

**Rappahannock Rapidan Regional Commission**  
**Rural Transportation Technical Committee**  
**April 7, 2010**  
**Minutes**

**Attendees:** Fritz Alderman (Town of Culpeper Planning), Marshall Barron (VDOT - Culpeper District), Jenny Biche (RRRC), John Cooley (Culpeper County Planning), Susan Eddy (Fauquier County Planning), Debbie Kendall – *Vice-Chair* (Orange County Planning), Patrick Mauney (RRRC), Chris Mothersead (Town of Warrenton Planning), Ray Parks (RRCSB-AAA), Jeff Walker (RRRC)

**Guests:** Darrel Johnson (VDOT TMPD), Margaret Moore (Parsons), Joe Springer (Parsons)

***Welcome and Introductions, Agenda, Minutes, Matters from the Public***

D Kendall called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Jenny Biche was introduced as the new Mobility Manager for RRRC. She will be working primarily on the Human Services Transportation program.

The agenda was adjusted, with item #3 – Update on VDOT Rt. 29 Corridor Study to be discussed prior to item #2 – Update on VDOT Long Range Transportation Plan.

***VDOT Route 29 Corridor Study Update***

J Springer provided the committee with a status update of the Route 29 Corridor Study. In December 2009, the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) accepted the study with four additional requests to be developed via a CTB sub-committee. The requests included:

1. Develop a list of priority intersections for improvements throughout the corridor
2. Minimize traffic signals throughout the corridor
3. Facilitate additional discussion in the Buckland area near the Fauquier & Prince William County boundary
4. Facilitate additional discussion in the Charlottesville/Albemarle/29 North area

J Springer indicated that preliminary drafts have been completed for items #1 and #2 and that Parsons and the CTB will be working to facilitate discussions for items #3 and #4 amongst the specific localities. Originally, those four items were to be completed by July 1, 2010, but it is likely that #3 and #4 will require additional time to coordinate and will likely result in additional public outreach at a date to be determined.

***Regional Long Range Transportation Plan Update***

Darrel Johnson explained the current status of the Regional Long Range Transportation Plan following the February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 Public Meeting and subsequent feedback received from the public, localities and CTB. At present, a committee including CTB members Peter Schwartz and James King is scheduled to meet with VDOT TMPD representatives and the VDOT Commissioner to re-evaluate the RLRP process and discuss the overall process, goals and objectives of the RLRP. Several issues have been raised, including the number of

recommendations, a lack of detail in the goals and objectives section and the decision to not constrain the finances in the development of the RLRP recommendations.

M Barron indicated that the RLRP document requires buy-in from the local elected officials and asked that the RTC members complete a thorough review of the recommendations, using their locally adopted Comprehensive Plans as the primary source for this review.

J Walker agreed with this step, indicating that the final review of recommendations has to come from the localities, as they know the viewpoints of their citizens and elected officials better than VDOT or the PDC. He also stated that it must be noted that the RTC cannot make local land use decisions, insofar as those decisions affect the stated goals and objectives of the RLRP.

J Springer stated that the RLRP was initially designed as a Needs-Based process, meant to identify locations that required some work to be done in order to address long-term safety or capacity deficiencies, but not necessarily identify the precise work that needed to be completed. This method is being consistently applied across the Commonwealth, utilizing standard travel demand forecasting. He also stated that inclusion in the RLRP does not equal implementation on the local level, as any recommendations would have to work through the local level.

S Eddy asked for clarification of the goals and objectives in the document. The stated goals were very general and not specific to the region and also stated that if the document was developed as a Needs-Based report, that needed to be indicated and incorporated in the text.

F Alderman and J Walker stated that the identification of a large number of locations is evidence that there are identified deficiencies that must be addressed. J Walker asked that, in addition to the discussion of the document as a Needs-Based plan, efforts be made to add a description of the process used to include or exclude intersections and corridors.

C Mothersead asked that a description of the main goals of the region – Route 29, Route 15, access to interstate 66, etc. – be included in the document, as well. D Johnson indicated that these would be included in the final Technical Report, but that space constraints may preclude these from being in the Plan Document.

M Moore and J Springer agreed to provide the RTC with the most recent text of the Plan Document for review by the RTC members, as well as a spreadsheet with each jurisdiction's recommendations broken out into a separate worksheet for review. The PDC will facilitate gathering the responses and coordinate with Parsons for inclusion in the Plan Document. Each locality will have responsibility for review of its recommendations in conjunction with their adopted Comprehensive Plan, while each locality will also review the Plan Document text and return changes to the Regional Commission for compilation and review.

### ***Next Meeting and Adjournment***

The next meeting of the RTC is scheduled for May 5, 2010 and will be held at the regularly scheduled time of 10 a.m. at the Regional Commission offices.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m. after a motion by F Alderman and second by J Cooley.