

**MINUTES OF  
FAUQUIER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
October 26, 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; Chris Butler, Adrienne Garreau, Peter S. Eltringham, Patrick Mauney, Dave Newman, Rick Gerhardt, Mark Nesbit

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

**Staff Present:** Andrew Hopewell, Maureen Williamson

**1. Approval of July 27, 2016 Committee Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Eltringham requested that on page 4, paragraph 2, the last sentence of the paragraph be amended to read "should be sufficient."

***ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. Eltringham and seconded by Mr. Sheedy, it was moved to approve the July 27, 2016 meeting minutes with the requested change. The motion carried unanimously.***

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

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

**Projects in Development**

**Route 622, Whiting Road, Railroad Crossing**

Mr. Nesbit noted that this project is being submitted as a Smart Scale application and also a Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Revenue Share project. He added that partial funding has been identified and said the next project milestone is to identify the remaining funding.

**Route 29/605 – Warrenton Park & Ride Lot Expansion**

Mr. Nesbit said that this project is fully funded through House Bill 2, which is now called Smart Scale.

### **Town of Warrenton:**

#### **Route 17/29/211 – Broadview Avenue**

Mr. Nesbit said that the Town of Warrenton is trying to secure additional funding for this project. To achieve total funding, the project is being divided into two phases:

- Intersection – Intersection of Frost Avenue and Broadview Avenue will be submitted as a Smart Scale application.
- Corridor – Partial funding for this project will come from VDOT Highway Safety Improvement Program funds and partial funding as a Smart Scale application. The section up to Route 17 (Winchester Road) is expected to score well as it has a high safety component.

Supervisor Butler visited Edgewood East subdivision in Bealeton to discuss with residents the surface treatment of the streets. Supervisor Butler asked the homeowner's association to send him a letter regarding their requests and when he receives it, he will share it with VDOT. Mr. Nesbit said that he has spoken to residents within the Edgewood East subdivision about the surface treatment and will follow up and revisit the road to ensure all major cracks and potholes are filled and the road is sealed.

#### **Bridge on Interstate 66 – Bridge over Broad Run**

Ms. Garreau noted having seen VDOT crews working on Route 55 under the bridge at Broad Run for the past month and asked for detail of the activity. Mr. Davison said that crews were repairing the bearing plates, which are located under the bridge. Ms. Garreau also asked if the bridge on Interstate 66 over Board Run is going to be resurfaced. Mr. Nesbit and Ms. Garreau agreed to discuss details of this project after the meeting.

### **Traffic Engineering Studies**

- Route 17 from Route 66 to Route 55 at Marshall – Request to Review Speed Limit  
Ms. Garreau asked for details regarding the request to review the speed limit at Route 17 from Route 66 at Marshall. Mr. Nesbit said that he received this resident request through Delegate Michael Weibert's office to study this section. VDOT's initial response to the study was to maintain the speed limit at thirty-five miles-per-hour. However, at Mr. Nesbit's request, a VDOT regional traffic engineer has been asked to review the completed study to determine if an adjustment to the current speed limit is warranted.
- Route 678 Speed Study – Complete  
Mr. Eltringham asked Mr. Nesbit for details of the completed study. Mr. Nesbit believes that the request was received from County residents who live on Wilson Road (Route 691) and asked that the section from Crest Hill Road (Route 647) to Dudie Road (Route 689) be reviewed as there were no speed limit signs posted. After review, it was determined that the speed limit for this section is forty-five miles-per-hour and VDOT reinstalled the six speed signs. Mr. Nesbit reports riding the stretch of road recently after the reinstallation of the signs and again, the signs were missing. Mr. Nesbit has asked a VDOT regional traffic engineer to study this stretch of road to determine the optimal speed limit. The speed study moves back into Under Review status.

### 3. *Old Business*

- Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan – Private Street Policy

At the July 27, 2016 meeting, Ms. Pham told the Committee that as part of the update of the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, staff is reviewing its current policy on private streets. Mr. Hopewell is asking the Committee for their input and feedback that will continue to shape the document.

Mr. Eltringham believes that the Committee needs a clear answer on the process for the transitioning of a private street to a state maintained street. He would like to see specific steps as to how a homeowners association would go about initiating the transition from private road to a state maintained road.

