and in the next two to three months VDOT will have an initial set of preliminary plans and will hold a public hearing on this project this fall. Liberty High School will likely be selected as the location for the public hearing.

Mr. Newman mentioned the predawn crash that occurred at the intersection of Route 28 and Route 29 on July 22, 2016. He commented that warning signs located at the intersection may be old and that traffic may have become used to the signage and therefore desensitized to them, rendering them ineffective. He noted that commercial drivers use warning signs and flashing devices as a driving tool as they assist the driver in planning their speed and gear. He encouraged VDOT to continue to monitor the intersection for the need of additional warning and/or enhancement of existing signage.

### **3. *New Business***

- **VRE Gainesville-Haymarket Extension**

Ms. Pham reported that staff conducted a public information meeting in conjunction with VRE in The Plains at Wakefield School on June 27, 2016. During the meeting VRE informed the public that the two storage/maintenance sites that were initially being considered for Fauquier County are no longer moving forward for further study. She said that this does not exclude the sites from further consideration in the future, especially if VRE runs into problems in trying to locate a storage yard and maintenance facility in Prince William County. However, VRE is finding that the cost to run trains from Fauquier County to the end of line station in Haymarket is becoming cost prohibitive. In addition, the topography was so severe at the eastern site that it would cost almost as much to grade the site as it would be to construct the storage yard and maintenance facility.

Ms. Pham said that the study is still in the very early stages and is expected to run for another year. Norfolk Southern is doing a separate study as they have not yet agreed to the extension. Dependent upon the outcome of the study, Norfolk Southern could require VRE to widen the rail line to three sections of track instead of two sections which would require VRE to install additional track and acquire additional right-of-way. This would add to the timing and expense of this project.

Ms. Pham said that Prince William County has also expressed concern with the project. VRE's preliminary studies have indicated an increase of ridership of approximately seven hundred riders per day. Given that the cost of this project is roughly half a billion dollars to extend the line for such a minimal increase, it is difficult to see the benefit. This minimal increase in ridership may make it difficult for VRE to receive funding.

Ms. Pham shared that based upon Prince William County's Comprehensive Plan and previous studies, this is the corridor where that County expects to see the most growth over the next twenty to forty years. This is part of VRE's justification to obtain the funding and extend the track now to be ready when the growth does occur. Additional concern has been expressed regarding the location of the three stations and the impact that the change in travel patterns would have on local roads from demand to access the stations. Localities are waiting to hear back from VRE on this.

Mr. Eltringham made note of a SuperNoVa Transit Study initiated by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation that looked at the entire region. The study was analogous to a comprehensive plan for how rail and public transportation was going to be used within the region. It might be beneficial to take a look at this document as well as to know what involvement VDOT will have in the discussion of rail and public transportation going forward within the region.

- Private Street Policy

Ms. Pham said that as part of the update of the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, staff is reviewing its current policy on private streets and found that there is not a private street policy. The goal is to update the Transportation Chapter and ensure that the standards for private streets are consistent in the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and Design Standards Manual. The purpose of this discussion is to bring the Committee current policy which has been found in these documents, trends that staff has been seeing in other localities, and discuss the kind of policy staff feels Fauquier County should be developing.

While the County does not currently have a private street policy in its Comprehensive Plan, there is language pertaining to private streets in the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and Design Standards Manual. Staff has found that there are certain areas where private streets are allowed including commercial and industrial zoning districts. Private streets are also allowed for family subdivisions that have the density to divide out one lot, which can then be used for a private street.

Ms. Pham stated that the County currently has three types of private streets outlined in the County's ordinances. However, there are no design or construction standards associated

with the ordinances. Type I and II private streets are allowed in Rural Conservation and Rural Agricultural districts, but there is nothing to describe Type I and Type II streets. A Type III private street with no design or construction standard is allowed with an application for a special exception. The County has typically allowed Type III private streets in rural or residential zoning districts with a minimum gravel road surface, at least eighteen feet wide, and two-foot shoulders along either side of the road.

A road maintenance agreement is one of the requirements of a private street application. This requires that any lot accessing the private street is required to sign a road maintenance agreement saying that they will financially participate in the maintenance and upkeep of the road. Mr. Eltringham noted that if road maintenance is in the covenants of a homeowner's association agreement that should be sufficient.

Ms. Pham reported that another requirement that staff sees consistently is that a private street has to connect to a public street. VDOT does get involved to ensure that the connection they have to the public street is sufficient and built to VDOT standards.

