

**MINUTES OF
FAUQUIER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
February 26, 2014**

7:00 P.M.

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

Members Present: Peter S. Eltringham, Chairman, Ed Moore, Vice Chairman, R. Holder Trumbo, Adrienne Garreau, John Green, Matthew Sheedy, and Mark Nesbit

Members Absent: Tony Tedeschi and Jeffrey Walker

Guests Present: Greg Banks, Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles; Ben Davidson, Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles; and Roy Tate, Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles

Staff Present: Kimberley Fogle, Chris Pettit, Meredith Meixner and Maureen Williamson

1. Approval of January 29, 2014 Committee Meeting Minutes

ACTION: On motion made by Adrienne Garreau and seconded by Ed Moore, it was moved to approve the January 29, 2014 Committee Meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Work Program 2014

Mr. Eltringham referred the Committee to the document titled “*Transportation Committee Work Programs for 2014*” and noted that this list is compiled in an effort to capture the major themes for the Transportation Committee to engage in during 2014.

Mr. Green suggested adding a bypass of Bealeton which would help to alleviate increased traffic due to approved commercial and residential projects on Route 17. Ms. Fogle indicated that a bypass is already represented in the Fauquier County Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Fogle suggested taking the Opal Service District Plan off the list, as it is going before the Board of Supervisors (BOS) for adoption and will not need to come back to the Transportation Committee this year.

Mr. Eltringham requested that staff update the Bealeton List to reflect the items that have not been addressed.

ACTION: Staff will remove the Opal Service District Plan and provide an update to the Bealeton List shown on the “*Transportation Committee Work Programs for 2014*” document.

3. Opal Interchange

Mr. Nesbit gave a progress update that VDOT has received the road signage for the interchange and is scheduled to be installed in early March. Mr. Nesbit indicated that the road markings will be done when pavement temperature allows.

Mr. Eltringham noted that VDOT was going to do sustained counting at this interchange. Mr. Nesbit confirmed that sustained counting was continuing, but there are no hard plans to make changes to signal time.

ACTION: The Committee opted to continue to monitor the Opal Interchange and to have it remain on the agenda for the March 26, 2014 meeting.

4. February 2014 – VDOT – Fauquier County Monthly Report

In the meeting packet, staff provided VDOT's monthly report for February 2014. Mr. Nesbit explained that this report covers ongoing projects and if Committee members needed additional information on a specific project, then he would provide it.

Mr. Eltringham asked Mr. Nesbit about a scoping contract on the Lord Fairfax interchange. Mr. Nesbit confirmed that they are through the RFP process, evaluating bids, and close to having a consultant.

Ms. Garreau asked about the projected start dates of the Route 622, Railroad Crossing (Nov. 2018) and the Route 661, Schoolhouse Road Curve Improvement projects (Dec. 2017). Mr. Banks gave an update on the Schoolhouse Road project that included the hope to accelerate the project by building it in conjunction with the Safe Route to School Project, which is scheduled for 2015. Mr. Banks reported that the Route 622, Railroad Crossing project is uncertain with the right-of-way where it lies in conjunction with the existing road that has been built to the south.

Ms. Fogle informed the Committee that she has met with VDOT regarding the Route 622, Railroad Crossing project and that County staff is evaluating three alternatives. Ms. Fogle noted that funding and right-of-way issues are affecting progress.

Mr. Eltringham asked that VDOT please notify staff when projects are complete and staff will inform the Committee.

5. Secondary Six-Year Plan – VDOT Presentation

A copy of the VDOT Six-Year Plan work session package was in each member's committee meeting packet.

Mr. Banks opened by stating that some of the financial information has changed and there are revisions to what was received in the packet. Mr. Banks specifically addressed changes to the allocations on a chart (found under tab 1) titled, "*Fauquier County Projected Allocations 2014 Six-Year Plan*." Mr. Banks explained significant cuts to funding in all categories of the chart including:

- "CTB Formula Unpaved State" – CTB now equals fifty vs. two hundred vehicles per day (vpd) count.
- "Formula Funds" – no State funding through 2020
- "Secondary Unpaved Roads" – no State funding through 2020
- "Telefee Funds," which he notes are in draft format, experienced a 3% reduction.

