

**MINUTES OF
FAUQUIER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
February 22, 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, Rick Gerhardt, Adrienne Garreau, Peter S. Eltringham, Patrick Mauney, Dave Newman, Mark Nesbit

Guests Present: Roy Tate, Virginia Department of Transportation
Greg Banks, Virginia Department of Transportation
Ben Davison, Virginia Department of Transportation
Darryl Shifflett, Virginia Department of Transportation
Sheriff Robert P. Mosier, Fauquier County Sheriff's Office
Lieutenant Mike Zeets, Fauquier County Sheriff's Office
Haley Kennedy, Student
Joe Evans, Student

Staff Present: Marie Pham, Fran Williams

1. Citizens Time

Supervisor Chris Butler introduced two government interns, Ms. Haley Kennedy and Mr. Joe Evans, who joined the meeting for educational purposes.

2. Approval of the January 25, 2017 Committee Meeting Minutes

ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. Stone and seconded by Mr. Sheedy, it was moved to approve the January 25, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

On page 5, under the Route 602 - Rogues Road project, referring to Mr. Nesbit saying that he will schedule a meeting with staff to give an update to the Committee, Ms. Garreau asked about the timeframe for the meeting. Mr. Nesbit said that there is a good possibility that an update will be provided at the March 22, 2017 meeting.

3. February 2017 – VDOT Monthly Report

Projects in Development:

Route 661, Schoolhouse Road, Intersection Improvements

Mr. Nesbit told the Committee that the contract has been awarded to General Excavation, Inc. to complete the road improvements at Cedar Lee Middle School. He noted an anticipated completion date of early August. He said that any work that will impact the school will be done during the summer months.

Route 622, Whiting Road, RR Crossing

Mr. Nesbit said that the project did not score well and therefore did not make the Smart Scale preliminary list of projects. He said that VDOT has done additional research and there may be other funding options for this project which will be discussed later in this meeting.

Traffic Engineering Studies:

Route 215/600 - Safety Review

Ms. Garreau asked for the next steps following the completion of the safety review. Mr. Nesbit said the turning movements were reviewed and traffic counts taken. The study determined that turn lanes are warranted. He said that a more detailed study is needed to determine whether a roundabout or a standard intersection improvement will be the least impactful to residential properties in the area. He also said that right-of-way will need to be obtained; there is 50 feet on Route 215 and Route 600 is prescriptive. The Committee strongly feels that property owners need to be made aware of the project particularly since right-of-way will need to be obtained. Ms. Pham said that the County will follow up with VDOT and bring the next steps to a future meeting of the Committee.

Route 245/55 in The Plains - Speed Study

Mr. Nesbit said the speed study was initiated due to a request from the town of The Plains as there are concerns with speed of traffic coming from the County into the town. The study included both approaches. He reported that the speed study is complete and VDOT is in the process of scheduling a meeting with the town of The Plains to review the results of the study. In an effort to support the town of The Plains, Ms. Garreau asked that the Committee be kept informed of VDOT's recommendations.

Route 29 from Route 651 to Route 28 – Safety Review

Supervisor Butler told the Committee that due to a recent fatal crash and citizen concerns, a review of Route 15/29 was conducted to determine if additional safety measures are warranted. The review resulted in several improvements that have been initiated or are planned. VDOT will hold a meeting with the Remington Town Council to discuss the results of the safety study. VDOT will invite concerned citizens to attend and let this be the forum to address concerns. Supervisor Butler noted that Ms. Pham is in possession of the safety report and will email a copy should anyone make a request.

4. *Old Business*

FY 2018-2023 Secondary Roads Six-Year Plan (SSYP) – Unpaved Roads

Ms. Pham introduced two VDOT representatives; Mr. Greg Banks and Mr. Darryl Shifflett, who attended the meeting to support the discussion of the FY 2018-2023 Secondary Roads Six-Year Plan (SSYP) – Unpaved Roads.

Ms. Pham made reference to an updated resolution that is to be used for this discussion. It was distributed at the start of the meeting.

Ms. Pham said that at the January 25, 2017 meeting, the Committee asked for crash data for the five roads it recommended adding to the FY 2018-2023 SSYP for unpaved roads. She reported that there was no crash data to report between 2010 and 2015 for the five unpaved roads the Committee is recommending for paving.

Ms. Pham said that current budget estimates indicate that even with the addition of these five roads to the unpaved road plan, there will still be roughly \$1.5 - \$2.0 million in unallocated funds by FY 2023. She reported that staff has been working with VDOT since the end of January about the possibility of using unpaved road funds to complete the construction of the railroad crossing on Whiting Road (Route 622) in Marshall at the 17/66 Industrial Park. In early February, VDOT confirmed that because the unpaved section of Whiting Road (Route 622) as well as the section of Whiting Road (Route 622) south of the railroad tracks is still in the state system, traffic counts are greater than fifty vehicles per day, and since it both exists as and is identified as an unpaved road, this project is eligible to be completed using unpaved road funds.

