

**MINUTES OF
ROUTE 29 NEW BALTIMORE ADVISORY PANEL**

Meeting #3: September 27, 2018

1:00 – 3:00 P.M.

1st Floor Conference Room – Warren Green Building

10 Hotel Street

Warrenton, VA 20186

Members Present: Natalie Erdossy, Brookside HOA; John Lynch, VDOT; Tim Hoffman, Vint Hill HOA; Paolo Belita, Prince William County; Pete Eltringham, Poms Farm; Garrett Moore, VDOT; Marc Geffroy, Business Community; Haven Melton, FAA; Craig Oakley, New Baltimore Fire Department; Cristy Thorpe, C. Hunter Ritchie Elementary School; Ike Broaddus, Vint Hill Business Community

Members Absent: Steve Combs

Staff Present: Fauquier County Sheriff's Office; Mark Nesbit, VDOT; Lou Hatter, VDOT; Ben Davison, VDOT; Holder Trumbo, Fauquier County Scott District Supervisor; Kimberley Fogle, Fauquier County; Marie Pham, Fauquier County

Guests Present: Ray Bell, Poms Farm HOA; Charlie Moore, Suffield Meadows; James Gray; Thomas Daily, Vint Hill Manor HOA; James Ivancic, Fauquier Times; Helen Ross, VDOT; Larry Terry; Mike Pinsker; Pat and John Browne; Chuck Medvitz; Bruce Reehl; Julie Bolthouse, Piedmont Environment Council; Don Del Rosso, Fauquier Now; John Anderson; Dave Mailer, Poms Farm; Brian Cohn; Haley Gray; Jim Schupine, Brookside HOA; Lou Emerson, Fauquier Now

1. Introductions/ Panel Comments

Garrett Moore opened the meeting at 1:02 p.m. with panel member and support staff introductions.

2. Review of Minutes

Garrett asked the committee if there were any changes to the minutes. No changes were noted. Tim Hoffman moved to accept the minutes. Ike Broaddus seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by all members present.

2. a. Interests Defined

Garrett briefly reviewed the list of interests that were defined at the August 30th meeting.

3. Public Feedback Received Since Last Meeting

Lou Hatter noted that since the August 30th meeting VDOT has received one e-mail that the flashers at US 29 and Rt. 215 should be keyed with the traffic, not the signal. This change was completed last year and the flashers are now controlled by loop detection in the dip that reflect the traffic queue.

Lou also noted additional information added to the website such as the meeting schedule, agenda, meeting minutes summary, and that VDOT is working on getting the video recording of the August

meeting on the website. Other information includes traffic information, the New Baltimore Service District (NBSD) Plan, surveys of the archeological and historic resources, as well as other information from previous meetings including the resources folder from the facilitated meetings with the Institute of Environmental Negotiations (IEN).

Pete Eltringham mentioned that there are some documents in that resources folder that could be taken out of context since they may reflect brainstorming ideas that were developed early in the process and do not reflect the final conclusions from the review. Lou also noted that some of the information goes back several years before the county's current Comprehensive Plan was adopted.

4. County Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Update

Kimberley Fogle, Fauquier County's Director of Community Development, handed out a copy of her presentation. (A copy of the presentation has been uploaded to the web site). The NBSD is bounded by US 29. The white areas surrounding the service district on the zoning map indicate no development activity to maintain the rural character of the county. The area in the Buckland Races Battlefield is developed in 10-acre lots so no future development is planned.

There are three key development areas:

- i. *The Triangle Area* – not intended for intensity. The back end is zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC). It is largely bounded by Broad Run Church Road (Rt. 600), Riley Road (Rt. 676), and US 29. One of the key aspects is the development of Cross Creek Drive which would be the main entrance into the triangle. It comes in from the back of Rt. 600 and provides services for US 29 travelers and the community. It would allow residents to access businesses without using US 29.

Tim Hoffman asked where on US 29 Cross Creek Drive would connect. Kimberley said it would connect between Northside 29 and the Shell station.

