

**MINUTES OF
FAUQUIER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
January 25, 2017**

5:00 P.M.

*2nd Floor Conference Room – Warren Green Building
10 Hotel Street
Warrenton, VA 20186*

Members Present: Chair, Jim Stone; Vice-Chair, Matthew Sheedy; Chris Butler, Peter S. Eltringham, Patrick Mauney, Dave Newman, Mark Nesbit

Members Absent: Adrienne Garreau, Rick Gerhardt

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
Lt. Colonel Robert Wilcox, Fauquier County Sheriff's Office

Staff Present: Kimberley Fogle, Marie Pham, Maureen Williamson

1. Election of Officers

Action: *On a motion made by Mr. Eltringham and seconded by Supervisor Butler, it was moved to elect Mr. Stone as Chair of the Transportation Committee. The motion carried unanimously.*

Action: *On a motion made by Mr. Eltringham and seconded by Mr. Stone, it was moved to elect Mr. Sheedy as Vice-Chair of the Transportation Committee. The motion carried unanimously.*

2. Citizens Time

There were no citizens for citizen's time.

3. Approval of October 26, 2016 Committee Meeting Minutes

ACTION: *On a motion made by Mr. Eltringham and seconded by Mr. Sheedy, it was moved to approve the October 26, 2016 meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously.*

4. Adoption of the 2017 Work Program and Meeting Schedule

The 2017 Work Program and Meeting Schedule were presented. In order to meet Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) April 1, 2017 deadline for submission of projects to the Secondary-Six-Year Plan, Ms. Pham noted that the March 2017 Committee meeting date has been moved up by one week. Generally the Committee meets the last Wednesday of the month, but in March, it will meet on March 22, to accommodate the VDOT deadline.

Action: On a motion made by Mr. Stone and seconded by Mr. Eltringham, it was moved to approve the adoption of the 2017 Work Program and the 2017 Committee Meeting Schedule, as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

5. January 2017 – VDOT Monthly Report

Warrenton Interchange Update

VDOT Project Manager Hal Jones updated the Committee on the Warrenton Interchange Design Project. Since his initial briefing to the Committee at the October 26, 2016 meeting, Mr. Jones said that in preparation for the May 9, 2017 (tentative date) public hearing, VDOT has met with stakeholder groups including the Fauquier County Sheriff's Office, Lord Fairfax Community College, and the Fauquier County School Board Office and has received positive comments from each about the project. Mr. Jones reports holding another stakeholder meeting this evening with a group of approximately twenty-four residents who live on the east side of Route 29 in the area of the interchange. At this meeting, residents will receive a similar briefing as to what the Committee heard at their initial project briefing. Upcoming stakeholder group sessions include meetings with Piedmont Environmental Council and area business owners in order to give key groups an early look at what is planned for the project. Ms. Fogle asked how County staff and the Town of Warrenton are being involved in the project. Mr. Nesbit said that a meeting to include County staff and Town of Warrenton staff will be scheduled in the near future.

Mr. Jones presented the initial concept plan for the interchange and said that currently VDOT is working on forecasted traffic and reviewing initial traffic analysis for the plan. He said that VDOT expects the review will be completed within the next two weeks and the outcome may determine if modifications need to be made to the concept plan.

Mr. Jones said that in June 2017, VDOT plans to issue a request for qualifications to design/build offerors. This will include VDOT holding a project information meeting for interested construction groups and their teams. After this VDOT will move through a qualifications selection process where VDOT will short-list three design/build teams and issue each a request for proposal, which includes a contract and concept drawings. Three firms will then issue to VDOT their proposed design, project cost, and work schedule. VDOT will evaluate firms based on price and qualifications. It is a best value contract. The procurement process can take four to five months and he hopes to have notice to proceed issued by April 2018.

Ms. Fogle asked how much construction groups can deviate from the concept plan. Mr. Jones said that they can deviate quite a bit, but they do so at their own risk as proposed deviations will have to be evaluated against the initial VDOT concept plan. Risk analysis is part of the process that VDOT engages in internally. VDOT accepts alternative technical concept plans submitted by construction groups; however, the deviations will be evaluated on their merits. This makes it all the more important for VDOT to remain engaged with stakeholder groups along the way as the project will have a certain amount of fluidity that may necessitate frequent updates. Value engineering and cost savings are embedded in the process as VDOT strives for the lowest estimated price.