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that on November 10, 2005, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) added Whiting Road (Route 622) to the FY 2007-2012 SSYP. She said that since its inclusion in the SSYP, \$726,500 has been allocated to the project; however, current estimates indicate the project requires an additional \$1.3 million to complete the construction of the road at the railroad crossing. She explained that staff considers this a high priority project for the County given the development occurring at the 17/66 Industrial Park. In the fall of 2016, staff applied for both Smart Scale and VDOT Revenue Share funds without success. In order to facilitate development at the 17/66 Industrial Park, staff is recommending that the Committee consider including this as an unpaved road project in the FY 2018-2023 SSYP and prioritize this road above Shenandoah Path (Route 607), which is currently priority #9.

Staff also recommends that previous funds allocated to Shenandoah Path (Route 607) in FY 2018 instead go to Whiting Road (Route 622) and by July 2018 staff feels that the project will be fully funded. She said that funding for Shenandoah Path (Route 607) would begin accruing FY 2019-2021.

Ms. Garreau, adding upon Ms. Pham's earlier mention of the 17/66 Industrial Park, said that from a land use perspective, the BOS will soon receive the development plan for the commercial development that has been rezoned for many years. The development of the 17/66 Industrial Park project is a very important piece of the economic development and economic future of the County.

Supervisor Butler said as the commercial lots are developed, the area will see an increase in industrial traffic and it will become a safety issue with children playing from the townhome development. If traffic can be directed through Whiting Road versus behind the McDonald's it is a win for safety as well as economic development.

Mr. Sheedy told the Committee of a conversation he had with property broker Mr. Carter Wiley who has been marketing the property for ten years. Mr. Wiley said that it is not just the land at 17/66 that is beginning to generate interest it is also the land to the north between the railroad and Route 55 that is taking off as well. Mr. Sheedy said that Mr. Wiley also raised a concern for a potential safety issue near the entrance of the 17/66 Industrial Park. He explained that vehicles park alongside the townhome development on Whiting Road (Route 622) and as the Industrial Park

develops there is potential for parked vehicles, pedestrians and children playing to be hit by industrial traffic moving in and out of the Industrial Park. He noted that when the townhome complex was approved, the BOS and the developers created ample parking in the rear of the complex and hopes that drivers can be encouraged to use this parking area rather than street parking.

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that projects in the SSYP have two sources of VDOT funding: Telefee Funds and Unpaved Road Funds. She said that Telefee Funds can be used on any type of secondary road project and Unpaved Road Funds are used to hard surface unpaved roads. Related to the Rogues Road (Route 602) project, because the project was receiving old funding sources, it now has to be fully funded through construction. As a result, staff was putting all secondary funds to the project and reduced the scope to the stretch of road from Edington Drive (Route 1653) to Finch Lane (future Route 652). She said that the budget for this project is tight and in speaking with VDOT it may be possible to put the last year of funding, which totals \$195,000, onto the Rogues Road (Route 602) project. The Committee agreed to allocate the \$195,000 Telefee Funds for FY 2023 to the Rogues Road (Route 602) project. There is no other project receiving Telefee Funds.

Mr. Eltringham asked if anyone had concerns with either the priorities or the using of Telefee Funds for the Rogues Road (Route 602) project before the Committee votes on approval of the resolution. There were no comments made.

ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. Eltringham and seconded by Supervisor Butler, it was moved to approve the resolution which included the agreement to allocate \$195,000 of Telefee Funds for FY 2023 to the Rogues Road (Route 602) project for safety and operational improvements from Edington Drive (Route 1653) to Finch Lane (future route 652), the shifting of Whiting Road (Route 622) to priority #7, and the insertion of Stoney Road (Route 636) to priority #9. The motion carried unanimously.

