

**MINUTES OF  
FAUQUIER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
February 25, 2016**

**7:00 P.M.**

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

**Members Present:** Vice Chairman, Peter S. Eltringham, Jim Stone, Chris Butler, Adrienne Garreau, Matthew Sheedy, Dave Newman, Rick Gerhardt

**Members Absent:** Mark Nesbit, Jeffrey Walker

**Guests Present:** Ben Davison, Virginia Department of Transportation  
Richie Lillard, Virginia Department of Transportation  
Lieutenant Andrew Marshall, Fauquier County Sheriff's Office  
Captain Lowell Neville, Fauquier County Sheriff's Office

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

**1. Election of Officers**

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

**Action:** *On a motion made by Mr. Butler and seconded by Ms. Adrienne Garreau, it was moved to elect Mr. Matthew Sheedy as Vice Chair of the Transportation Committee. The motion carried unanimously.*

**2. Approval of October 28 2015, Committee Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Garreau asked staff to correct the misspelling of Mr. Sheedy's name at the top of Page 8.

Mr. Sheedy asked if staff had determined who owns the Waterloo Bridge. Ms. Marie Pham said the ownership is split between Fauquier and Culpeper Counties.

Mr. Sheedy asked for an update to the VRE Gainesville Haymarket Extension Study. Ms. Pham briefly spoke about Norfolk Southern conducting a study, which is expected to take a year to complete, in order to determine how well VRE will mesh with this corridor. She also said that VRE is doing their own preliminary studies to determine access to existing rail line and the likely need to expand the lines to provide the desired service. She informed the Committee that the next meeting is scheduled for the end of April and Ms. Pham will advise the Committee of the date once it is received.

***ACTION: On a motion made by Ms. Garreau and seconded by Mr. Butler, it was moved to approve the amended October 28, 2015 meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously.***

### ***3. Adoption of the 2016 Work Program and Meeting Schedule***

Ms. Pham discussed the following work items, which staff proposes be undertaken by the Transportation Committee throughout the calendar year 2016.

- Update the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan
- Update the FY 2017-2022 SYIP priorities and SSYP
  - Ms. Pham hopes to finalize Committee discussions at the March 30, 2016 meeting in order to take the recommended plan to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) as early as April, potentially May at the latest. June delivery date to VDOT.
  - Ms. Pham noted that Supervisor Trumbo would like to speak to the Transportation Committee at the March 30, 2016 meeting to discuss Rogues Road (Route 602). Therefore, the Committee will have some continued discussion at the March 30, 2016 meeting.
- SSYP Unpaved Road Public Outreach
  - Ms. Pham has additional roads that she is recommending adding. Public outreach will have to be done for these roads as well.

A tentative 2016 meeting schedule was reviewed by Ms. Pham who said the Committee will need to meet again in March to finalize the FY 2017-2022 SYIP priorities and SSYP for their submission to Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) by June. She also proposed, dependent upon Committee workload, an every other month meeting schedule. Ms. Pham requests that the Committee suspend meeting in August and September as HB2 applications are due during that time frame.

Mr. Stone proposed changing the meeting start time from 7:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Committee agreed to move Citizen's Time to a later point in the agenda to accommodate citizens who may want to speak during this time.

***ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. Stone and seconded by Ms. Garreau, it was moved to adopt the 2016 Meeting Schedule and to move to an earlier start time of 5:00 p.m. commencing with the March 30, 2016 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.***

### ***4. Citizen's Time***

The Committee agreed to move Citizen's Time to a point in the meeting when Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) will be discussed.

### ***5. November 2015 – VDOT Monthly Report***

Mr. Ben Davison gave a brief overview of the February 2016 monthly report and touched upon the following highlights:

## Projects in Development:

- **Route 15/29 Business, Bridge over Rappahannock River**

Mr. Davison confirmed that this is the Remington Bridge. Mr. Eltringham noted that there is a lot of community interest in the history of the bridge. Ms. Garreau asked if there was a public meeting date. He replied the date be set for 2017. Developing a repair plan is the aim of VDOT for this project.

- **Route 622, Whiting Road, RR Crossing**

Ms. Pham confirmed that it is the County's intention to apply for funding through House Bill 2 (HB2) to fund the project.

- **Route 15/17/29 Business Interchange**

Mr. Davison confirmed that this project did score well in HB2 and being recommended by the State to be selected for funding by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB).

