

Mary Leigh McDaniel
Fauquier County Supervisor
Marshall District
10 Hotel Street, Suite 208
Warrenton, VA 20186

Tom and Jack Peterson
12590 Belle Meade Drive
Markham, VA 22643
703-887-6696
tdp1@mac.com

August 16, 2016

Dear Mary Leigh,

Thank you for meeting with us on Thursday, August 4 to discuss the proposed Markham Truck stop. As discussed, I'm following up with a listing of thoughts to share with VDOT and others. Thank you also for requesting a postponement of the August 31 VDOT public meeting to accommodate community concerns about vacation season, and the absence of several key Markham residents. Cherie Calvert also requested a postponement with Ben Davison of VDOT without success.

In summary, we feel that this issue needs more evaluation time and local involvement for a series of reasons that involve: 1) lack of urgency, 2) outstanding questions related to the July 2015 Virginia Truck Parking Study and those brought up at the first community meeting last spring, 3) absence of a supporting VDOT policy related to public funding of commercial trucking needs, and 4) numerous serious local impacts. We also believe that a private public task force or some other community collaborative planning and review mechanism is essential to guiding a better decisions going forward and avoiding unnecessary conflicts. These issues are described in more detail below.

I believe the Markham community is supportive of legitimate safety issues and needs for trucking as they are considered in a community and statewide context. Many of us can proactively help VDOT, Fauquier County, and other parties understand needs more clearly at the local level and find real solutions that work for the I 66 segment from Marshall to Strasburg. To do so, however, we need to be involved in a constructive manner under a workable timeline and given a chance to look at a full range of alternatives, consistent with the VDOT study recommendations.

Questionable Urgency

It is not clear why the development of this proposed facility is imminently needed. To date the justifications by VDOT have centered on a shortage of parking spaces and conflicts with roadside parking near the Marshall interchange. However, review of currently available spaces indicates more than enough spaces are available to replace the short term need for a new facility of 20 spaces, such as proposed for Markham. It also appears that the potential for new facilities is high to meet longer term needs.

By way of background, the 2015 VDOT Parking Study indicates 43 truck spaces are unused and available for truck use now in the I 66 corridor from Washington, DC to Strasburg, a 75-mile stretch (page 34)

(actual mileage is estimated at 81 miles for this corridor by Map Quest). The segment from Marshall to Strasburg is 32 miles, or 43 percent of the 75-mile corridor. The net demand for the 75-mile corridor is estimated at 542 spaces (585 spaces needed – 43 spaces available = 542 net spaces needed) (page 58, column 13).

This past weekend I visited sites and conducted attendant interviews for facilities within 17-32 minutes of Markham (Warrenton, Front Royal, and Strasburg). Results indicate that the 43 unused sites referenced in the VDOT study are concentrated in the Warrenton, Front Royal, and Stephens City areas and not the segments between Washington, DC and Marshall (there is no specific listing of the locations of the 43 spaces in the VDOT study). Because this was only a first review of underused existing spaces, this may be an underestimate, particularly when looking at the broader region (see Table 1 below). Again, longer term sites with significant supply potential and potential for low operation cost also appear available in these areas.

It is important to recognize that unused spaces exist in the current inventory indicates, by definition, that the VDOT demand calculation for I 66 is longer term in nature, although there is no clear indication of timing for the demand assessment in the study. It does note that overall freight demand in the Northern Virginia corridor is expected to double over the next 20 years (page 19), suggesting that the overload for spaces in the Front Royal and Strasburg areas will unfold over the next two decades. This, plus the availability of spaces in the Marshall to Strasburg corridor now, suggests that a parking crisis does not exist in the short term. Other issues may be driving the road side parking conflict.

Table 1. Unused Truck Stop Spaces within 32 minutes of Markham, VA

Name and Location	Time from Markham	Unused Spaces
Quarles, Warrenton	32 minutes	20-30
High Point, Stephens City	29 minutes	10-11
Liberty Gas Station, Stephens City	27 minutes	12-24
VDOT Truck Stop, Front Royal	22 minutes (including U turn from westbound I 66)	4-8
Other potential facilities given more time for review	TBD	TBD
Total		46-73

Note: Results are based on on-site inspection and interviews with attendants regards night time availability of parking.

The current spaces available in the Front Royal and Strasburg locations alone (not including Warrenton) total 26-43 spaces and are more than the proposed level of parking in Markham (20). This includes an apparent underutilization of the eastbound I 66 VDOT truck stop (as a practical matter, this facility serves both eastbound and westbound trucks via easy U turns in both directions), and it is not clear why another such facility is needed while this one appears underused. This raises questions about the underlying causes of off road parking. As an example, one truck stop operator (Quarles, Warrenton) expressed frustration and confusion over why trucks were not using available spaces and making other choices that caused local conflicts; in another case (7-11 Front Royal) truck carriages were parking within sight of available spaces in department store parking lots that were off limits. Cost does not appear to

be an issue since most truck stops surveyed had no charge for overnight use, and the 7-11 in Front Royal charged only \$3.