FY 2018-2023 Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) Priorities for Primary and Interstate Roads

Ms. Pham said that at the January 25, 2017 Committee meeting, staff noted that the SYIP priorities for Primary and Interstate Roads was no longer required. Primary and interstate roads seeking funding must do so by applying for Smart Scale funding. As VDOT no longer requires a list of priorities for these roads by June 1st, staff is recommending that a listing of these prioritized projects instead be included with the County's Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan as an appendix. She noted that staff feels the list will carry more weight in the Comprehensive Plan as this document establishes government policy related to transportation and is still used as a reference by VDOT. This would also allow the Committee to revisit and update the priorities for primary and interstate roads as often as needed. Ms. Pham asked the Committee for their thoughts and/or concerns related to the inclusion of the priorities within the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Eltringham said that he is in agreement with Ms. Pham's statement that the inclusion of the primary and interstate road priorities as an appendix to the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan will make both documents stronger. He also noted that the Committee has

not yet been provided the opportunity to review the revision of the Transportation Chapter and said that he hoped the chance would come at a near future Committee meeting. Ms. Pham indicated that the revision is in process with the last piece being the development of a private street policy. She said she feels confident that a draft of the policy will be brought to the Committee for review at the March 22, 2017 meeting.

Ms. Garreau asked if the Committee had any objections to continuing to review and submit the list of primary and interstate road priorities on a yearly basis to VDOT and the BOS and also include them as an appendix to the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Nesbit said that since the method of funding the priorities has changed, a resolution from the BOS is no longer a requirement. The Committee felt that as VDOT is not the only customer of the document and as a reporting body to the BOS, it is the Committee's responsibility to keep the BOS informed as to the chosen priorities for all types of roads. Ms. Pham noted that staff would continue to seek yearly input from the Committee on primary and interstate road priorities for submission to the BOS for their resolution and also initiate their inclusion as an appendix to the Transportation Chapter.

5. *New Business*

Smart Scale Update

Supervisor Butler informed the Committee that the BOS sent a letter to Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) member, Ms. Alison DeTuncq, in regard to several observations and concerns about the prioritization process for the Smart Scale transportation funding. A copy of the communication was distributed to Committee members during the meeting.

At the January 25, 2017 meeting Ms. Pham presented the FY 2018-2023 Smart Scale scores and informed the Committee that all six of the projects submitted by the County scored too low to be recommended for funding. She reviewed the Smart Scale biennial process with regard to timing of submissions, Category C weighting system, the scoring process, and the normalization of scores. A PowerPoint presentation was used to illustrate Ms. Pham's analysis of the Smart Scale process and its impact to the County's submissions.

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that the State is divided into four categories – Categories A-D. Initially, she said, the County was put in Category B. She continued that when categories were originally determined, the CTB developed the category system based on quartiles, which looked at population, density and other factors. The category is dependent on where the area falls within the quartiles. At the beginning of the process, after categories were assigned, the CTB gave regions the opportunity to weigh in on whether they felt they were put into the appropriate category. At this time, staff requested to be moved from Category B to Category C.

Ms. Pham reviewed the current weighting system saying that 25% comes from Access to Jobs, 25% Economic Development, 25% Safety, 15% Congestion, and 10% Environmental Factors.

Ms. Pham reviewed the scoring process. She reported that once a project is submitted, it is given a measure value. Then scores are normalized with the highest scoring project receiving one hundred percent of the points. The normalized score is calculated as the percentage of the highest scoring project. For example, she said last year the interchange was nine percent of the total score of the highest scoring project for intermodal access so the normalized score was nine. While the high

scoring project received one hundred points, the interchange received nine points. This is calculated statewide. A weighted value is then calculated by multiplying the normalized value and by its weight. The weighted values are summed for the project's benefit. The benefit is divided by the project cost (in tens of millions of dollars) to determine the Smart Scale score. This is the score used to rank all of the projects.

In evaluating the scores, one of the significant issues staff saw statewide was a reduction in funding. Last year a total of \$1.7 billion was available to fund projects, whereas just over \$1.0 billion was available this year. Staff also saw a large cut to Culpeper District funding, which dropped from \$54 million to \$20 million. In addition, the number of projects submitted this round doubled. After seeing how the process worked last year, localities were smarter about how they chose to submit projects and as a result scores increased. Also last year, she said the CTB elected to combine High Priority Project or state funds with Construction District Grant funds in "Step 3" to ensure that every district received some state funding. It was this controversial step that gave the Culpeper District the interchange last year. As a result, the CTB passed a resolution to remove this step from the funding scenario. Lastly, as Ms. Pham noted having said before, the normalization of scores negatively impacted the Planning District Commission (PDC).

One of staff's concerns centers on the fact that the PDC's projects cannot compete with urban area projects as urban areas have more development, greater access to jobs, and more congestion. What staff has heard back from the CTB regarding this concern is that the percentage of their score for projects is so much lower that they are not getting as great a benefit as we do as we have a higher percentage. Ms. Pham does not feel this is necessarily true. Another response to this concern is that urban area project costs are so much higher than ours and said that a higher cost project cuts their score. While Ms. Pham believes this is true, staff does not see quite the change from this that we thought we would.