- **Route 602 – Rogues Road**

Mr. Davison noted that a reduced project scope has been discussed. He said that the original scope of work included improvements to a three mile section, which has now been scaled back to a one mile section of the road. He confirmed that the work will center on road widening and incorporating left hand and right hand turn lanes. He noted that improvements are stage one of a multi-stage project for the corridor.

Ms. Pham told the committee that Supervisor Holder Trumbo will be in attendance at the March 30, 2016 Committee meeting and his intent is to discuss this project further.

### Town of Warrenton

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

Mr. Davison reported that the project went through the HB2 scoring process and is not being recommended for funding. He said that the Town will seek alternative funds to complete the project.

## 6. *New Business*

### **Six-Year Plan Update: Secondary Six-Year Plan and Interstate and Primary Roads Six-Year Plan**

- **FY 2017-2022 Secondary Six-Year Plan (SSYP)**

Telefee Funds and Unpaved Road Funds

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that projects in the SSYP have two sources of VDOT funding: Telefee Funds and Unpaved Road Funds. Telefee Funds can be used on any type of secondary road project and Unpaved Road Funds can be used to hard surface unpaved roads. Currently Telefee funds are estimated at \$173,000 per year, which is approximately \$1 million over six years, and Unpaved Road Funds are estimated at approximately \$3.75 million over six years. While saying that the budget figures are not firm, she reported receiving revised figures from VDOT suggesting that for the next four years the unpaved

roads carry an average of \$500,000-\$600,000 per year. By 2021 and 2022, figures should increase to around \$740,000.

Ms. Pham reported that as a result of HB2, all projects included in six-year plans must be fully funded through construction. If a project cannot be fully funded through construction, it cannot be added to the six-year plan. However, an unfunded project can be listed as a priority, but unless the funding is there to actually construct the project, it will never make it onto the plan for funding to be allocated.

Ms. Pham informed the Committee that there are five additional roads that staff and VDOT are considering as potential candidates for the SSYP for unpaved roads: Ernest Robinson Road (Route 737), Green Road (Route 674), Harts Mill Road (Route 688), Old Culpeper Road (Route 800), and Springs Mill Road (Route 823).

**Ernest Robinson Road (Route 737)**

Ms. Pham noted that this road is not a good candidate for the Rural Rustic Program. The road is narrow with trees lining both sides of the road.

**Green Road (Route 674)**

Ms. Pham described this road as being tight in width, with drainage issues and trees lining both sides of the road. Because this is a through road, VDOT would need at least 16' of road surface throughout the length of the road. Green Road is 0.70 of a mile and serves ten properties. She believes that this road is not a good candidate for the Rural Rustic Program and may be better served by traditional construction.

**Harts Mill Road (Route 688)**

Ms. Pham said that this road may potentially be a good candidate for Rural Rustic treatment. Additional measurements need to be taken to determine its suitability.

**Old Culpeper Road (Route 800)**

Ms. Pham explained that this road has previously been in the SSYP for unpaved roads. It may be possible to get the 16' of road surface needed for Rural Rustic treatment. Overall the road is narrow and that ditches may need to be added, but staff feels it may be a good candidate for the Rural Rustic Program.

**Spring Mill Road (Route 823)**

Of the five roads presented, Ms. Pham said that this road is the best candidate for the Rural Rustic Program. The road is narrow in spots, but VDOT may be able to widen the road 3'-4' to the east to obtain the 16' of road surface needed for the Rural Rustic Program.

Mr. Stone asked at what point residents along the proposed roads get involved in the decision making process and also asked how the five roads made it to this list. Ms. Pham said that some of the roads have been on the SSYP previously and as funding levels decreased, they were removed from the list. She also said that the first step was for staff to visit each of these roads to determine their candidacy for the Rural Rustic Program and the next step will be to reach out to residents.