Mr. Banks distributed a revised replacement page which does reflect some of these changes.

Mr. Banks explained that the "CTB Formula Unpaved State" allocation was a new allocation that was programmed into last year's Secondary Six-Year Plan and carried the caveat of having to be programmed to roads that carried at least 200 vpd for unpaved roads. There is legislation that has been introduced and has passed the House and Senate to lower that figure to 50 vpd or greater. Mr. Banks noted that this is expected to pass and he will operate under the assumption that it will be 50 vpd. Mr. Banks hopes to have "CTB Formula Unpaved State" draft allocations by Friday, February 28 to Staff. The traffic counts in the booklet are also incorrect and Mr. Banks is expecting updated traffic counts by Friday, February 28, as well.

Mr. Banks discussed last years' Secondary Six-Year Plan (Tab 4) and provided an update to many project completions and ongoing priorities.

Mr. Banks made a request of the Committee for a prioritized list of additional roads to use as a planning tool to add projects to the Secondary Six-Year Plan (whether unpaved or regular construction projects) should funding become available later in 2014. Mr. Eltringham agreed that roads that have fifty trips or more a day should be prioritized, but does not want to build an unmanageable document. Mr. Trumbo commented that we need to find projects that need to be done and recommend them on their merits not on whether there is money to spend.

Mr. Banks mentioned an unpaved patch of road listed as Route 604 (travel Route 605 to the east just prior to entering into Prince William County, on the north side the last secondary road on the left is Burwell Road) where the pavement stops just before the end of the Fauquier county line. Similarly, there is an unpaved patch of road in Prince William County where it meets Fauquier County. Prince William County is paving their portion of this similar stretch of road. This road carries about 190 vehicles per day and is a short gravel section of about 500 to 600 ft. Prince William County plans to pave their stretch by 2017-18. Mr. Banks suggested that this could be one of the roads to add to the Secondary Six-Year Plan.

Mr. Trumbo suggested an unpaved section of Old Bust Head Road that has continuous maintenance problems. He explained that it is a short 500 to 600 ft. stretch of road that did not qualify last year, but will qualify this year due to the lowered vpd criteria.

Mr. Pettit confirmed that Burwell Road is on the list and Old Bust Head Road will be added to the project list for 2014.

Because traffic counts were not received, Mr. Eltringham asked staff to revisit the established timeline in order to meet VDOT's May approval date of the Secondary Six-Year Plan. Per Mr. Pettit, staff had originally planned to get the VDOT traffic counts tonight in order to determine which roads on this list were eligible under the 200 vpd count. He continued, that because the criteria is now reduced to fifty vpd; it is likely that all of these roads, even using the 2001 counts, would qualify under that funding.

Mr. Pettit noted that staff could use the entire list assuming that all roads are eligible and go ahead and contact the citizens that live on these roads and open the public comment period. He confirmed that at the March 26, 2014 meeting, the Committee will have received citizen comments and will need to make a final decision on the Secondary Six-Year Plan list in order to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors (BOS). In turn, the BOS will need to take action on the resolution no later than the May BOS meeting.

After discussion, Mr. Eltringham suggested that staff notify residents on the top six roads being, Tapps Ford Road, Swains Road, Lunsford Road, Green Meadows Road, Moss Hollow Road and Wheatley School Road. He further suggested that the remaining roads be kept as inventory for future projects, should additional funds become available.

ACTION: On motion made by Mr. Eltringham and seconded by Mr. Trumbo, it was moved to have Staff proceed with public notification on Tapps Ford Road, Swains Road, Lunsford Road, Green Meadows Road, Moss Hollow Road and Wheatley School Road, and include Old Bust Head Road on the inventory list. The motion carried unanimously.

6. *Old Business*

- **Atoka Road – Earsaline Anderson Request**

Secretary of the Mount Olive Baptist Church, Earsaline Anderson, at 2932 Atoka Road in Rectortown, has requested that safety improvements be made near the intersection of Old Maidstone Road (Route 849) and Atoka Road (Route 713), and near the entrance of the church on Atoka Road. She had requested that signage be added, speed limits be reduced, and speed bumps be installed.