Mr. Sheedy said that it would be helpful to know what other local jurisdictions have in place in regard to private streets so as to have a framework to work within. For example, he asked at what point in the development of a subdivision it is determined that roads are deemed private and/or eligible for state maintenance. Mr. Hopewell noted that Ms. Pham has done extensive research into other jurisdiction's private street policies. He said that private street policies from jurisdictions has not been shared with the Committee, but certainly can be shared. Mr. Sheedy said that perhaps a proper point of reference would be Rappahannock County's private street policy as the two counties share the same rural characteristics. Mr. Hopewell reiterated the fact that there is not a lot of guidance on developing a private street policy and he hopes that the County can be a leader in setting precedence.

Mr. Eltringham asked if the County has a role with the interface of private roads and conservation easements. He also asked if there is a restriction with regard to owned easements and the development of private roads. Mr. Sheedy said that the interface that comes to mind, from a developer's perspective, is the County's desire to remain more rustic, which makes it considerably easier to subdivide land and build gravel roads. He mentioned that current County policy is contradictory in that one clause states that roads need to be built to VDOT standards and another says you can do a private driveway and there seems to be no clear connection as to when one applies over another. He said that if the majority in the County want to keep it rural, sometimes making roads more expensive even if they are less appealing has a certain value to it. He added that there are a number of properties in the County that have the potential to be subdivided and the thing that could stop them is the cost of building a road is expensive. He concluded by saying that roads are expensive and can slow down development in some cases.

### 4. *New Business*

- **Public Outreach on Unpaved Roads**

Late August to early September County staff and VDOT conducted three public meetings with residents along six unpaved roads.

### **Swains Road (Route 739)**

Mr. Hopewell said that on Monday, August 29<sup>th</sup>, staff and VDOT met with residents along Swains Road (Route 739) to discuss their interest in having the road hard-surfaced as a Rural Rustic Road. He said that three options were presented and discussed with the residents.

1. Why Swains Road is not a suitable candidate for the Rural Rustic Program.
2. Traditional Construction and what it would entail along Swains Road.
3. Keeping Swains Road as a gravel road and continuing its current maintenance.

Mr. Hopewell said that residents were not opposed to Swains Road (Route 739) remaining gravel surfaced, however, in the past six to eight years they felt that the maintenance has not been as frequent or as well done as it had been in the past. Mr. Nesbit explained that their maintenance budget and staff had been significantly cut at around that time and that resources are currently stretched. He did meet with a team of residents to review the areas along the road that need the greatest maintenance and to look into the possibility of hard-surfacing the steep hills that wash out after rain to improve the condition of the gravel road.

### **Dulins Ford Road (Route 798) and Old Culpeper Road (Route 800)**

On Tuesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, staff and VDOT met with residents along Dulins Ford Road (Route 798) and Old Culpeper Road (Route 800) to discuss their interest in the roads being hard-surfaced as Rural Rustic Roads. Mr. Hopewell said that twenty-one residents attended the meeting, ten from Dulins Ford Road (Route 798) representing seven properties and eleven from Old Culpeper Road (Route 800) representing ten properties. Mr. Hopewell presented a map indicating the resident's responses at and following the meeting as well as comments received. He noted that the residents attending the meeting for both roads were overwhelmingly supportive of having their roads hard-surfaced as Rural Rustic Roads. Residents from each road also requested a high priority position in the Secondary Six-Year Plan (SSYP) to ensure that their road be hard surfaced as soon as possible.

### **Shenandoah Path (Route 607), Spring Mill Road (Route 823) and Stoney Road (Route 636)**

On Monday, September 12<sup>th</sup>, staff and VDOT met with residents along Shenandoah Path (Route 607), Spring Mill Road (Route 823) and Stoney Road (Route 636) in the Cedar Run/Lee Districts to discuss their interest in the hard surfacing of these roads as Rural Rustic Roads. He said that approximately twenty people attended the meeting from all three roads, seven from Shenandoah Path (Route 607) representing six properties, three from Spring Mill Road (Route 823) representing two properties, and nine from Stoney Road (Route 636) representing eight properties. He said that residents of all three roads were very supportive of having their roads hard surfaced. Mr. Hopewell referenced a map indicating the responses received at and following the meeting as well as comments from the residents.

Mr. Eltringham asked for the estimated cost of hard-surfacing each road in order to assist in making priority designations on the SSYP. He also said that staff should make each Board of Supervisors (BOS) member aware of roads being considered for hard-surfacing that are within their district.