Based on feedback staff received from the Committee at the October 28, 2015 meeting, Ms. Pham reviewed the draft FY 2017-2022 SSYP and discussed the following roads in detail:

- Lunsford Road (Route 674) – Construction completion projected for June 2016
- Green Meadows Road (Route 801) – Project Ad Date: June 2016
- Wheatley School Road (Route 742) – Project Ad Date: Summer 2016
- Burwell Road (Route 604) – Project Ad Date: Summer 2016
- Tall Cedars (Route 788) – Added to the list at October 28, 2015 meeting. Currently priority #11
- Fox Groves (Route 659) – Added to the list at October 28, 2015 meeting. Currently priority #12
- Tapps Ford (Route 645) – Currently priority #13
- Swains Road (Route 739) – Staff recommends removing from SSYP as residents are opposed to traditional construction and the road is too narrow for Rural Rustic Program.
- Shenandoah Path (Route 607) - Added to the list at October 28, 2016 Committee meeting. The road is currently priority #15.

In regard to Shenandoah Path (Route 607), Ms. Pham said she recently received a call from a property owner who has repeatedly been against hard surfacing. She also noted having had a 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. Butler asked VDOT for their input on Shenandoah Path (Route 607). VDOT responded by saying that a lot of regrading work goes into maintaining the road. They continued by saying that they identify the road as having a high reported number of incidents and citizen requests for paving.

Mr. Eltringham asked if Shenandoah Path (Route 607) has cut-through potential. Citing a cut-through study prepared for Tapps Ford Road (Route 645), Ms. Pham said that a similar study could be done for Shenandoah Path (Route 607). The entire road is approximately 5.8 miles with the unpaved portion being 0.69 mile. She reminded the Committee that staff and VDOT conducted a community outreach meeting on October 21, 2015. She said that a large property that comprises the majority of the frontage is owned by one family who were represented at the meeting and are opposed to the paving. One property owner who also attended the meeting and has a small property on the frontage, is in favor of paving. Three property owners were not in attendance at the meeting.

Residents of Tapps Ford Road (Route 645), Mr. Richard Parli and Ms. Debra Dodge, spoke in opposition to the paving of Tapps Ford Road (Route 645). They noted that they have spoken before the Committee as well as the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to express their opposition to the paving of the road. Mr. Parli presented the results of a recent exhibit prepared to illustrate those who are for and against paving. He said that residents of Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) are overwhelmingly against having the road paved. He stated that the citizens have spoken, as evidenced by the recent exhibit. He said he is willing to take his matter to the BOS again, but he said he has learned that the BOS takes recommendations from this Committee. He asked the Committee to consider the exhibit as a definitive determination that the majority of citizens of Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) are against paving.

Mr. Parli said he is heartened that the road is at the bottom of the list, but repeated that the vast majority of the residents do not want it paved. He said that only four property owners did not sign the petition against paving. Ms. Dodge added that she feels that there is belief that paving a secondary road is making an improvement and in many instances that may be the case. But for Tapps Ford Road (Route 645), she said it will not be an improvement, as she feels there will be an increase to traffic, noise, the speed, the number of motorcyclists and bicyclists on blind curves and twisting roads. She asked, how it is considered an improvement when paving will take property away from people who live on the road and change the rural nature of the road, which is one of the things that attracts residents to Fauquier County. She said that paving Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) is not going to improve it - it will be a detriment.

Mr. Stone asked how Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) was added to the list. Ms. Garreau said that it came on the list as an early candidate of the Rural Rustic Program. Mr. Eltringham said that the State made the decision to increase funds for rural rustic roads with the idea of paving them. He added that staff had to move quickly in order to make use of the funds because there was a time stamp put on them. As a result, he said staff went out over a period of three months and put the initial list together with input from the community, BOS at the time, members of the Transportation Committee, and other stakeholders in the County. The list was compiled with the knowledge it would have to be prioritized each year. Ms. Garreau said that the road was taken off of the list after staff performed a study, which resulted in a resounding vote against paving. She continued by saying that Tapps Ford Road was added back into the plan after a resident approached Marshall District, Supervisor Peter Schwartz, who, at that time, recommended the road be added back on the and at the bottom of the list. Ms. Pham confirmed the project's estimated cost to be \$2.1 million.

Ms. Pham noted that the County hired a consultant, independent of staff, who determined that Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) would not draw additional traffic. Ms. Pham stated the study examined Tapps Ford Road (Route 645), parallel roads, and built environment around the area to determine who was using the road and whether or not it would draw traffic from other nearby areas. She said the consultant concluded it would take longer for people to divert from roads they were already using to take Tapps Ford Road (Route 645). She also said it was determined that even if it is paved it is not going to be a substantially faster route for cut-through purposes.