Mr. Nesbit noted that VDOT traffic engineering staff performed a typical speed study and that traffic engineering staff has given the preliminary recommendation to maintain the existing 35 mph speed limit. VDOT is recommending the installation of a 48"x24" "TWO Directional Large Arrow" sign at the intersection of Rectortown Road (Route 710) and

Atoka Road. However, the safety data does not show safety issues at this site, therefore, VDOT traffic engineering staff is still reviewing this request to ensure consistency with existing speed zones on other similar routes in adjacent areas and whether the Historic District designation provides justification for lower speed zones.

Mr. Trumbo made notice of the fact that this is a village zone within the County, as well as a Historic District. Mr. Nesbit reiterated that the speed study is held open in draft format and is still preliminary so as to research current speed limits in similarly zoned areas. Mr. Nesbit hopes to have this request resolved by the March 26, 2014 meeting.

Pastor Tony Craddock of Mt. Olive Baptist Church, thanked the Committee for helping them. He agreed with Mr. Trumbo who he said spoke vividly about the area being more than just a Historic District; it is also populated with homes at the intersection that pre-date automobiles. Mr. Nesbit said that the safety data does not show that there are issues at this intersection. He noted the recent fatality at the intersection, but reported that it had nothing to do with the way the road was built.

Mr. Eltringham stated that as VDOT continues to look at the speed limit in this area, they should consider traffic calming and engineering techniques that are consistent with both the Historic District and a village zoning designation.

ACTION: VDOT will provide the final traffic study to the Committee members at the March 26, 2014 meeting.

- **Elihu Hill Road (Route 722) – Ellen Mitchell Request**

Mr. Pettit reviewed that both Elihu Hill Road and Mountjoy Road are experiencing issues with inappropriate through traffic specifically related to incorrect GPS system readings. The request, per Ms. Ellen Mitchell, is to seek signage to direct drivers away from Elihu Hill Road and Mountjoy Road.

Mr. Nesbit stated that VDOT recommends that “No Outlet” signs along with supplemental “Notice” signs be placed at the beginning of both Elihu Hill Road and Mountjoy Road to deter through traffic. He explained that the recommended signs should be installed in the next 30-45 days and said that it is further recommended to monitor the effectiveness of the signage once installed.

Mr. Eltringham asked how state and staff will continue to work with GPS to solve this issue. Mr. Nesbit replied that the state is still developing policy on coordination with the GPS industry on these types of issues. From a staff level, Mr. Pettit confirmed that these two roads do not connect, they do on a map, but the issue would be to convince GPS providers to show that these two roads are not connected.

Ms. Mitchell recounted recent inappropriate traffic issues which seem to be caused by the incorrect GPS readings. She reported vehicles of various types including eighteen wheelers and passenger cars getting inappropriately guided to her house due to inappropriate GPS

readings. Because of the inappropriate guidance to her house, vehicles of all types use her driveway as a turn-around. She expressed her aggravation and fear due to people tearing up her property and using her driveway as a turn-around day and night. She also reported that existing signage has been knocked down by an eighteen wheeler.

Mr. Nesbit agreed to look into existing VDOT signage that has been knocked down.

Mr. Eltringham asked VDOT communications staff to share their GPS contact with County staff and staff will work alongside VDOT to resolve this issue.

- **Mountjoy Road – Joseph Guite, Jr. Request**

Mr. Pettit explained that a portion of Mountjoy Road is in the state system and reviewed the request seeking to have the entire length of Mountjoy Road taken into the state system for maintenance and a turnaround provided for “lost” large vehicles.

A discussion was had between Mr. Guite and Mr. Pettit related to the portion of Mountjoy Road in question of being a state maintained road. Mr. Nesbit noted that the section of road under consideration must be built to state standards and must have a dedicated minimum 40’ of ROW that is clear of utilities. The portion of Mountjoy Road in question does not. Mr. Nesbit confirmed that this issue has come up before and it was determined that it was not a state road. He continued by saying, that it is basically up to the County to provide a resolution asking the state to take it into the system and to identify the funds needed to bring it up to state standards.

Mr. Trumbo inquired where the state maintenance line officially ends and the disposition of the road. Mr. Nesbit agreed to contact the Richmond VDOT office for the official length, condition of the road and provide a letter to the County.