The plan calls for traffic calming and creating an urban feel as new commercial development occurs for Broad Run Church (Route 600). On-street parking on Rte 600 would be provided to help slow traffic.

Ike Broaddus commented that it would change the character on Rt. 600. Kimberley agreed. Craig Oakley asked where on Rt. 600 the proposed road would connect. It would be offset east from Kelly Road (Rt. 675). Ike added that there's a sign on the road in the approximate location where it will connect.

The dashed line parallel to and south of US 29 is a service drive that provides business access from the rear.

- ii. *Vint Hill* – primarily industrial and tourist facilities.
- iii. *Mill Run* – industrial and office use. The county's long range plan anticipates a signal at Telephone Road (Rt. 838) as well as closing Grays Mill Road (Rt. 674) at US 29 and realigning it further south on US 29. There was consideration to aligning Telephone Road (Rt. 838) and Old Alexandria Turnpike (Rt. 693) but the county is now looking at other options.

Transportation concepts in the Comprehensive Plan include maintaining US 29 as a rural four-lane road, minimizing cut through traffic while providing access to services, and creating an urban node at Cross Creek and US 29. The urban node is a defined area along US 29 to create a place. This area is recommended for signage and enhanced landscaping.

Principles for the Gateway Corridor include the following:

- Maintaining level of service (LOS)
- Minimizing delay
- Minimizing the crash rate
- Increasing safety
- Innovative approaches to keep traffic flowing
- Minimizing speed
- Consolidating entrances

Kimberley reviewed development projects underway or with the potential to develop. Vint Hill is requesting an increase in development by approximately 750,000 sf for a data center. Additional projects are scattered around the service district. Ike asked about the two residential projects on the north side of US 29 and how big they could be if fully developed. Kimberley responded that Wooded Run Estates (Sections 1 and 2) could add 79 lots and the Reserve at Glanaman has the potential for 24 lots.

Pete asked if the wetlands in the Cross Creek area wouldn't limit the development potential. Kimberley explained that FEMA adjusted the area for less wetlands and that the county did a floodplain study and created a floodway. The floodway can be channelized in pipes to allow additional development and provides the opportunity for rear access.

Pete inquired about using the roads that create the hard edge for the service district to carry the majority of the traffic. Kimberley said that US 29 and Rt. 676 do, that Rt. 215 is constrained because it's in a battlefield, and Rts. 602 and 605 serve as a commuter traffic route. Pete noted that the panel cannot look at US 29 without considering Rts. 602 and 605 because of the through traffic there.

5. Define Priority Issues/Movements

Garrett asked the group what they considered the most important movements at the intersections of US 29 and Rt. 215 and US 29 and Rt. 600, starting with Rt. 215.

US 29/Rt. 215

Garrett noted from previous discussions that the left turn from US 29 SB onto Rt. 215 was perhaps the first priority. The group agreed.

Natalie added that a signal needs to remain at the intersection to protect right turns from Rt. 215 onto US 29 NB. Consider signaling the right-turn lane replacing the stop sign with a traffic signal. Ike noted that the signal can remain where it is but it needs to remain for the intersection. Natalie and Tim agreed.

Garrett noted that an increase in volume will occur and experience has shown that in the long-term the intersection will need to be grade separated. Tim suggested that VDOT observe the intersection at dawn or dusk. With the limited volume vehicles speed more and sometimes do not have headlights on making it even less safe. Ike inquired about an acceleration lane to provide some

protection. Garrett responded that due to the humps VDOT was trying to avoid that because of the added expense. The hill would need to be cut at Monterey Church to make that work. Pete noted that at the signal box at the intersection people can see all three faces of the battlefield.

Garrett asked if the left turn from Rt. 215 onto US 29 SB is essential. Ike said it is as necessary as the left turn from US 29 SB onto Rt. 215. Tim felt that if access became more difficult people would divert to the back roads. Pete added that the residents off Pilgrims Rest Road (Rt. 625) need the breaks in traffic the intersection provides to enter US 29.