Ms. Pham noted that if residents of a private street want the private street to be brought into the state maintenance system and maintained by VDOT, the residents along the road would have to pay to bring the road up to VDOT standards. Localities are allowed to set aside money from secondary road funding to help contribute to this, but Fauquier County does not participate in this.

Typically when the County receives an application for a private road the ordinance does mandate that lots on the private street are restricted from further subdivision. If lots continue to divide, the concern is that the private street will not be able to accommodate the increased traffic.

Ms. Garreau said that the private street concept does have land use implications, as it could be used as a means of controlling growth in areas where growth is not wanted.

Some of the standards currently identified in the County's documents include the following:

- Typically the County requires a fifty foot easement for private roads; however, VDOT has a forty foot standard. Staff will review easement requirements as construction design standards are developed.
- Private streets will not be through streets. If it is a private gravel road, the County would not want it to connect to two public streets which would create considerable cut through traffic.
- There are length limitations for private streets; however, applicants can request that this requirement be waived.
- Emergency Services has to have access to the length of the street at all times.

The challenges that the County is seeing is that there are no defined policies for private streets. With no policy recorded, it is a challenge for staff to support the request. There are only two standards to waive the public street requirement and it is very easy for applicants to meet these.

Ms. Pham noted that staff has reviewed the private street policies and standards of approximately twenty-four counties in Virginia for direction on developing a private street policy for Fauquier County. In general, most counties do not have a private street policy, though many do have varying standards for design and construction.

Ms. Pham briefly described the findings of her review of other county private street ordinances:

- Discourage or limit private streets although every county researched has provisions for the construction of private streets.
- Private streets are to be maintained by the property owners at no cost to the County.
- Many counties allow private streets in agricultural, rural, industrial and commercial zones.
- Allowed for family subdivisions, 2 lot family subdivisions with the stipulation that the two lots are deed restricted.
- Townhomes and multi-family developments seem to allow private streets because VDOT standards do not allow perpendicular or angled parking on public streets and this allowed the streetscape desired for multi-family development.
- Most counties allow private streets with the equivalent of a special exception application.
- Many counties also stipulate that emergency services must have full street access, the private street cannot be a through street, the lots accessing private streets must be deed restricted, and that lots in a subdivision accessing a private road must access the private road, not the public street directly.
- A few counties note that private streets should be allowed in areas where a public street would result in significant environmental degradation.

Ms. Pham reported that staff will continue to develop this policy. The next steps include meeting with Community Development Senior Staff in early August, and staff will be taking a draft of this policy to the Planning Commission at a work session at the August 18, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Eltringham asked if the policy is going to be for private streets going forward, how would private streets and roads maintained by homeowner's associations that presently exist be treated by the new private street policy. Ms. Pham said that they would be grandfathered and continue as is. She said the new policy will affect those applications received after the policy is adopted.

Mr. Sheedy asked if Ms. Pham is aware of any State prohibitions against the County's ability to restrict what is done on private streets. Ms. Pham replied that it is up to the County to determine how private streets are built. She said that it is not so much that we are prohibiting them, we are asking the community to build to a particular standard. She added that while we may discourage them by making the standards stricter, she believes the County will not disallow private streets.

Fauquier County Sheriff Robert Mosier asked if there was any mention of traffic safety enforcement within the research done on private street ordinances. Ms. Pham answered no.

Ms. Garreau asked Sheriff Mosier if County police vehicles are allowed on private streets. Sheriff Mosier said that on private streets and private right-of ways, County police will patrol if the homeowner's association makes a request of law enforcement to patrol the street.

Supervisor Gerhardt requested the County explore policy language to include the allowance of adjacent land owners to use an existing private road. This request stems from a current situation where an adjoining property to a private road that was granted a right-of-way to an adjacent property so as to give an access to Coffee Pot Hill Road. Due to residents along the existing private road not allowing a new resident who is developing an adjoining property to use the existing private road, a new private road will be cut through the historic McCormick House and graveyard.

Ms. Pham said that if the Committee would like to provide input, staff is in the very early stages of researching and drafting a new policy.

#### **4. Old Business**

Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan – Bridge Appendix

On June 17, 2016, staff emailed a copy of the Bridge Appendix Goals, Objectives, and Actions to Committee members. Ms. Pham asked members for comments, input and feedback noting it would be helpful as this is the document that will be included in the Comprehensive Plan update.

