

**Win-Fred MPO  
Policy Board Meeting  
October 17, 2007**

**Winchester-Frederick County MPO  
Frederick County Board of Supervisors' Meeting Room  
Policy Board Meeting Minutes  
October 17, 2007 – 10:00 a.m.**

Vice-Chairman Stewart Masters called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. with the following MPO Policy Board members present: Mr. Chuck DeHaven; Mr. John Riley; Mr. Art Major; Mr. Brian Henshaw (for Mike Kehoe); and Mr. Garrett Moore.

MPO Policy Board members absent: Chairman Richard Shickle; Mr. Charley Gaynor; Mr. John Simkins; Mr. Charles Badger; and Mr. Tony Cho.

Others present: Mr. Jay Tibbs; Mr. Eric Lawrence; Mr. Tim Youmans; Mr. Perry Eisenbach; Mr. Tom Hoy; Mr. Jerry Copp; and Mr. Bob Ball

**1. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:**

- a. Welcome and Introductions – Mr. Masters welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- b. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the September 19, 2007 Policy Board Meeting.  
Mr. DeHaven noted a typographical error on page 1 under item #3. He advised the date should be October 17 instead of October 18.  
**A motion was made by Mr. Riley to approve the minutes as corrected from the September 19, 2007 Policy Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moore. The motion carried unanimously.**
- c. Review and Approval of FY 2007-2008 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Progress Report and Invoice.  
**A motion was made by Mr. DeHaven to approve the FY 2007-2008 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Progress Report and Invoice. The motion was seconded by Mr. Riley. The motion carried unanimously.**
- d. Committee Meeting Status Report – **This item was for information only.**
- e. Review and endorsement of proposed Enhancement Program grant applications.  
**Mr. Riley made a motion to endorse both projects (i.e. City of Winchester – Winchester Green Circle Trail – Town Run Linear Park and Frederick County – Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Improvements in the vicinity of Senseny**

**Win-Fred MPO  
Policy Board Meeting  
October 17, 2007**

**Elementary School). The motion was seconded by Mr. Henshaw.  
The motion carried unanimously.**

**2. Public Comment Period.**

There were no public comments.

**3. Final MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Plan.**

Staff requested the Policy Board adopt the Final MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Plan. It was noted that both the Citizens' Advisory and Technical Advisory Committees had recommended approval of this plan.

**Mr. Riley moved to adopt the Final MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Major. The motion carried unanimously.**

**4. Amendment to FY 2008 UPWP Work Task 4B: City and Countywide Transit Study.**

Staff requested the Policy Board approve the amendment to the FY 2008 UPWP. The Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval.

**Mr. DeHaven moved to approve the amendment to the FY 2008 UPWP Work Task 4B: City and Countywide Transit Study. The motion was seconded by Mr. Riley. The motion carried unanimously.**

**5. Fairmont Avenue TIP Amendment.**

This item was tabled at the Policy Board's September meeting due to the lack of City representation. Staff requested the Board approve the withdrawal of this amendment.

Mr. Youmans noted the City had received a letter from Winchester & Western Railroad affirming their support of the withdrawal of this amendment.

**Mr. Major moved to remove Fairmont Avenue from the TIP. The motion was seconded by Mr. DeHaven. The motion carried unanimously.**

**6. Route 37/81/11 Interchange Study.**

The Policy Board took no action on this item.

**7. Plan Adoption Process.**

**Win-Fred MPO  
Policy Board Meeting  
October 17, 2007**

This item was tabled at the Policy Board's September meeting due to a lack of City representation. During discussions, the Policy Board members agreed that jurisdictions should review and approve plan documents prior to their coming before the Policy Board for action.

Mr. Riley advised that any plans or development that occurs within the boundaries of one of the participating jurisdictions should be signed off on by that jurisdiction prior to coming to the MPO.

**Mr. DeHaven moved to adopt the policy as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Major. The motion carried unanimously.**

**8. Proposed FY 09 and FY 10 TIP Information.**

Staff requested the Policy Board approve the FY 2007-2010 addendum, with planned project obligation information for FY 09-10 to be carried forward for public review and comment.

Mr. Riley noted the two proposed projects were Sulphur Springs Road in Frederick County and Weems Lane to Loudoun Street in the City of Winchester.

**Mr. DeHaven moved to adopt the TIP amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moore. The motion carried unanimously.**

**9. Other Business.**

**a. VDOT Draft Access Management Standards and Regulation**

Mr. Lawrence presented the Policy Board with a memo from Mr. John Bishop transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Frederick County Board of Supervisors concerning VDOT's Draft Access Management Standards and Regulation. The Board of Supervisors would like the MPO to be informed of their concerns and sought endorsement of the Board's action or adoption of a resolution from the MPO expressing its concerns as well.

Mr. Moore noted this issue was discussed at the public hearing on VDOT's six-year plan.

**Mr. DeHaven moved for adoption of resolution similar to that of the Frederick County Board of Supervisors or a resolution in support of the Board's resolution stating the Policy Board's concerns with the draft access management guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Riley. The motion carried; however,**

**Win-Fred MPO  
Policy Board Meeting  
October 17, 2007**

**Mr. Moore abstained as this document would be sent to his agency.**

b. Plan Adoption Process – Clarification

Mr. Youmans asked the Policy Board to revisit item #7 as he wanted clarification regarding the Policy Board's action. He stated that he was concerned that, as adopted, if one of the three participating localities does not sign off on a project, then it would hold it up at the Policy Board level.

Mr. Riley responded that it should hold projects up. He went on to say that the purpose of this policy was to avoid a conflict with a jurisdiction that did not support an initiative being considered by the Policy Board and the Policy Board doing something that was county productive to the locality.

Mr. DeHaven hoped that comments would be rendered when requested.

After some discussion, the members were comfortable with the language adopted.

**Meeting adjourned at 10:24 a.m.**