- **Route 29 Interchange Design Discussion**

Mr. Nesbit told the Committee about a Route 29 interchange design update meeting VDOT held on November 12, 2016 with County Administrator, Mr. Paul McCulla, Community Development Director, Ms. Kimberley Fogle, and representatives from the Town of Warrenton. He introduced VDOT representative Mr. Hal Jones and reported that he will function as the project manager for the Route 29 Interchange Design Project.

Mr. Stone and Mr. Eltringham noted that associated with this project is the creation of a bicycle path/pedestrian walkway on both sides of the road for access to the community college and commercial businesses. Mr. Nesbit said that a bicycle path/pedestrian walkway will be part of the discussion as we go forward to develop this project.

Mr. Jones said that the bypass was designed in the 1970s and at that time the interchange was designed at the location of the intersection now. He noted that the configuration of that interchange was a trumpet shape, which did not accommodate access from the east side of the bypass. Also in the 1970s, he said that VDOT purchased right-of-way in this area in which to build an interchange. He said the 1980 bypass plans showed a temporary connection for where the intersection is now. He reviewed funding for the project and reminded the Committee that the project was submitted to Smart Scale with an original application amount of \$43 million. He said that the project received \$26.9 million with preliminary engineering estimated at \$2.5 million, right-of-way and utility work estimated at \$2.5 million, and the balance, approximately \$22 million, to be put toward construction. Looking at this with a design, build and delivery project, preliminary engineering has begun with new traffic counts being taken. He noted that as a federally funded project, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process must be followed. A part of the NEPA process is to look at traffic counts and delineate wetlands and streams in the project area.

Currently, Mr. Jones is reviewing concept studies done in 2010 and more recently concepts done with a VDOT consultant, to hone in on the best configuration for the interchange which for now, is a diamond interchange that provides good access and maximum flexibility for future adjustments. Mr. Jones said that the project is moving from the concept stage to the preliminary design stage and the future schedule includes a public hearing tentatively scheduled for late spring (May) 2017. The schedule includes engaging stakeholders along the way so by the public hearing in the spring of 2017 there will be no surprises. Mr. Eltringham asked if the Committee would see pictures prior to the public hearing and Mr. Jones said that there are no preliminary designs to bring to the Committee yet as VDOT is just moving into the preliminary design stage. Mr. Jones said that possibly in January VDOT may have preliminary designs to bring to this Committee as the NEPA process calls for a noise analysis and VDOT anticipates that the outcome of the analysis may necessitate the need for noise walls to be incorporated in the design.

Mr. Sheedy asked Mr. Jones if he has any insight as to why the project received significantly less than the \$43 million VDOT and staff had requested. He also asked if VDOT has a clear plan for what the reduced funding of \$26.9 million affords and why this is the right number for the interchange. Mr. Jones said he does not have knowledge as to why application funding was reduced. Mr. Sheedy said his concern is that with arbitrary cuts in funding you may not be able to reach the full scope of the project. Mr. Jones said

that even with reduced funding, VDOT's objective is to get a full design for the interchange and ease the two primary problems of congestion and safety. However, he said that it may be that VDOT cannot provide every request that was in the Smart Scale application. He mentioned in particular, a twenty-space park and ride facility and a Journey Through Hallowed Ground component that impacted the scoring. He said VDOT will be doing cost estimates along the way and if the findings suggest that we will not be able to afford the full construction we will have to cut out some of the components and then rescore the project internally so as to not go afoul of the Smart Scale funding. He added that the project will have to maintain a score that is equal to or better than the original application score.

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

### **Markham Rest Area**

Mr. Nesbit told the Committee that on August 31, 2016 VDOT and the County conducted an open house meeting for residents regarding the possibility of a truck rest area in Markham. He said that approximately eighty-four residents signed into the meeting to ask questions and express their concerns. He added that the comment period remained open until September 10 and VDOT received nearly ninety comments on the rest area. He said that seventy-nine percent of the comments did not support the project, eighteen comments were in support of the project, and three percent did not state a preference.

Mr. Nesbit said that area land owners and residents citing a range of potentially negative effects, objected to the rest area and because of the strong opposition, VDOT has decided to delay the implementation of the truck rest area and to study other alternatives that were suggested in the study. Opposition to the project included cost, location, environmental impact to wildlife, poor lighting, and a deficit in the needed number of parking spaces. He said that a letter noting the suspension of the project was sent to County Board of Supervisors Chairman Chris Granger. He added that a stakeholder group has been initiated to study other alternatives for a truck rest area location.