Garrett said that a second left turn lane from US 29 SB onto Rt. 215 could be evaluated. Tim expressed concern about immediately merging traffic on Rt. 215 from two lanes into one.

Garrett said that another option is to evaluate two left turns out from Rt. 215 onto US 29 SB. The panel members did not have any issues with that. Tim noted that the signal time for Rt. 215 is short and that this might improve traffic flow.

Garrett mentioned the Michigan U-Turn on Rt. 7 at Georgetown with a single left that has a light with a second u-turn option so if drivers cannot make the left turn they can go down and make the u-turn. He noted this would be the same location on US 29 where a u-turn can be made now, but it would be signalized. He asked the panel members if there was any objection. Natalie asked if the signal would remain at US 29 and Rt. 215. Garrett said that it would. Pete expressed concern with that solution and possibly facilitating additional rear end collisions. Garrett responded that they would remove the humps to address this. Tim felt this would exacerbate his concern with making a right turn from Rt. 215 onto US 29 NB. Increased traffic flow on Rt. 215 with a short right turn lane would have traffic stopped up. Haven Melton felt that the two turn lanes would be better.

Garrett asked if this would mitigate the concerns of the group. The group said it would. Garrett summarized the five improvements for the US 29/Rt. 215 intersection as the following:

1. Double left turn lanes from US 29 SB onto Rt. 215, keeping the signal at the intersection.
2. Improve the right turn with signalization from Rt. 215 onto US 29 NB.
3. Double left from Rt. 215 onto US 29 SB.
4. Signalized u-turn on US 29 south of the US 29/Rt. 215 intersection and remove the humps.
5. Left turn lane on Rt. 215 into Weston and Community Christian Church.

Ike asked if the southern u-turn signal would be synchronized with the signal at US 29/Rt. 215. Garrett said it would be designed to work as one signal but there may be a delay in timing with the synchronization.

Pete noted that there are battlefield protection people who feel any change to the topography ruins the battlefield but recognizes the need to improve safety and throughput. He felt that if the design could stay in the existing right-of-way it has merit. Garrett said that the Department of Historic Resources will have to do a finding. VDOT doesn't have final control and may have to mitigate this. Garrett said VDOT will look at this as a possibility and bring it back to the group in October to see if it makes sense.

Tim acknowledged that he likes this solution but is concerned with the impact it will have further south on US 29. Garrett said they have to hit an equilibrium somewhere and are challenged with several constraints. Tim noted that at 5:00 a.m. US 29 backs up from Rt. 600 to Rt. 676. Pete asked if at the next meeting the group could have an overview of the signal timing. Garrett

suggested looking at the intersection of US 29 and Rt. 600 first. With more than three to four signals it is virtually impossible to time the signals. Natalie noted that roughly half of Brookside wants signalized access from Rt. 676 onto US 29. If this happened it might take some of the traffic off the Rt. 215 and Rt. 600 intersections. Garrett responded that VDOT is looking to extend the right acceleration lane but need to address Rts. 215 and 600 first.

Action item: VDOT will bring the panel information on the signal timing on US 29 from Dumfries Road (Rt. 605) to the Prince William County line.

US 29/Rt. 600

Garrett asked if the most important movement was the left turn from Broad Run Church Road (Rt. 600) onto US 29 SB or the left turn from Beverleys Mill Road (Rt. 600) onto US 29 NB. Pete was more concerned with the curve of Rt. 600. Natalie agreed that the right turn from Broad Run Church Road (Rt. 600) onto US 29 NB is problematic. Tim noted that there's an acceleration lane with the right turn lane. Pete said that drivers are traveling too fast and a longer deceleration lane is needed. Craig said that the right turn lane is long. Ike pointed out that drivers don't know where they're supposed to be due to the line striping. Garrett said that if the problem is drivers speeding on US 29 NB and causing accidents at Rt. 600, then the right turn onto US 29 NB needs to be extended/fixed. The Michigan left does this but VDOT needs to look for a different approach. Natalie added that the left turn from US 29 SB onto Rt. 600 also needs to be fixed if drivers cannot turn left from US 29 SB onto Rt, 676.