Mr. Jones said the concept drawing shows the shared use path throughout the paving limits which goes across the bridge and ties into Turkey Run Drive (Route 882). The ramp is aligned on the existing Lord Fairfax Road (Route 880) and the bridge will be slightly north of where the intersection is now. The reason for this is to utilize the existing intersection as long as possible.

Mr. Eltringham asked about signals at the interchange. Mr. Jones said that the traffic analysis will determine if there is a need for signalization at the intersection. However, VDOT anticipates if there are two left turn lanes a signal will be necessary. The design year for the interchange is 2040 and VDOT is also looking at a 2030 design year to determine if we cannot build everything what could we accomplish with the main portion being the grade separation which would take us out to 2030.

Mr. Eltringham asked about the amount of right-of-way involved in the project. Mr. Jones said that while there are no limits on the concept plan as it is primarily temporary easements for grading that will be needed. Utilities, drainage, and stormwater management will each impact right-of-way.

Mr. Eltringham asked if significant drainage or geophysical changes will impact property owners. Mr. Jones noted that the Turkey Run tie in, as it is shown on the concept plan, will require a considerable fill because VDOT will be going up in grade along Lord Fairfax Road (Route 880) to get across the road. Supervisor Butler asked if the road was going to be super elevated and Mr. Jones replied that it is an urban low-speed design; therefore, it is only a two percent super elevation. He commented that the location on Route 29 is actually a high point which is convenient as without it, VDOT would need to provide clearance for the bridge. The project includes two drainage sheds going north and south. There is a good amount of area in the existing right-of-way for stormwater management certainly on the southeastern quadrant.

Supervisor Butler asked for the weight capacity of the bridge. Mr. Jones replied that there is no weight restriction on the bridge.

Mr. Sheedy asked if VDOT had to make any significant design reductions to meet the \$26.9 million budget. Mr. Jones said that the concept plan reflects what VDOT believes to be an ultimate configuration that meets all of the needs of the interchange. Mr. Eltringham asked about the possibility of a roundabout. Mr. Jones said that the use of a roundabout is still one of the working concepts being considered. Mr. Eltringham commented that a roundabout might abate the need for signalization and mitigate traffic back-ups. Mr. Jones said that there is a similar project in Richmond which is utilizing the roundabout design at the end of a ramp terminal. Mr. Eltringham commented that the elevation is not friendly to a roundabout and Mr. Jones added that it covers a bigger footprint and is less pedestrian and bicycle friendly. Mr. Eltringham asked about creation of a bicycle path/pedestrian walkway on both sides of the road for access to the community college and commercial businesses. Mr. Jones said the concept shows a shared use path along the entire eastern side where we are changing pavement and runs up to Business 15.

Mr. Sheedy asked about the timing of the need for future improvements. Mr. Jones said that he hopes that the design of the interchange will satisfy the needs through 2040. Mr. Newman asked for the duration of construction of the intersection. Mr. Jones offered a ballpark construction timeframe of two years. He said that a construction time determination has not yet been done and that in a couple of weeks VDOT will have good data on the traffic analysis which will either verify

that this is a good concept or allow us to review other concepts. VDOT is at a stage where they are starting to quantify the project to get a first cost estimate for the concept plan. They would like to offer incentives on projects where they are warranted; however, the constraining budget makes it difficult, but this is something VDOT is looking to do to try to facilitate a quicker construction completion date. Currently a 2020 completion date was noted.

Ms. Fogle asked if an electronic version of the concept plan is available. Mr. Jones said that he will forward an electronic version of the concept plan to Ms. Pham.

Supervisor Butler asked Mr. Jones to notify him and Supervisor Gerhardt via email with the numbers on turnout and any comments that come out of tonight's stakeholders meeting.

