

Synopsis of Meeting Feb. 16 with Supervisor Geary Higgins and representative of VDOT, Loudoun County and the WCA

The meeting was requested by the WCA Beautification and Streets committees, to help coordinate action on drainage problems in Waterford largely those related to roadside drainage and repairs that could be addressed before and during road maintenance paving by VDOT of State roads in Waterford proposed for 2017.

Background:

VDOT representatives and County Storm Water representatives and of the WCA met previously in Waterford Nov. 20, 2017 to discuss what changes might improve the function of existing drainage along state maintained roads in the Village. These discussions shortly followed release of the VDOT coring study(David Shields, Material Division report 9/16/16) issued in September 2016 that concluded, among other things, that poor drainage was the single thing most affecting the integrity of the roads because of percolation through the road bed under the pavement. The report also concluded (pg.4) that the elevation of the road surface through multiple reapplication of paving was the cause of some of the drainage overflowing drains and sidewalks but not the major contributor. Buildup of the road base prior to application of repaving of asphalt was a major factor, most notably at the junction of Second Street and Main Street (Shields,2016, p.4) and along west Main Street where the surface elevation is 7"-10" below the road surface(Shields,2016,p.4). The report further concluded that the existing road base in some places was non- existent, to very poorly constructed and that this condition needs to be corrected through complete reconstruction in several areas (Shields, 2016,p.5).

The VDOT coring study recommended complete reconstruction and lowering of the road elevation by excavation and repair of the road base by as much as 12 "(Rt 665, Clarkes Gap Road and Factory Street) and to 9" along Water Street, East Main Street, West Main Street. Three options were generally recommended overall 1.complete reconstruction, 2. Mill to 2" repair substrate as needed, and 3. Mill to 2" and restore surface with no increase or reduction of elevation (Shields,2016, p.6-9). At our WCA/ VDOT November meeting, it was announced by VDOT management, after their internal review of the coring document and road repairs, that they would not reconstruct the road base. Normal stripping to 2" and replace in kind (after patching of sub-base as required, was the option they chose for repaving in 2017. The result would be no change in elevation or improvement in drainage. The reason was cost and timing—reconstruction would be a capital budget outlay that might take from 8 to 10 years to obtain. In the meantime the roads need maintenance. Repaving typically occurs on 16 to18 year cycles with patch and repair from midterm to the next repaving. Assuming repaving in 2017 the next repaving might not be till 2023.

February 16 Meeting:

Attendees- Supervisor Higgins, Stacy Cary, Ernie Brown, County Administrator for facilities, Allan Brewer Steve Plante County Health and Stormwater Drainage Control, Sunil Tatori and Pawan Sarang (VDOT), and Eugene Couser, Tim McGinn and Nick Ratcliffe(WCA task force for repaving and drainage), Wendy

Roseberry (Pres, WCA), Sharyn Franck(WCA vice pres.) Jeff Bean (invited WCA member) and Sarah Holoway(concerned home owner and WCA member).

Sunil reviewed the status of State controlled roads in the village explaining that they are classed as major collector roads for public use not minor roads such as dirt roads. As such, the State has the responsibility to maintain them and repave as needed for preservation of the roads and for safety.

Wendy Roseberry noted the multitude of issues with the infrastructure of the village and hoped that a integrated approach to long range solution of such items a burial of power lines, lowering of street levels and improvement of public amenities might be formed with the cooperation of the County Government.

The discussion then turned to the central purpose of the meeting which was to coordinate responsibilities of the County and the State in correcting poorly operating drainage systems along the roads as well as major collection systems transferring the water from the VDOT maintained drainage on their ROW to facilities in part managed by the County.

Pawan, explained the suggestions that VDOT has for drainage improvements along the roads that were established in the November joint meeting. These included re-grading of drainage ditches, unclogging culverts, installation of channel drains along sidewalks, and inspection of subsurface collectors to see that they are functional. These changes could be made before or in concert with repaving and are consistent with the Shield, 2016, report (p.5).

Steve Plante noted that the collection system for Church Street outflow along that portion west of Second Street has a collapsed drain that lies outside VDOT's ROW is the responsibility of the County and that a construction contract for repair is in place. Ernie Brown stipulated that this is justified because of the safety concerns. Geary Higgins noted that once it is determined that the extension of Church Street (an alley) is the property of the County further improvements may be made for control of the discharge by the County.

The task force was pressing for a surface water drainage study for the town. Ernie Brown explained that the County is not responsible for run off on private property and that the responsibility to control falls to the home owners once the water is on private property. This entails digging out of drainage ditches outside of VDOT right of ways.

There was discussion about what constitutes a surface water control plan for the village. Pawan noted that the Kimmel-Horn study of surface water remediation did not contain requisite engineering studies consistent with a thorough study but rather a statement of commonly used corrective measures each of which would need specific data and plans for implementation. Ernie Brown speaking for the county said that that level of study was outside the scope of the county.

Sunil expressed the opinion, as did Pawan, that review of paving of roads in historic districts do get the review of state and county agencies, but that approval for repaving for maintenance was routinely granted through VDOT management, at a level higher than theirs. They thought that repaving of existing

roads would not trigger a review based on section 106 of the Federal National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended in 1992.

It was decided by the group, with the agreement of Supervisor Geary Higgins, that when plans for construction of the drainage improvements were completed by VDOT, in the next month, that a public meeting would be held in Waterford to get the feedback of property owners in the village, including those properties owned by the Waterford Foundation. Geary Higgins office would host that meeting in Waterford. The Waterford Citizens Association requested that they review the construction contracts awarded by VDOT to contractors before those contracts being let. The meeting adjourned on that note at about 7:20.

References

Shields,D.P., 2016, Pavement Investigation and Evaluation for the Town of Waterford: Commonwealth of Virginia,Dept. of Transportation, Materials Division, Northern Virginia District,86pp.

Nick Ratcliffe

For the Waterford Citizens Association

Feb.19, 2017