Ms. Garreau commented that Goal 2, Objective 2.1, Action 2.1.1 seemed vague and she is uncertain as to how you would arrive at that. She inquired as to whether it would be appropriate to insert something here that this action would be achieved by working with VDOT. She pointed out that the action of identifying bridges nearing the end of their service life should be done with the assistance of VDOT. She asked staff how they would effectively make this happen, and if they cannot, under this language, the language may need to be recast in a way so it will actually get a result we are happy with.

#### **5. Staff Updates**

##### **FY 17-22 Six Year Improvement Program (SYIP)**

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that on June 13, 2016 meeting, the Commonwealth Transportation Safety Board (CTB) did review the projects recommended in the SYIP. Fauquier County had two projects up for consideration: the Warrenton Interchange at Route 29 and Lord Fairfax Community College and the Warrenton park and ride lot. Ms. Pham updated the Committee that the HB2 program name has been rebranded/renamed to Smart Scale. As mentioned at the May 25, 2016 Committee meeting, the CTB was only recommending funding \$26 million of the interchange, requiring that Lord Fairfax Road bridge over Route 29 as opposed to bridging Route 29 over Lord Fairfax Road. VDOT currently has a consultant reviewing the interchange scope of work to determine if it is feasible to construct the interchange with the \$26 million.

### **Revenue Sharing Projects**

Staff submitted two projects for Revenue Sharing funds last fall: the extension of Salem Avenue (Route 1006) to Cunningham Farm Drive and additional funding for Phase II of the Vint Hill Public Street Network. Both projects were approved for full funding at the June 13, 2016 CTB Action Meeting.

### **Markham Rest Area**

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that staff and VDOT held a meeting on March 7, 2016 to discuss the rest area. Since the meeting, VDOT has been working to address the concerns of residents that were expressed at that meeting. There is a follow-up meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 31, 2016 from 6:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m. at the Marshall Community Center. Mr. Nesbit said that the media notice was sent July 27, 2016 with the public information attached. Ms. Pham noted that a letter will be sent to approximately seventy residents, which includes those who attended the meeting in March and those who signed the petition. Staff also increased the radius by extending the reach of residents to one mile beyond the rest area to the east and the west.

Mr. Sheedy asked if Mr. Nesbit will clearly demonstrate the need for the rest area as at the last meeting he felt residents were receiving mixed messages regarding other opportunities with similar facilities. Mr. Nesbit noted that members of VDOT's Central Office staff and those who prepared the statewide study will be in attendance at the meeting to explain why this is the logical location for the rest area. He said that it was a resolution from this Committee that requested VDOT pursue the opening of the rest area and added that support from this Committee will be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Newman noted that in 2017 the federal government will mandate electronic logs and truckers will be required to take scheduled breaks. He cautioned that VDOT and County law enforcement do not want drivers sitting on the shoulder of an interstate taking their breaks. He believes that the name of a truck rest stop needs to be changed/updated to a truck safety rest area. He added, it is a place for truckers to take their mandated breaks to be legal on the highway. It is a safe haven and the federal law says that every driver must be provided a safe haven spot to take their breaks.

Mr. Nesbit noted having met with Delegate Michael Webert and Senator Jill Holtzman Vogel and having received their support for the opening of the rest area.

### **Smart Scale (HB2) Applications**

Ms. Pham reported that staff is submitting seven Smart Scale applications this fall. Ms. Pham briefly discussed the following seven applications:

1. Whiting Road (Route 622) Railroad Crossing: The County previously received Revenue Sharing funds for this project totaling approximately \$700,000; however, the cost has increased to at least \$1.27 million. The application would request the funding to complete the project.

The County has been receiving applications for development to occur at the 17-66 Business Park. However, Whiting Road does not continue across the railroad and as developers look at trying to develop this property for the industrial park the additional connection is needed.

2. Schoolhouse Road and Route 28 Intersection – Safety Improvements:  
This is the #15 intersection in the district on VDOT’s top 100 list. County staff is working with VDOT on what this project would entail.
3. Rogues Road (Route 602): Reconstruction of Rogues Road from Dumfries Road (Route 605) to the Prince William County Line. Current six-year plan funding available for this project totals 4.3 million. One of the CTB’s criteria when reviewing a Smart Scale application includes is the applicant requesting funding for the entire project or requesting funding to offset the cost. With 4.3 million to offset the cost of the reconstruction this could help the project score well to get the remaining funds in order to complete the entire project at once rather than having to focus on one section at time.
4. Route 28 Intersection with Routes 616 and 603. Construct a roundabout at the intersection of Route 28 with Bristersburg Road and Bastable Mill Road. The VDOT concept allows for the Calverton Market and the antique shop to remain in place and it enhances the properties in that it gives them better access and parking. VDOT confirmed that the roundabout will be designed to accommodate truck traffic.
5. Route 29 Northbound Corridor: Correct the vertical alignment of Route 29 northbound approaching Vint Hill Road (Route 215). This intersection has the highest crash rate in the County and District as a result of the limited sight distance approaching the signal. The State could come back with a less expensive alternative.
6. Broad Run Church Road (Route 600) and Riley Road (Route 676): Replacing the existing 4-way stop with a roundabout. This project is in the County’s Comprehensive Plan.
7. Intersection Improvements at Mill Run Business Park: Implement a restricted crossing U-Turn (RCUT) Intersection on Route 29 at Old Alexandria Turnpike (Route 693) and Telephone Road (Route 838).