January 2017 – VDOT Monthly Report

Mr. Davison gave a brief overview of the January 2017 monthly report and touched upon the following highlights:

Projects in Development

Route 15/17/29 Median HSIP Improvements (Phase I)

Mr. Davison told the Committee that VDOT held a public hearing for this project on December 6, 2016. Since the public hearing, he reported that there have been changes made to the project and VDOT has pulled back the scope of work. Originally the work spanned from the Quarles Truck Stop intersection crossover south to the Opal intersection and due to some design issues related to the crossovers at Clark Brothers and East Coast businesses, VDOT thought it best to get the work at Quarles Truck Stop completed first. VDOT reported that they would like to keep the same ad date of spring 2017. Items excluded from Phase I will be included in Phase II of the same project.

Route 622, Whiting Road, Railroad Crossing

Mr. Davison noted that this project has not been recommended for Smart Scale funding. Mr. Nesbit said that the score is a preliminary scoring or recommendation by staff and will not be official until June. He also said the project is being considered by VDOT as a Revenue Share project. He added that partial funding has been identified and said the next project milestone is to identify the remaining funding.

Ms. Fogle asked if any of the professional engineering done to date is useful. Mr. Nesbit confirmed that a portion of the professional engineering has been done, but believes VDOT is looking towards construction funding to finish the project. VDOT is hoping to use a portion of unpaved roads funding as there is some remnant right-of-way at the south side of the railroad crossing that appears has never been abandoned. She asked Mr. Nesbit if he thought there is a possibility of having State forces do the project as the cost increased significantly when the County had to look at it from the standpoint of going out to bid and hiring outside forces. Mr. Nesbit said that the railroad crossing would have to be done by contractors and that it is not something that could be done by outside forces.

Supervisor Butler asked who, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors (BOS), a letter could be sent in support of the Route 622, Whiting Road, Railroad Crossing project. Mr. Nesbit noted that a letter on behalf of the project could be sent to two Commonwealth Transportation Board representatives

including Mr. Greg Yates, at-large rural representative, and Alison De Tuncq, Culpeper District member. Ms. Pham agreed to forward their contact information to Supervisor Butler.

Route 602 - Rogues Road

Mr. Davison confirmed that this project includes the stretch of road from Edington Drive (Route 1653) to Finch Lane (future Route 652). Mr. Eltringham asked Mr. Nesbit how County staff is being involved now that the project is moving towards the project scoping milestone. Mr. Nesbit said that VDOT is in the process of approving the typical section connecting Edington Drive (Route 1653) to the high school with plans to widen the shoulders and lanes. VDOT is also extending turn lanes up to Finch Lane (future Route 652). VDOT will work with the county to schedule an update of the project during an upcoming meeting of this Committee.

Upcoming Bridge Maintenance Activities

Route 787 – Watery Mountain Bridge

Mr. Davison confirmed that the bridge is under construction. He informed the Committee that VDOT has scheduled a one-night closure for February 1, 2017. All property owners have been made aware of the closure and VDOT has made accommodations to get residents to and from their homes.

Traffic Engineering Studies

Route 29 from Route 651 to Route 28 – Safety Review

Supervisor Butler asked about the safety review of the Route 28 and Route 651 to Route 28 stretch. Mr. Davison said the safety review is in relation to a fatality that occurred at this location. Supervisor Butler proposed a crossover somewhere between Route 28 and Route 651 for enforcement purposes. Mr. Nesbit said that VDOT has not finalized their response, but he is working with traffic enforcement and will share his response within the next two weeks.

6. Old Business

- **FY 18-23 Secondary Roads Six-Year Plan (SSYP) – Unpaved Roads**

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that each spring staff is asked to update the Secondary Roads Six-Year Plan (SSYP). She said she would like to take this plan to the Board at its April meeting as a finalized version is due to VDOT in May. She also reminded the Committee that in the fall of 2016 staff was completing outreach to residents about the possible hard surfacing of five gravel roads including:

1. Shenandoah Path (Route 607)
2. Stoney Road (Route 636)
3. Dulins Ford Road (Route 798)
4. Old Culpeper Road (Route 800)
5. Spring Mill Road (Route 823)