Using the PowerPoint presentation to show access to jobs, the highest scoring project received 2600 points. She said that the County comes nowhere near that. The County gets fifteen percent of our total score from this measure. The high scoring project costs \$50 million and the county's highest scoring project costs \$13 million. As a result, the highest scoring projects received almost two points where the District barely scored a tenth of a point. Multimodal access percentages were actually a little closer. However, there is still a big difference in scores an urban area project receives compared to what the county is receiving.

Turning to Economic Development support, she said that when you look at the number of points that they are receiving, over 23 million, and our highest scoring project received approximately 300,000. She said that this is a tremendous difference in terms of points. However, the highest scoring project earns only three percent of their total score from this whereas the county gets fifteen percent of the total score from this. She concluded that our scores are being cut so low from the start that we cannot compete.

Ms. Garreau asked why Schoolhouse Road (Route 661) and Rogues Road (Route 602) projects scored above Whiting Road (Route 622) in terms of Economic Development support. Ms. Pham said that it may depend on how close you are to the project and she will need to look back at applications to discern what happened.

When Ms. Pham went through and looked at Category A and the average cost of the projects submitted was about \$39 million. She said the average cost for Categories B, C, and D was between \$13 and \$15 million. While Category A projects are costing more, they are receiving hundreds of times the points than we can achieve. As a result, we do not see the mathematical balance. This is where the process is hurting us the most. As scores are normalized, we cannot compete.

Ms. Pham reviewed statewide what categories the projects were in that were in the top ten for funding. She found that sixty percent came from Categories A and B, which are urban areas. She continued saying that forty percent came from Categories C and D, which are the more rural categories. She still believes that when you start looking at how normalization plays out, it negatively impacts the rural areas. She explained that the County is not zoned to put in the Economic Development like Hampton Roads or the more urbanized areas. As a result of this process, Ms. Pham does not believe that the benefit scores depict the benefit a project would have to our area and our region.

Mr. Eltringham asked if other than the category weighting system list on slide 4, is there any definition of the CTB's intent with regard to these various categories. Ms. Pham responded that there is no set definition. The county's projects score highest in safety and environmental impact. As a result, the projects would score better in Category D than any of the other categories. When the county requested to be moved to Category C, safety was thirty percent in both Categories C and D and therefore it didn't matter if we were in Category C versus D. What we were requesting was to be in a category that had the highest percentage of the score from safety improvements. After the CTB agreed to move the PDC to Category C, the weighting system was altered and safety was reduced from 30% to 25%. To say that safety is in our highest priority we need to be in a category that reflects this. Therefore, staff is recommending to be moved to a category that fits better with our priorities.

Ms. Garreau asked if there is a possibility for the County to request a change of categories. Mr. Mauney said that what staff heard last year was once the policy was adopted by the CTB, the only way to change it is to have a CTB member request the change. He feels that to change policy, staff must work through CTB Culpeper District representatives, Ms. Alison DeTuncq and Mr. Greg Yates. Mr. Mauney agreed with Ms. Pham's assessment that at the time of the Rappahannock-Rapidan Region's request to be moved from Category B to Category C, it was with the understanding that in Category C, safety comprised thirty percent the category's total score. However, at the same time the Rappahannock-Rapidan Region was placed in Category C, the safety weighting was reduced to twenty-five percent and this could be used as reasoning for the request to move from Category C to Category D.

Mr. Mauney said that Economic Development is the only category of the five where the locality has the ability to present information to support the project. He informed the Committee that the other categories are scored by computer.

Mr. Eltringham asked if there is a way to compete within the category for funding and not against urban areas such as Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads. Ms. Pham looked at this and said that there are a select few projects from Categories C and D that had the highest scoring project. If projects are normalized by category, not statewide, Category A and B scores will also increase and will likely have little effect on our ranking.

Staff and CTB member, Ms. DeTuncq, have requested that a percent change be used for calculating economic development. In looking at this measure it is only five percent of Category A's total score, which means only three percent of their entire score comes from the Economic Development Support. If we are moved to Category D, it becomes twenty-one percent of our total score. Right now, in Category C, it is nine percent of the total score. Ms. Pham is not saying we go back to the percent change, but we ask the CTB to look at another way to analyze Economic Development Support because if it is such a large part of our score and such a low part of theirs, if they get zero points for three percent of their score it is not going to hurt them.