Ike recommended that the first priority is the left turn from Rt. 600 onto US 29 SB and the second priority is the left turn from Rt. 600 onto US 29 NB. An audience member added that traveling across US 29 on Rt. 600 is also problematic because the light is too short. Tim agreed and said that he rides a bike through the intersection and you can hardly get through in time. Pete noted that the longer the signal provides green time for Rt. 600 the more US 29 will back up. Garrett said the signal needs to be set up to clear and protect people crossing.

Ike noted that the largest turning movement based on the data is the US 29 NB right turn onto Rt. 600 and felt that this should be the second priority. Tim noted that there's a turn lane for this movement. Natalie pointed out that there are weaving issues with drivers using this to accelerate onto US 29 NB and decelerate/turn into The Fauquier Bank. Garrett said that it might be possible to widen Rt. 600 to get turning movements in. Tim pointed out that for cyclists this is one of the few intersections to safely cross to travel from between the northern and southern parts of the county.

Garrett summarized the five prioritized movements for the US 29/Rt. 600 intersection as the following:

1. Left turn from Rt. 600 WB onto US 29 SB.
2. Right turn from US 29 NB onto Rt. 600 EB.
3. Left turn from Rt. 600 EB onto US 29 NB.
4. Left turn from US 29 SB onto Rt. 600 EB.
5. Through movement on Rt. 600 across US 29.

Garrett said he would have VDOT compute a rough score of this scenario to bring back to the panel. Pete asked if 2011 turning movement data was the best available. Garrett responded that the date, even if current, would only be so accurate and is expensive to obtain so it was likely not the best use of funds to collect more recent data. Ike agreed.

Action Item: Garrett will take the US 29/Rt. 215 scenario and US 29/Rt. 600 scenario back to VDOT to study and provide a rough benefit to cost score based on the HSIP criteria and bring the information back to the panel in October.

Ike noted that he did receive one e-mail from a resident asking about the possibility of roundabouts on US 29. He said he has not seen a good study indicating whether or not they would work. Garrett responded that as there are more lanes roundabouts are more challenging. Garrett said he would gather INRIX data and look for comparisons. Pete noted that they were examined with the NBSD Plan and the community thought it might work on Rt. 600 to improve safety but the volume may not work well and there was concern for emergency vehicles.

Action Item: VDOT will follow up by gathering traffic data to find locations with comparable traffic volumes to assess the feasibility of this option.

An audience member asked VDOT to be prepared to speak to how these potential changes could impact other roads. Chuck Medvitz asked that a signal on US 29 at Rt. 676 continue to be considered. Garrett said this might be a follow-up project. Pete asked that a signal at Baldwin Street (Rt. 673) also be considered.

Brian Cohn inquired about access into Weston and Monterey Church. Both intersections are in the battlefield – one in the core area and the other in an area of integrity. He added that the speed limit signs are confusing and need to be reviewed. Garrett stated that VDOT will conduct a speed sign cleanup concurrently with this. He noted that VDOT will need to show a return on investment and address any historic issues. If there is a fatal flaw in this it needs to be identified early. Brian Cohn said he would like to review the concepts with the right-of-way. Garrett said that he cannot guarantee they will stay within the right-of-way.

Action Item: VDOT will conduct a speed sign cleanup.

6. Meeting Calendar

Garrett noted the meeting schedule as Item 6 on the agenda.

7. New Business and Wrap-Up

If not in October, then in November the panel will look at longer range solutions and signal timing. If the panel concurs with the concepts at the next meeting, then VDOT will ask DHR to review.

8. Adjourn, 2:36 p.m.