VDOT confirmed that Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) is a frequently maintained road. Mr. Richie Lillard of VDOT said that of the roads listed in the SSYP, Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) and Shenandoah Path (Route 607) receive the most requests for maintenance from citizens. He added that if Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) was paved, it would cause them to spend less time and effort maintaining the road.

Mr. Butler noted that Mr. Parli and Ms. Dodge have spoken in opposition of paving the road before the Committee twice and remarked that the Committee has heard from no one in favor of the project.

Mr. Sheedy informed the Committee that Marshall District, Supervisor, Mary Leigh McDaniel, has been informed of the situation. He said that she feels the best compromise for now, would be to keep Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) on the list, but at the bottom of the list.

Ms. Pham added that the decision to keep Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) on the list was strictly based on Supervisor Schwartz's direction. There are two to three private side streets that access Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) to get out of the subdivision. During the initial public outreach phase, residents who live along the public side streets were invited to give their input. These groups of residents who live along the private side streets were those in stronger support of hard surfacing the road than the residents living along Tapps Ford Road (Route 645).

Mr. Eltringham asked about any known safety issues along Tapps Ford Road (Route 645). Ms. Pham said that there are no safety issues.

Mr. Sheedy said that staff may want to discuss Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) with Supervisor McDaniel to provide her with the detailed results of the recent exhibit prepared to illustrate those who are for and against paving as presented by Mr. Parli tonight.

Ms. Pham reported having received a request for hard surfacing from a resident who lives along Dulins Ford Road (Route 798). The road has been in the plan previously and the resident stated having a petition signed in favor of hard surfacing. Staff is planning a site visit within the next week. The road is on the south side of Route 29 in the Marshall District.

Mr. Sheedy asked for clarification related to HB2 and the fact that Ms. Pham mentioned earlier in the meeting that all projects in the plan must be fully funded. Ms. Pham answered by saying that if Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) remains at the bottom of the plan, although staff gives VDOT a list of priorities, VDOT will not show the project in the plan because they will not have the money to fully fund it.

Staff informed the Committee that VDOT is expecting an influx of funds over the next six years and the concern Staff is hearing from VDOT is that if the County cannot find a way to allocate all of the funding, the County will start to lose it.

Mr. Butler asked if staff had information about Fox Groves Road (Route 659) and Culpeper County regarding an event center and a private drive that crosses into Culpeper County. Ms. Pham said that Culpeper County Planning Commission considered an application for an event facility, Presqu'isle, located approximately two miles south of the end of state maintenance on Fox Groves Road (Route 659). She said that the only access to the event center is from Fauquier County's Fox Groves Road (Route 659) that intersects with Freeman's Ford Road (Route 651) in Remington. The applicant proposed to maintain the existing width of the private section of Fox Groves Road (Route 659) on the Fauquier side and add 3-4" of stone, crown the road for drainage, install traffic calming devices at the bridge approach, and trim brush along the road while staying within the existing easement. The facility is expected to generate roughly seventy vehicles per week for events such as weddings. The Culpeper County Board of Supervisors approved the application with conditions including that the applicant improve and maintain the road, that guard rail or curb is installed on the private bridge, and that a structural engineer inspect the bridge at least every two years and any

recommended improvements to the bridge be completed within six months. Mr. Butler noted that for Fauquier County, the road will only be used by three residents and a milk truck in and out to a dairy farm two to three times a day. Ms. Pham said that the road was added to the list at the request of residents and Supervisor Chester Stribling, who heard from a resident requesting hard surfacing. Mr. Butler reported that two families were in favor of paving the road, but may have shifted their decision.

Mr. Butler said that he will visit the residents who live along this road to get a consensus on where they stand on paving the road.

Mr. Butler asked staff to contact Culpeper County's Community Development office to find out the proposed opening time of the facility.

**ACTION: Staff to contact Culpeper County Community Development to ask the proposed opening date of the event center facility.**

Ms. Pham recommended adding Spring Mill Road (Route 823) and Dulins Ford (Route 798) into the plan.

Mr. Sheedy asked Ms. Pham if she felt there were enough projects to fill the budget. He said that if the Committee recommends removing Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) from the list, Supervisor McDaniel's concern was could staff find a way to spend the funding allocated to Tapps Ford Road (Route 645). Ms. Pham said that with the five additional roads staff has proposed and with strong support from residents along Spring Mill Road (Route 823) and Dulins Ford (Route 798), she said she feels that the budget could be filled. Staff would rather have too many roads on the plan than not enough.