### **Smart Scale Applications**

Mr. Hopewell noted that six Smart Scale applications for FY 2018-2023 have been submitted. He offered to go over each application briefly, but as the Smart Scale applications were thoroughly reviewed at the July 27, 2016 meeting, the Committee felt no need to revisit each application in detail.

Mr. Eltringham commented on Priority #5 as he feels it is important that in any communication from the County on the Route 29/Route 215 vertical alignment improvements that the context sensitive nature of the Buckland Battlefield be mentioned. He is not opposed to the project, but expressed the importance of fixing it with the understanding of the context sensitive nature of the Buckland Battlefield.

### **VRE Gainesville-Haymarket Extension Study**

Mr. Hopewell mentioned that on December 7, 2016 VRE will hold a third public meeting to provide an opportunity to review updated ridership forecasts and cost estimates, ask questions about VRE expansion options, and comment on the evaluation of station, yard, and terminus alternatives to advance for further study.

## **6. Citizens' Time**

Mr. Michael Switzer and Ms. Judy Olsen residents along Dulins Ford Road (Route 798) were in attendance to support the hard surfacing of the road.

Mr. Switzer asked for an update on the Waterloo Bridge. Mr. Nesbit stated that at the April 14, 2016 meeting, the BOS initiated a resolution requesting 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.

## **7. Member Comments**

Mr. Nesbit wanted to make the Committee aware of a small project that will have big implications in the Opal area. He reported that in order to address safety issues on the Route 15/17/29 southbound approach to the signalized intersection with Frontage Road FR 1077, VDOT plans to close off access to Route 17 southbound from Frontage Road FR 1077. He continued by saying that this access restriction will be accomplished by closing Frontage Road FR 1077 approximately 0.80 mile south of the intersection with Route 15/17/29. He said that at this location, a U-turn facility will be constructed to redirect traffic onto Route 17 northbound and back to Route 15/17/29 southbound, where vehicles will use the loop ramp south of Opal to access Route 17 southbound.

He assured the Committee that local access to commercial and residential entrances will not be restricted by this alteration. Local traffic will continue to access their properties by using Frontage Road FR 1077 and the planned U-turn facility. Local traffic will use the loop ramp in the same way as through traffic on Route 15/17./29 in order to access Route 17 southbound. He said that the project will be implemented within the next four to six weeks and will take approximately two-weeks to complete. The project is being funded with highway safety funds at an estimated cost of one-hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. Nesbit noted that VDOT will hold a public hearing on December 6, 2016 on the design of safety improvements planned for Route 15/17/29 north of Opal. He said the hearing will run from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at Liberty High School. VDOT proposes to make changes to Route 15/17/29 north of Opal to reduce crash potential in four locations as phase one of a two-phase project. The changes include closing two median crossovers and reconfiguring two crossovers. Funding is expected to come from the federal highway safety improvement program.

Mr. Eltringham asked about the upcoming meeting schedule for 2017. Ms. Garreau said that the frequency of meetings is dependent upon the number of agenda items. She reminded the Committee that the next big agenda item is the Secondary Road Six-Year Plan. Mr. Hopewell said that Committee discussion on the Private Street Policy is important as staff plans to bring the

policy to the BOS within the first half of 2017. Mr. Eltringham said that much of the work can be done via email.

Sheriff Robert Mosier made the Committee aware that the Sheriff's Department has implemented the position of commercial truck inspector and is working on a plan to have this person in areas where truck traffic is heavy. He also let the Committee know that the Sheriff's Department has increased the number of TEAM assignments (Traffic Enforcement and Monitoring Assignments) in different County locations where many complaints have been received and is trying to dedicate resources to traffic safety enforcement across the board. He reported that there are a lot of "hot spots" in different areas of the County and they are trying to pull together non-reportable data to support reportable crash data to assist VDOT and this Committee in decision making.

Mr. Eltringham said that in the past the Committee had made some requests of the State to limit truck traffic in the County, in particular on Zulla Road (Route 709). He felt it might be helpful for the commercial truck inspector to obtain this file. He commented that the Committee felt that Zulla Road (Route 709) was being used by bootleg loggers and you can tell this because of the maintenance requirements on the road. He feels that the maintenance requirements on the road is pretty good evidence that trucks have been using them in volume. He believes this file would provide good evidence of the Committee's concerns and that they have probably gotten worse over time.

**8. *Adjournment***

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m. The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, January 25, 2017.**