ACTION: VDOT will provide an official piece of correspondence, with regards to where the state maintenance line ends on Mountjoy Road as well as a legal definition of the road.

- **Kings Hill Road (Route 657) – Walter Shipe Request**

Mr. Pettit explained that Walter Shipe has suggested adding a deceleration lane southbound on Route 29 (James Madison Highway) at the intersection of Kings Hill Road (Route 657).

Mr. Nesbit noted that upon review of VDOT traffic and project management staff who are also handling the Route 28 corridor improvement project, they agree that, the right turn volumes at this location are low and the crash history does not support the need for a right turn lane. The turning movement will not be considered in the upcoming Route 28 corridor improvement study. However, according to VDOT, a right turn lane would be beneficial to traffic flow in the intersection and the County could choose to pursue adding this as a project to the Secondary Six-Year Plan.

Ms. Garreau asked if this could be considered a safety improvement on the part of VDOT.

Mr. Nesbit confirmed that no there is no safety or crash history to support it from a safety improvement perspective.

Mr. Green voiced his concern for increased traffic and stated that this is the only exit off Route 29 that does not have an exit ramp.

ACTION: On motion made by Mr. Green and seconded by Mr. Trumbo, it was moved to approve the addition of Kings Hill Road (Route 657) to the bottom of the list of the Primary Six-Year Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

- **Delaplane Post Office – Supervisor Peter Schwartz Request**

Mr. Pettit gave a brief overview of the request suggesting that a sign, such as “Slow Down Pedestrians Ahead” or “Pedestrian Crossing,” be placed just east of the post office on the north side of the street.

Mr. Nesbit reported that the request was forwarded to district traffic engineering staff for review and the study is completed. The recommendation of the study is to install a Pedestrian Warning sign on the southbound approach in advance of the post office. This work should be completed in the next 30-45 days.

ACTION: VDOT will install a Pedestrian Warning sign on the southbound approach in advance of the post office within 30 – 45 days.

- **O’Keefe Road – John Green Request**

Mr. Pettit explained that this request has been placed back on the Transportation Committee agenda for further discussion. According to Mr. Green, the intersection has experienced a number of accidents and he believes that the sight lines of the intersection, particularly due to utility poles, are inadequate.

In the Committee’s work packet, Mr. Pettit included photos taken at the intersection that show sight line obstruction due to utility poles. He noted however, the last time we discussed this request (December 2013), VDOT indicated they would be adding the stop bars at the site. These have not been put into place due to weather.

Mr. Pettit stated that he contacted utilities regarding moving the utility poles and found that these are more complex poles and cost \$10k each to move. In addition to moving the poles, there would be some right-of-way required or an easement acquired.

Mr. Green shared his concerns for vehicles pulling out of O’Keefe Road and suggested that the O’Keefe Road sign should be moved. Mr. Nesbit stated that VDOT does not feel that

moving a sign 2'-3' would improve the sight distance and reiterated that the crash history for this movement does not support changes.

Mr. Banks noted that all of the fatalities shown in the RNS system (derived from state police records) shows the traffic is coming from Oak Shade Road turning south and getting hit. Mr. Green described two accidents that don't seem to be reflected in the state police records and the Committee asked if he would provide official information for review.

Mr. Nesbit noted that this request was reviewed by district traffic engineering staff and their recommendation is to install or refresh pavement markings (stop-bars). The pavement marking work will take place as soon as weather permits. No signage changes were recommended as a result of the review.

ACTION: VDOT will install pavement markings at this intersection when weather permits and Mr. Green will provide data supporting the accidents he has described.

• **Route 17 (Marshall to Warrenton) Traffic Calming – Scott Filling Request**

Mr. Scott Filling submitted a Transportation Committee Request Form for a variety of traffic calming and safety improvements on Route 17 from I-66 (Exit 28) in Marshall to the start of the Warrenton Bypass.