She said that all of these unpaved roads, excluding Stoney Road (Route 636), are currently included in the FY 17-22 SSYP. Staff heard favorable comments from residents along all five of the roads in regard to hard surfacing. She presented a copy of the mapped resident responses received to date. Given that none of the residents along any of the roads have

expressed opposition to having their road hard surfaced, the Committee is tasked with prioritizing the order to hard surface the unpaved roads. To assist in this process, she presented cost estimates for hard surfacing these roads with the exception of Stoney Road (Route 636), which she estimated based on other roads of similar length. She noted the County has over \$4 million in the SSYP to spend on paving. The priority presented is based on what was in the plan last year and it is subject to change.

Mr. Sheedy commented that in the past the Committee has discussed how a road qualifies for the Rural Rustic Program and asked if there were guidelines to follow to determine the prioritization of the roads for inclusion in the SSYP. Ms. Pham said that it is completely up to the County as to the prioritization of the roads. Mr. Eltringham said that in the past, the Committee reviewed safety, traffic data, and a consensus of the residents along the road. Mr. Sheedy asked if there are any safety issues on the five proposed roads. Ms. Pham and VDOT confirmed that there are no known safety issues on the five roads. Mr. Sheedy said that looking at the number of residents served per dollar spent and at the percentage of residents in favor of hard surfacing, he proposed the following prioritization:

1. Stoney Road (Route 636)
2. Dulins Ford Road (Route 798)
3. Old Culpeper Road (Route 800)
4. Spring Mill Road (Route 823)
5. Shenandoah Path (Route 607)

In regard to Shenandoah Path (Route 607), Ms. Pham reminded the Committee of having had a previous discussion with Ms. Marilyn Doyle, Transportation Supervisor with the School Board Transportation Office who spoke in favor of paving the road due to school busses having issues along the road in winter. Mr. Eltringham said that the only thing missing from the information presented is safety data on Shenandoah Path (Route 607) to further support its prioritization. Ms. Pham said she would check for safety data on Shenandoah Path (Route 607). Mr. Sheedy revised his prioritization proposal by moving Shenandoah Path (Route 607) to priority number one due to the safety concern for school busses traveling the road during the winter. Committee members were in agreement with the proposed prioritization.

Ms. Pham said that the next step is the crafting of the resolution to submit to the BOS for approval. Ms. Pham said that this topic will be on the February 2017 meeting agenda.

7. New Business

- **Information on Bringing Private Streets into the State System**

Ms. Pham noted that at the last meeting Mr. Eltringham had asked for clarity as to how a private street is brought into the state system. Ms. Pham provided a brief overview of the process and said that this process will be included in Chapter 10, the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

- **FY 18-23 Primary Roads and Interstate Roads Six-Year Plan (SYIP)**

Ms. Pham said that in the past the county was asked to submit a prioritized list of interstate and primary road improvements to VDOT. The Committee reviewed a copy of the approved

resolutions for the FY 17-22 SYIP priorities. Ms. Pham asked for the Committee's assistance in reviewing these resolutions and determine if the priorities have changed and if there are any additional projects that should be included or deleted from the lists. She noted that the County will have to submit these projects for the Smart Scale prioritization process and the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) will then select projects for funding based on the score/benefit. She advised that the lists need to be finalized by March in order to take this information to the BOS in the April/May timeframe.

Ms. Pham noted that there is question as to whether VDOT needs the prioritized lists as the County will also be submitting these same projects to the Smart Scale prioritization process. It may not be necessary to submit both a prioritized list to VDOT in addition to submitting projects through the Smart Scale process. The county is waiting for clarification from VDOT. Ms. Pham was hesitant to say that the Committee does not have to do the prioritization for VDOT, but said that it may be extra work and will not do anything for us if this is not the way funding is allocated. However, Mr. Eltringham noted that having a BOS resolution ready may carry some weight in particular if a Committee member, Board Supervisor or staff feels it necessary to testify on behalf of a project before the CTB.