The CTB passed a resolution making it more difficult to get signals installed particularly on corridors of statewide significance, which Route 29 is. Coupled with the fact that this intersection does not currently warrant a signal, staff and VDOT are looking at an alternative solution to be able to move vehicles through and around this area more safely and effectively. This is a Revenue Share Project for which funds have accrued.

Mr. Eltringham asked if staff needed documentation in the meeting minutes to show Committee agreement with this prioritization of projects. Ms. Pham said that no vote on the prioritization is needed. She said that this list of Smart Scale applications will go to the BOS at the August 11, 2016 meeting and be listed on their consent agenda. She informed the Committee that even though it is not required to have a resolution of support from the BOS for projects on Corridors of Statewide Significance, staff does like to request a resolution to help support the projects.

Ms. Pham has coordinated with Mr. Patrick Mauney of the Rappahannock Rapidan Regional Commission as four of the projects are on Corridors of Statewide Significance and do require resolutions of support from the Regional Commission.

On a motion made by Mr. Eltringham and seconded by Mr. Newman, it was moved that it be reflected in the minutes that the Committee agrees with Smart Scale applications one through seven, which are slated to be submitted to the CTB in the fall of 2016. The motion garnered six yeas and one nay vote.

### **Roundabout Article**

Mr. Stone noted a roundabout article that was distributed with the meeting packet. The article was presented for information purposes only and required no discussion.

### **Swains Road**

Ms. Pham reported receiving an email from Supervisor Mary Leigh McDaniel as residents of Swains Road have contacted Supervisor McDaniel asking to have the road hard surfaced under the Secondary Six-Year Plan (SSYP) as a Rural Rustic Road. Ms. Pham, Mr. Nesbit, and Mr. Sheedy explained to Supervisor McDaniel that the road was previously in the SSYP and that it was found to be too narrow and therefore did not qualify as a Rural Rustic Road construction project. They also explained that if the road were to be hard surfaced it would be done as traditional construction and would involve the removing of trees and cutting into the landscape, which would lessen the rural character of the road. Ms. Pham added that since originally looking at this road for inclusion in the SSYP, new stormwater management regulations have gone into effect and may require additional work on this road.

Supervisor McDaniel has requested that staff meet with the residents again and explain everything that would be involved in the hard surfacing of the road. Ms. Pham stated that staff wanted to make the Committee aware that this request has come back and that staff will be meeting with residents in the next couple of months.

## **6. Citizens' Time**

Dr. Ann-Marie Hancock, who appeared before the Committee, noted applying for a Category 13 Special Permit to operate an equine veterinary clinic located at 6666 Carters Run Road (Route 691). She noted that while the Special Permit has been postponed due to the difficulty in getting a commercially permitted entrance, the Special Permit process allowed her to meet her neighbors and to discuss the road and in particular, the speed limit of the road. She said that she has had the opportunity to review speed study results as presented by VDOT. VDOT has recommended against changing the speed limit on this road. Based on the history of this road, Dr. Hancock comes before the Committee for assistance with having the speed limit decreased to 35 mph.

Ms. Garreau said that the Committee has no jurisdiction over VDOT owned roads. Mr. Eltringham added that VDOT does not change speed limits based on wants and desires however well stated or researched. He said that VDOT has engineering parameters that dictate road speeds.

Mr. Nesbit said that the road has been studied and at this location, the site distance is the issue. He added that the lower the speed limit the shorter the site distance you are required to have, but if you artificially lower the speed limit it does not make it any safer. He said that what it does allow is a driveway to be designed at a lower VDOT standard. He said that lowering the speed limit does not cause people to change their driving habits. Mr. Eltringham said that people change their driving habits based on the way the road is engineered.

**9. *Member Comments***

There were no member comments.

**10. *Adjournment***

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m. The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, October 26, 2016.**