Mr. Lillard said that going forward, the County should keep a contingency list that is separate from the County list in the event that additional funding becomes available. The key is to make sure what is on the County list can be funded. He added that only projects that the County is serious about getting done should remain on the list and projects like Tapps Ford Road (Route 645), if the County is not really serious about it, are best for the residents to remove.

Mr. Sheedy asked Ms. Pham if she suggested earlier in the meeting that there may be additional funding. She responded by saying that Mr. Greg Banks of VDOT told her the estimates, which she downplayed them slightly at \$740,000 per year. Looking at FY 2019, that funding is currently coming from a twenty million pot. This is expected to increase to as much as \$25 million in 2021 and 2022, therefore this could result in funding levels of \$770,000 for FY 21 and FY 22.

Ms. Pham reported hearing regularly from a resident who lives along Lees Ridge Road (Route 684) near Whitney State Forest who wants to see the unpaved portion of the road paved. Ms. Pham has visited the road and feels that it would be suitable for traditional construction as it is narrow and hilly. As adamant as this resident is about hard surfacing, if the Committee finds that they need a high dollar project to put in the plan at a future date, this one may be suitable.

Mr. Eltringham asked that the following changes become the new draft and that this be the place the Committee start reviewing discussions at the March 30, 2016 meeting.

- Remove Swains Road (Route 739)
- Leave Tapps Ford Road (Route 645) on the list pending further discussion
- Leave Fox Groves on the list (Route 659) pending further discussion
- Add Dulins Ford Road (Route 798)
- Add Old Culpeper Road (Route 800) at the bottom of the list, as Priority #14

Ms. Pham confirmed that roads that require traditional construction go on the SSYP. She further clarified that what VDOT is required to look at first when they review a road for hard surfacing is Rural Rustic. If the road cannot be done that way, and the County is adamant about having it done, VDOT will use traditional construction, but is roughly three times more expensive per mile versus the cost of Rural Rustic.

Ms. Garreau asked Ms. Pham to review the aspects of Rural Rustic road treatment versus traditional construction. Ms. Pham explained that the Rural Rustic Road concept is VDOT's preferred approach to paving many low volume unpaved roads. Typically with a Rural Rustic treatment, there is no upfront site plan for the work. A focal point of the program is on leaving trees, vegetation, side slopes and open drainage abutting the roadway, undisturbed to the maximum extent possible while providing hard surfacing at the lowest cost possible. VDOT has a 30' prescriptive right of way to work within and the process is tar and chip, not asphalt. The intent is to keep the rural feel of the road and a low cost way to keep residents out of the dust and to keep VDOT maintenance low. Traditional construction may be more appropriate for those unpaved roads that have significant alignment issues, need major reconstruction or have extensive proposed development along the road. There must be a minimum of 16' of roadway with 18' of roadway being desirable for Rural Rustic Roads.

Mr. Sheedy asked what triggers staff and or VDOT to recommend traditional construction. Mr. Davison said when the road has to be widened to achieve the necessary 16' of roadway and major grading, traditional construction is recommended. He also asked if there is a compromise of the two techniques as there is a considerable jump in cost to go from Rural Rustic to traditional construction. Mr. Davison said compromise is tough as landowners are opposed to giving up portions of their land in order to make the grades work to tie back into their land. Mr. Davison said that there must be a minimum of 16' of roadway with 18' of roadway being desirable and said that slopes are recommended at 4:1 desirable with 3:1 minimum. Shoulders, ditches, curves straightened, and traffic engineering studies were all listed as aspects of traditional construction.

#### Six-Year Improvement Program

Ms. Pham led a general discussion about the Six-Year Improvement Program, which includes primary roads and interstates. She said that the projects in this plan have not changed over the past couple of years. She asked the committee for their input, recommendations for changes, anything that should be added, or rearrangement of priorities. Mr. Eltringham noted that historically, the County and the VDOT Warrenton Residency agreed with the projects in the plan but they have never had the compelling safety data that would compel funding as opposed to other priorities on the interstate highway system.