Mr. Mauney said that certainly some of the projects that got submitted this year were not in the Secondary Plan, but he believes it is a valuable discussion to have in terms of looking through the list to discern if it is time to rework them if not for a resolution but for the County's prioritization internally. Ms. Pham reported discussing with VDOT the development of a process to determine what are the County's priorities in terms of roadway projects and then how do we go about determining which ones we are suitable for submitting for Smart Scale funding.

Ms. Pham said that this topic will be on the February 2017 meeting agenda.

Mr. Eltringham asked for the status of priorities 1-9 on the Primary Roads Six-Year Improvement Program:

1. Route 15/29 and Route 215.
 - Safety and operational improvements at the intersection of Route 15/29 and Route 215
 - Submitted to Smart Scale in 2016 to correct the vertical alignment
2. Route 28
 - Complete Phase I corridor improvements from Route 15/29 to Route 17
 - Widening and resurfacing scheduled for summer 2017
3. 15/29/East Shirley Avenue (near Lord Fairfax Road)
 - Replace an existing signal with a grade separated interchange at the intersection of Route 15/17/29 and Business Route 15/17/29
 - Project submitted for funding and work is in progress
4. Vint Hill Road (Route 215) and Broad Run Church Road (Route 600)
 - Intersection improvements to Vint Hill Road and Broad Run Church Road to accommodate turning movements
 - The County will apply for VDOT Revenue Share funding

5. Route 28
 - Improve safety and visibility at the intersection of Route 28 and Bristersburg Road (Route 616)/Bastable Mill Road (Route 603)
 - A Smart Scale application was submitted and the project was not recommended for funding
6. Route 15/29
 - No application submitted
7. Business 17
 - No application submitted
8. Route 17 through Bealeton
 - No application submitted
9. Route 17 (North of Warrenton)
 - Transportation alternative program funds

Mr. Sheedy asked if any applications have been made for the Interstate Highway Six-Year Improvement Program. Ms. Pham replied that they have not, saying that the focus is to submit projects that will score well and have the chance to get funded.

Mr. Sheedy agrees with Mr. Eltringham that the Committee needs to find out what the BOS needs and wants and to find out how we can be helpful.

Mr. Eltringham sees value in going through the prioritization and resolution process and knowing as a Committee that the BOS has resolved our priorities because in a dynamic environment of resources and funding, it would be beneficial to have a list of priorities ready so as to take part in additional funding opportunities. He continued by saying that if our priorities are well known when other types of government monies become available, it may be our projects chosen for funding.

Ms. Pham asked the Committee to review the resolutions to verify if projects are in the right priority order and if there are recommendations for the adding and/or deleting of projects. She said that this topic will be on the February 2017 meeting agenda.

8. Staff Updates

Smart Scale Applications

Ms. Pham updated the Committee as to the scoring of the County's six projects submitted for Smart Scale FY 2018-2023 funding. She reported that all six of the projects scored too low to be recommended for funding.

Ms. Pham addressed handouts distributed at the meeting. The first handout reflected statewide how many projects were recommended for funding within each construction district and how much money was available for funding. She reminded the Committee that Smart Scale projects are funded from two different pots of money. She said the first funding source is the District Grant Program (DGP) which funds top scoring projects within each district eligible for DGP funds using High Priority Project (HPP) funds until remaining funds are insufficient to fund the next highest scoring project.

She said that the second pot of money the district competes for statewide are the HPP funds and there is just over \$658 million available for statewide funding. Similar to last year, the CTB went through and said that projects that were only submitted for the statewide funds that otherwise would not qualify, the district grant fund were funded first with \$23 million worth of projects there with the remaining funds they went through and funded projects statewide.

The second table she presented focused on Culpeper District funding. She said there were thirty-five projects submitted in the Culpeper District, nine of those are being recommended for funding. Only three were recommended to be funded with district grant funds and six more are recommended for funding using state funds. She said our highest scoring project was the safety improvement at Schoolhouse Road (Route 661) and Route 28 and it is ranked sixteenth within the construction district and ranked 176 out of 403 projects statewide. She reported that the lowest scoring project was Rogues Road (Route 602) to do construction between Dumfries Road (Route 605) and Edington Drive (Route 1653) and that one scored 348 out of 403 projects within the state.