In a response to Mr. Filling's requests, Mr. Nesbit reported that:

- VDOT traffic engineering staff estimated costs for four permanent mount electric speed signs as \$200,000.
- Speed study still pending due to weather. Crash data has been collected and will be correlated with speed data when completed. Data expected by next meeting, March 26, 2014.
- Two portable speed trailers are again available for placement. These portable trailers were there in December 2013.
- VDOT is awaiting request from County BOS for the placement of permanent electronic speed detection devices on this section of Route 17.
- Mr. Nesbit will invite Regional Traffic Engineer to next meeting, March 26, 2014.

Mr. Eltringham asked about funding for the signage. Mr. Nesbit said that if VDOT determines the need for speed signs and it meets other VDOT criteria, then VDOT would put them up. Mr. Trumbo reminded the Committee of the potential BOS action requesting VDOT to put up the signs.

Mr. Trumbo remarked that he has seen a flashing sign with LED display of the speed limit. He believes this type of sign may specifically be for a school zone. However, he asked Mr. Nesbit if there are multiple choices on speed signs or is there a specific sign that will work in a given scenario. Mr. Nesbit said that he does not know what type/manufacturer of the four permanent mount electric speed signs, as listed above. Mr. Roy Tate of VDOT noted

that if it was a school sign, it was most likely put up by the school. He also said that school districts maintain their speed signs on a permit from VDOT.

Ms. Garreau asked if this is a project the County will take and Mr. Trumbo replied, no this is something the County is going to ask VDOT to do and maintain.

Mr. Nesbit suggested a meeting be set up between Mr. Filling, VDOT Regional Traffic Engineer, Staff on behalf of Committee, to discuss Mr. Filling's questions.

ACTION: Staff to coordinate a meeting to discuss Route 17 issues with invitations to include: Senator Vogel, Delegate Webber, State Police, County Attorney Kevin Burke, Mr. Trumbo, Supervisor Peter Schwartz, Peter Eltringham, Sheriff Fox, VDOT Regional Traffic Engineer, Mark Nesbit, Matthew Sheedy, Great Meadow Representative, and appropriate County Staff. The meeting preference day and time is mid-week, late afternoon, 4:00 p.m. or 5:00 p.m.

In preparation for the meeting, Mr. Pettit will prepare an overview of Mr. Filling's issues related to Route 17. Mr. Eltringham would like for Mr. Filling and himself to see the list of issues before it is distributed to meeting attendees.

Mr. Filling's questions for VDOT included:

- Related to VDOT traffic engineer collecting speed counts, Mr. Filling would like to ask where speed counts were taken.
- Where should the two portable and four potential permanent mount electric speed signs be located?
- Mr. Filling reached out to an alternative traffic engineering company to investigate their pricing for department of transportation safety equipment. He asked if VDOT would entertain using alternative equipment vendors, who offer better pricing.
- Mr. Filling is asking for a special exception for installation of signs prohibiting the use of engine braking.
- Is it possible to designate this area as a Traffic Safety Corridor?
- Can the use of video cameras be taken into account to capture the abuse of Jake Brakes?

Mr. Eltringham asked Mr. Trumbo if the Committee has heard back from the Sheriff's Office on their review of the Jake Brake Ordinance. Mr. Eltringham would like to continue to track this agenda item.

ACTION: The Committee will continue to monitor this request and to have it remain on the agenda for the March 26, 2014 meeting.

7. Citizens' Time

There were no comments or questions from citizens.

8. *Other Items*

- **Waterloo Bridge**

Mr. Nesbit stated that he met with both Fauquier County and Culpeper County's administrators and provided them with the same information that was provided this Committee. VDOT is supplying the administrators with requested information and then the Administrators need to go through their respective boards with information and recommendations.

- **Alternate Signage for Atoka Road Request**

Earlier in the meeting, Mr. Trumbo mentioned a specific type of flashing speed sign that informed a driver of their actual speed vs. the posted speed. He asked Mr. Nesbit if this type of sign might be appropriate for the Atoka Road Request. Mr. Nesbit noted that the location would need to be a public entity and there is a specific statewide policy that was developed for specific situations. Mr. Nesbit will check into the feasibility of using this type of sign for the Atoka Road request.

- **Old Waterloo Road**

Mr. Matthew Sheedy asked if the Committee had received a formal response from VDOT regarding the request to lower the speed limit on Old Waterloo Road. Mr. Eltringham replied, yes, the speed limit has been changed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, March 26, 2014.**