Mr. Lillard suggested that since HB2 funding is being sought for the interchange at Lord Fairfax, it may be better suited as the number one priority on the primary road plan. Ms. Pham said that Route 29/215 should remain fairly high on the list as there should be a plan or recommendation this summer from the Route 29 Stakeholders Group to move forward for that stretch of the corridor that should include this intersection. Ms. Pham said that this project should also remain high on this list as HB2 funding will be sought in the future.

Mr. Eltringham said that in the past the Committee categorized the prioritization of projects in the plan with safety data. The Committee reviewed the safety data for the Route 29/215 project. Ms. Pham said that there have been no fatalities at this location in the past few years but stressed this is our highest intersection for the nine counties within the Culpeper District. Mr. Eltringham said that it is a difficult decision to move this project below number one as the safety data compels it to be the highest priority. He asked about safety data for the interchange at the Lord Fairfax and Ms. Pham said that crash data for the intersection does not make the top one hundred list for the nine counties. For the new members, Mr. Eltringham said that particularly for the top four projects on the list, prioritization was aligned with a balance of safety and level of service, with safety used as the first consideration. This discussion will continue at the March 30, 2016 Transportation Committee meeting.

## ***7. Old Business***

- **Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan**

Ms. Pham said staff's intent is to give the Committee a chance to digest this list, as it includes seventy-six projects between road segments and interchanges. The projects were pulled from the County's six-year plan, the comprehensive plan whether from Chapter 10 in General Transportation or the service districts plans, from VDOT safety data and from level of service data so anything that was failing or near failing in 2040 has been added to this list to make sure that staff is accounting for anything that is likely to be congested in the near future. Staff asked the Committee to review this list over the next month and be prepared to discuss any recommendations for changes at the March 30, 2016 meeting. Mr. Hopewell will also be at that meeting to discuss the list in further detail.

Mr. Eltringham asked for the source of the safety data used. Ms. Pham confirmed using VDOT's Regional Traffic Engineer, Nathan Umberger's Top 100 Intersections and Top 100 Road Segments data. Mr. Eltringham asked for the source of the level of service data. Ms. Pham said that VDOT has generated a statewide model and staff has access to this data.

## ***8. Staff Updates***

### **House Bill 2 Update**

Ms. Pham reminded the Committee that last year staff submitted two applications for the House Bill 2 prioritization process: the US Route 15/17/29 Interchange and the expansion of the Warrenton Park and Ride Lot at the intersection of Route 29 and Colonial Road (Route 605). At the January 19, 2016 Commonwealth Transportation Meeting (CTB) meeting, the State presented the project scores and rankings for all 287 projects that made it through the

screening process as well as a recommended list of projects to fund. An unexpected benefit of the Federal Transportation Act that passed in December 2015 is that it has added a little over half a million dollars of additional funding for HB2 this year. Prior to the Act passing, the State expected to allocate \$1.2 billion for the entire state but that has increased to \$1.7 billion. The Culpeper District submitted seventeen projects and all of them made it through the screening process to be scored.

Ms. Pham reported that the Warrenton Park and Ride Lot scored exceptionally well at a state ranking of 29. This project scored well because the cost was low which increased its score. The interchange ranked 226 which is attributed to the high cost of the project at \$42 million and the normalization of scores statewide. She noted that this is one of the things that staff specifically argued against last year. Ms. Pham reviewed the normalized scores for both projects.

Ms. Pham said that the State developed a four-step process to recommend which projects to fund which is working in the County's favor. Initially, staff had the impression that once the list of scores was generated, the State was going to work their way from the top down until funds were exhausted. However, this four step process would ensure that every construction district receive statewide High Priority Projects funding. Looking overall at the projects recommended for funding for each district and the total number that are recommended for funding, almost every district would receive funding for about half of their projects or more.

Currently both of Fauquier County's projects are recommended for funding; however, there has been push back from CTB members who are concerned with step three which ensures that every district receive some High Priority funds. There was concern specifically when the State recommended the interchange as this was the first of only two low scoring projects to be recommended for funding. Some CTB members are questioning why the State is recommending a project with a 0.5 score when there are projects with much higher scores and these projects are not being recommended for funding. Ms. Pham added that Commissioner Charlie Kilpatrick, Secretary Lane, and Deputy Secretary Donohue all supported the recommendation to fund the interchange.