Ms. Pham said that it was mentioned at the CTB meeting that all of the projects in Culpeper District are in Albemarle County, Charlottesville, and the Town of Warrenton. Mr. Sheedy asked if Charlottesville has an advantage or do the scores reflect the fact that they have more serious traffic issues. Ms. Pham said that through her initial review, looking at who scored well and who received the top scores as opposed to our projects, it appears to be an issue which we discussed last year. When the scores are normalized, which means if Northern Virginia relieves congestion by 50,000 hours because of an improvement on Interstate 66 and we improve it by 10,000 hours because we do not have the traffic on our roads nor the person throughput they have we get cut down significantly because they get 100 percent of the points and we get whatever fraction we are of their high score.

Ms. Pham said that the Committee may recall that last year the interchange was recommended and we were fortunate to have that project funded. One of the things that happened last year was when the CTB combined construction district grant funds with statewide funding to fund the next highest project in each district that qualified for both pots of money. This is how the County got the interchange funded last year. When the CTB met in October 2016, they removed this step and passed a resolution saying that we are no longer combining funds to fund a project.

Ms. Pham said that there is approximately \$47 million that is unallocated this year and the CTB still has the option to allocate this money to other projects in the state or hold onto this money and save it for next year's funding. She said that looking at the chart for the Culpeper District, even if they continue to fund projects, she is concerned that our projects are ranked too low to receive funding.

Mr. Mauney added that Broadview Avenue was submitted to Smart Scale last year and one of the things that the Town and VDOT did this year was to split it into two different projects. The Town also bought down some of the cost total of \$8.6 million and asked for only \$5.3 million. In Charlottesville, the Exit 118 WB 1-64/NB Route 29 project was submitted last year at a much greater cost than they submitted this year. They went back and looked at the project and found a way to get similar benefits from a smaller project.

Ms. Pham reported receiving these scores late and has not had the opportunity to fully analyze them and prepare a presentation. She plans to do this and bring her analysis back to the Committee at the February 2017 meeting.

Mr. Sheedy said that his takeaway is that the system can be to some degree manipulated by buying down the amount asked for or separating out different parts of the project. His request is that staff review how these projects were scored and what we can take away from that.

Joint Planning Commission Work Session with Culpeper County

On Thursday, November 17, 2016, Fauquier County Planning Commission conducted a joint work session with Culpeper County to discuss projects near the counties' border. Mr. Sam McLearn, Culpeper County's Director of Planning and Zoning, mentioned that transportation improvements associated with the Clevenger's Corner development are planned and most residents will commute north and travel through Warrenton.

Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan

Route 28 Improvements

Staff held a work session with the Planning Commission last week to discuss the improvements on Route 28. The Bealeton Plan discusses the Bealeton Bypass and realigning Route 28 to the south to provide access closer to the airport and get regional Route 28 traffic out of Bealeton to allow those streets to function more like a main street than the thoroughfare it functions as today. The Planning Commission directed staff to keep the Bealeton Bypass in the Plan along with the realignment of Route 28 to the south and they have also asked staff to do intersection improvements at Route 28 such as including turn lanes and pull offs and potentially widening in some areas to allow larger vehicles, particularly farm vehicles to have places to pull off to allow for vehicles to safely pass. There was also some discussion about the intersection of Route 28/Route 29 to look at alternative intersection improvements there rather than adding turn lanes at that signal to help with the capacity and safety improvements in that area.

Mr. Eltringham asked if there is a draft of the chapter that the Committee could review. Ms. Pham said that more clarity will be provided at the February 2017 meeting.

Buckland Bypass Study

Ms. Pham told the Committee that Prince William County has reinitiated the Buckland Bypass Study. She said the first meeting is Thursday, January 26th at 7:00 p.m. in Haymarket at Haymarket Elementary School at 15500 Learning Lane. Supervisor Trumbo, Ms. Fogle and Ms. Pham will attend the meeting as representatives of Fauquier County.

9. Member Comments

There were no member comments.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:33 p.m. The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, February 22, 2017.**