

Rappahannock Rapidan Regional Commission
 Rural Transportation Technical Committee
 Minutes of March 5, 2008

Attendees: Marshall Barron (VDOT, Culpeper District); Rick Carr (Fauquier County, Planning Director); John Cooley (Culpeper County); Dave Cabbage (VDOT, Warrenton Residency Administrator); Rosemary Damewood (Town of Remington- Town Council); Susan Eddy (Fauquier County); John Giometti (VDOT, Culpeper District, Planning & Land Development); Debbie Kendall (Orange County, Strategic Planning); Patrick Mauney (RRRC); Peggy Miles (Orange County Airport); Chris Mothersead, *Chairman* (Town of Warrenton, Planning Director); Harriet Parcels (RRRC); Ray Parks (RRCSB); John Shelbourne (VDOT-TMPD); Jeff Walker (RRRC, Executive Director)

Guests: Kevin Byrnes (GWRC, Director of Regional Planning); Daniel Cole (Spotsylvania County); Fulton DeLaMorton (Stafford County); Nick Donohue (Governor’s Office- Assistant Secretary Transportation); Wanda Parrish (Planning Director, Spotsylvania County); Peter Schwartz (At Large Rural- CTB); Rodney White (Spotsylvania County)

Chairman Chris Mothersead opened the meeting at 2:00 pm and welcomed guests in attendance: representatives from George Washington Regional Commission/PD16 member jurisdictions; Mr. Peter Schwartz, At-Large Rural member Commonwealth Transportation Board; and the Assistance Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Nicholas Donohue. Mr. Mothersead said that the Committee would defer approval of the minutes and other parts of the agenda until the April meeting in order to devote the entire meeting to Mr. Nick Donahue’s presentation about proposed draft Secondary Street Acceptance Standards. Mr. Mothersead then introduced Mr. Donahue, Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. Donahue delivered a Powerpoint presentation regarding proposed Secondary Street Acceptance Standards (SSARs) that were required under SB 1181. He stated that the purpose of the SSARs is to ensure that streets accepted into the state system for perpetual public maintenance provide commensurate public benefit. The legislation requires: connectivity of road and pedestrian networks; minimization of stormwater run-off and reduction of impervious surface through reduced street widths; performance bonding and cost recovery. He said the timeline for implementing the SSARs is to reach out to local governments and developers in each Planning District, then publish the regulation for public comments (April, May or June), then the Advisory Committee will review the public comments and refine the regulation and a final action on the regulation is expected by the CTB towards the end of 2008. He said the SSARs have vesting provisions that recognize vested property rights. Streets can be accepted individually or as a network addition. The regulations pertain to three “area types”: Compact, Suburban and Rural. The connectivity requirements for network additions differ for each area type:

Area Type	Link: Node ratio	External Connection Requirement
Compact Area:	link-node ratio of 1.6 or above	One external connection and an additional external connection and stub for every 50 links or fraction thereof;
Suburban Area:	link-node ratio of 1.4 or above	Same standard as for Compact Area
Rural Area:	no link-node ratio required	Same standard as for Compact Area

Mr. Donahue referenced examples of link-node ratios in developments. He said that the connectivity requirements are goals and that there will be circumstances where they cannot be met. Exceptions include: incompatible land use, physical impedances, existing development, parcel shape and access management requirements. Mr. Donahue said that the regulations allow the locality to enable a developer to meet the link-node ratio requirements for network addition through provision of additional stub-outs. However, if the stub-outs are not connected with future development, the network addition would be removed from the state system after one year. He then discussed pedestrian accommodations required under the regulations.

Area Type	Pedestrian Accommodation Requirement
Compact Area	Sidewalks along both sides of the street
Suburban Area	Sidewalks along both sides of the street or a system of trails and sidewalks; Developments with 2+ acre lots may use a trail system or sidewalks along one side of the street
Rural Area	Trail system or sidewalk along one side of the street No pedestrian requirements for Streets with ADT of 200 or less.

Mr. Donahue then briefly discussed the surety and fees and other provisions of the regulations.

Questions and Answers

1. Does a "Transfer of Development Rights Receiving Area" automatically become subject to the requirements of a Compact Area even if it is located in a Rural Area?

Answer: YES.

2. If an area is a designated area in a Comprehensive Plan, even if it is in a Rural Area, is it automatically subject to the requirements of a Compact Area?

Answer: YES.

3. A question was asked about the impact fee legislation that has been put under study until next year.

Answer: VACO has committed to work out broad impact fees.

4. With a stub-out, if it is in an existing development but there is not adequate right-of-way to create a connection to a new development, whose responsibility is it to make the connection?

Answer: The new developer will pay to make the connection if there is adequate R.O.W. If there is not sufficient right-of-way, the Commissioner may exempt it. The connectivity requirements are goals and there are exceptions recognized in the regulations.

5. Are a multi-use trail and a shared-use trail treated the same way in terms of meeting the pedestrian accommodation requirements by VDOT?

Answer: NO. One meets the VDOT design requirements and the other does not.

Mr. Donahue noted that the cost to the developer for putting in sidewalks and trails is balanced by the reduced cost from narrower road widths. The road widths may vary depending on whether there is on-street parking or not. Curbs and gutters are optional in rural areas.

6. A number of communities are promoting neo-traditional development that would be adversely impacted by some of these requirements. How will this be dealt with?

ANSWER: The neo-traditional developments section has been removed from the regulations as has the maintenance fee requirement.

7. As local governments learn to work with these new link-node requirements, is there somebody they can go to at VDOT who will help them review a proposed street plan and determine if it meets the requirements?

ANSWER: There is nothing provided in the regulation on this but the VDOT district and residency contacts will be helpful in addressing these issues.

As a closing comment, Executive Director Jeff Walker indicated that a link to the regulations will be included in the forthcoming minutes (<http://www.vdot.virginia.gov/projects/ssar/>), as well as posted on the Commission's website at: (<http://www.rrregion.org/longrangeplan>). Mr. Schwartz of the CTB complimented Mr. Donahue for the outstanding work he has done over the past 9-10 months in developing the regulations and educating local governments and others about their content and implementation.

With no further questions, Chairman Mothersead thanked Mr. Donahue for his informative presentation and discussion and adjourned the meeting at 3:50pm.