Mr. Eltringham said, subject to Planning Commission member comments that he is in favor of moving the interchange to priority number one on the list for this year and having those two safety items that are above it shifted below.

Ms. Garreau said that she would like to think about the shifting of priorities. She said they are in the middle of a series of meetings for improvements to Route 29 that may result in additional changes to this list. She assured the Committee that it is very much on our minds in the Scott District.

The dips at the intersection of Route 29 and Route 215 were discussed. Captain Neville with the sheriff's office said that the engineering done for 29 and 605 and 29 and Vint Hill intersections was done longer ago than was done for the eastern bypass. VDOT agreed. He continued by saying this is why there is a difference in safety and crash data versus the level of service issue. When the eastern bypass was built it did not anticipate the volume, but the design and safety standards were improved. So if we just went on safety, the calculations

speaking for themselves as far as the safety wave. Mr. Davison added that you can see this throughout the Route 29 corridor, particularly the older section. He said we have straightened the curves, but when it was designed, there wasn't the concern for hills from a safety aspect. He added that speeds and traffic have increased and now it is a safety issue.

Ms. Pham concluded by saying that the CTB is considering the State's recommendation. She said the public hearing will be in April or May and she will let Committee members know the date as soon as it is set.

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

Mr. Eltringham commented that he feels there would be a need in the Culpeper District and in the Rapidan Region, for the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission and the counties involved to arrange for bus transportation from park and ride lots to the VRE extension planned for the Gainesville/ Haymarket area.

### **Catlett Road (Route 28) and Bristersburg Road (Route 616)/Bastable Mill Road (Route 603)**

A town hall meeting in December 2015, hosted by Delegate Lingamfelter, was held for residents in the Catlett area to allow them to express their concerns regarding the intersection of Route 28 with Bastable Mill Road (Route 603) and Bristersburg Road (Route 616). Staff continues to work with VDOT, who also attended the town hall meeting, to look at improvement safety measures for this intersection. At the January 14, 2016 meeting, the BOS approved a resolution in support of traffic improvement at the intersection.

### **Railroad Crossing at Whiting Road**

Ms. Pham informed the Committee that staff is considering applying for HB2 funding for this project due to an increase in cost. She said that the County has been directed to pursue Option 2, which would require approximately \$546,000 in additional funding. Ms. Pham said that Supervisor Trumbo is well informed on the details of this project, but that the BOS has not discussed this update.

Ms. Garreau said that she would discuss the need for a resolution with Supervisor Trumbo.

Mr. Sheedy noted a conversation he had with 17/66 broker Mr. Carter Wiley. He said the thing you need to be careful of is you still have a couple hundred acres to develop north of the railroad and when that gets developed if it is too difficult for trucks to get south on that road and they are going to use Route 55. It would disrupt the area if large trucks are able to use that road. Mr. Butler also noted having concern for commercial traffic going through the townhouses.

## **House Bill 2**

Ms. Pham said that currently, staff applies for HB2 funding each year. At their October 27, 2015 meeting, the CTB adopted a bi-annual application process for all programs except State of Good Repair, which will continue to have funding programmed annually. She clarified that High Priority Program Funding and Construction District Grant Funding will be applied for in the even number years and the Revenue Staring, Highway Safety Improvement Program, and Transportation Alternatives Program will be applied for in the odd number years. She said that this will help in terms of the total applications due each fall and said it will also help with VDOT and their evaluation of applications and the allocation of funding.

There was \$1.7 billion available for HB2 funding this year, but next year it will drop to \$800 million. The State is anticipating a larger pot of money once funding is only allocated every other year.

Ms. Garreau asked if Ms. Pham anticipated the number of applications will go down by 50 percent. Ms. Pham said that she doubts it. She feels that areas will still be fighting for their projects. She expects this year when Transform 66 and other huge projects that scored high and caused others to be scored low are removed from competition that a lot of people will be trying to take advantage of that and try to get in the next highest project they could not compete with before. When you look at this list in particular, and you start to look at who all is making those top scores, it's your big areas for the most part. This was staff's concern last year when this process was developed. We cannot compete with these big areas and still score well unless we have a very low cost project. The normalization of scores was introduced late in the process and took a lot of us by surprise.

### ***9. Member Comments***

There were no member comments.

### **10. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m. The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, March 30, 2016.**