Staff is recommending that the Rappahannock-Rapidan Region be moved to Category D typology or a category where safety is going to be the highest. Ms. Pham reported that during a discussion with VDOT, the consensus was to seek projects that will score well in multiple measures. She found that at all Category C projects recommended for funding were scoring well in at least two to four different measures. Staff and VDOT also discussed reducing the project scope as a means of achieving a higher score. Mr. Nesbit added that he believes we need to look at service district areas where the County wants growth to be and said that Route 215/600 would probably score well. Ms. Garreau asked why Route 215/600 would score better than Route 29 and Vint Hill Road. Mr. Nesbit said that the crash history was not a severe crash history as it was more property damage type accidents and not the injury and fatality producing accidents. Ms. Garreau also asked if the Route 29 and Vint Hill Road project will change the priorities that VDOT has for the Culpeper District. He replied that the cost to fix the intersection was lower than the cost to fix the humps. Ms. Pham said because the project keeps the signal in the scope of work, the signals are known for creating the rear end collisions so we are only making so much of a safety improvement there. If the project was submitted without a signal, she feels the project would have scored higher. As an example, Ms. Pham noted that the Town of Warrenton submitted Broadview Avenue 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.

Ms. Pham noted that Culpeper District CTB representative, Alison DeTuncq, is available to meet with the Committee on Friday, March 10 at 1:00 p.m. Ms. Pham will send an email confirmation with meeting date and time to Committee members.

6. Staff Updates

Ms. Pham informed the Committee that Prince William County held their kickoff meeting for the Buckland Bypass Study on Thursday, January 26, 2017. Supervisor Trumbo, Kimberley Fogle and Ms. Pham attended the meeting representing the County. She said that in addition, VDOT had representatives from the Culpeper District including, Mark Nesbit, Joe Webb, Marshall Barron, and Dan Painter. Ms. Julie Bolthouse with the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) was also in attendance. Since the meeting, Ms. Pham has not heard from Prince William County regarding a second meeting.

Mr. Eltringham agreed with Ms. Pham's meeting notes found in the meeting's preparation package and would like to make a point that in regard to safety in particular around the Vint Hill Road area

that we would want to be more specific and talk about the Route 29 vertical alignment and the safety improvements at Route 215 on a corridor of statewide significance.

Mr. Eltringham said that this is a study that is looking for a problem to solve. He stated that the problem that they are trying to solve with the study is to establish a reason why there needs to be a by-pass. He said the reasons are not compelling.

Ms. Garreau would like to add to Mr. Eltringham's observation, that given Prince William County's initiation of the study and the schedule they have agreed to, they are not deterred from pushing the survey and the study forward. She stated that we need to take this very seriously.

Ms. Pham said that Ms. Bolthouse of PEC, was vocal during the meeting about the fact that Prince William County was saying this was the solution to the problem without first defining the problem and showing that this was the best solution.

Ms. Pham said that many citizens speaking in opposition to the by-pass, made several suggestions for alternatives including: removing signals to increase capacity, finish widening Route 15, and initiating projects listed in their Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Garreau said that the study that the firm is contracted to do does not require them to go back and figure out why they are doing the study. She stated that this should have been accomplished during the first study. She also said they are being paid to do the study and not to figure out why they are doing it.

Mr. Eltringham said that it needs to be communicated that when Fauquier County came to this meeting it did so with appointed representatives and County staff. He added that the County did not bring the host of people who are standing by to participate in this process who are not enamored by it. Ms. Garreau said that this was very clearly conveyed to Supervisor Lawson.

The Committee asked to be kept informed of any public meetings, public outreach, and project website updates.

Revenue Sharing

Ms. Pham told the Committee that one project was submitted for Revenue Sharing funding last fall – the Whiting Road (Route 622) railroad crossing. This project would construct the missing section of Whiting Road (Route 622) over Norfolk-Southern Railway for access as the 17/66 industrial park develops in Marshall. Due to recent changes in the priority that these projects are funded and the limited funding available, this project was not recommended for funding.

Ms. Garreau asked if Whiting Road (Route 622) is being addressed through the Rural Rustic Program, does this mean that the railroad crossing does not get widened. Mr. Nesbit said that the crossing has been designed for two-way traffic. He added that the project is not a Rural Rustic project and it will be of a higher standard than a Rural Rustic treatment.

Statewide Truck Parking Solution

Mr. Nesbit told the Committee about a presentation VDOT made to the CTB concerning the initiation of a pilot program to look at the usage of electronic automated apps to provide real-time information to the trucking community as to what spaces are available within a specific search area. He told the Committee that the CTB does have to approve the funding for implementation. Mr. Nesbit felt that Interstate 66 would be part of a pilot program. Mr. Newman commented that access to truck rest stop parking continues to be a hot button issue in all states and it is only going to get worse. He added that he is pleased that VDOT has initiated this study.

7. *Member Comments*

There were no member comments.

8. *Adjournment*

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