In addition to the availability of unused spaces, there has not been adequate consultation with the Markham community on underlying needs, issues, alternatives, and impacts. This has to be clear from the March public meeting and comment since that time, and from consistent historical opposition dating back to the 1970s. Local opposition is growing and inflamed by VDOT's rush to develop without adequate study of alternatives or meaningful involvement of the locality. This is likely to spillover to other public officials if the "damn the torpedoes full speed ahead" approach continues. In contrast, the VDOT study acknowledges that more detailed local study is needed (page 56, see longer discussion below) and calls for the formation of a private public task force as a mechanism for guiding future decisions on parking facilities:

"VDOT should create a multi-disciplinary task force to assess and develop solutions for existing and future truck parking challenges... As part of the Task Force, VDOT should hold a workshop to review the findings from this study and collectively develop implementable strategies and action items" (page 7).

A local private public task force could be undertaken, without timing conflicts, based on the current inventory of unused truck parking spaces documented in Table 1 above. If community interests are involved in a task force, it would fill a void in the VDOT study stakeholder list that excluded private landowners and community interests. We believe future task forces should be fully inclusive and not guided entirely by VDOT practice. See the description of the task force by VDOT below, for instance, and its exclusion of community interests:

"Potential Task Force participants should include VDOT, Virginia State Police, truck stop owners (NATSO), trucker advocacy groups such as VTA and OOIDA, and other industry stakeholders (page 7).

We would request an appropriately diverse and inclusive group be formed that includes community interests. The use of a task force would provide time and resources needed to resolve a number of unanswered questions for the Marshall to Strasburg segment of I 66.

[If it would help, I would be happy to donate staff time from our transportation and economic development analyst at my organization (Scott Williamson), or others on our team who specialize in related policy design, analysis, and implementation issues. Scott is experienced with state and local transportation and land use policy development issues and links to economic development. He works regularly in a collaborative environment with state agencies and stakeholders. I would be happy to continue to provide my time and assistance as well, and to mobilize other forms of assistance as needed.]

Unanswered Questions

Because VDOT has referenced its 2015 VDOT Virginia Parking Study as a rationale for implementation of a Markham truck stop, it is important to look more carefully at this report and understand what it does and does not provide us to support a local project implementation decision. By its own description, the study is a general scoping effort and not an analysis of specific supply and demand and response options and impacts. It notes:

"In this phase of the study, truck parking data collection was not considered, but to calculate a more accurate demand, additional data collection and analysis should be completed. To

obtain the most accurate demand results detailed parking duration studies would need to be completed at facilities along each of the study corridors to obtain peak hours and average parking duration” (page 56).

The results of scoping interviews with stakeholders that serve as the basis for general findings are caveated in the study due to their statistical limitations, as described the following note (one of many) regards online surveys of VDOT Residency Staff, and a second note regards state troopers:

“Due to the small sample size, these results were considered more qualitative in nature” (page 49).

“Identifying Demand Indicators from Surveys: The results from the Virginia State Troopers and Virginia Truckers surveys were used to indicate locations and corridors where truck parking needs are perceived to be greatest. The responses are subjective in nature and should only be used in conjunction with the calculated demand and identified gaps.” (page 59)

Overall, the study is insufficient to inform local decisions, and instead provides a general understanding of issues, indicators, and ideas. Put differently, it is more “a finger in the wind” than the kind of homework needed to make smart implementation decisions. On top of this, number of technical issues stand out in the study in terms of their lack of clarity, consistency, and comprehensiveness.

For instance, the assessment of parking space demand for trucks in the study takes place in isolation of an assessment of overall travel demand and system capacity for the I 66 corridor. It does not evaluate total changes in demand from passenger cars and trucks combined, and potential conflicts from capacity constraints for both that may require demand reduction measures for trucks (and truck parking) in the future. These could affect long term parking demand. Because the study predicts a doubling of freight demand by 2035 (page 19), it is fair to assume that a similar increase in passenger traffic could also occur. When combined, the impacts of both could be overwhelming and trigger other policy and technology responses that are not considered at present in the VDOT study.

The VDOT study alludes to the need for an examination of a full range of potential alternatives prior to enactment of specific local responses (as well as recommending more detailed analysis and task force involvement in these decisions). In contrast, VDOT’s plan for Markham bypasses this process entirely. As we indicated in our meeting, and consistent with the VDOT study, we believe a discussion of site design modifications for a Markham facility is premature because there has been no examination of a full range of alternatives needed to address both policy and project questions, nor an adequate assessment of key local issues such as described above. We would expect to see a range of possible response actions that go beyond traditional public facility development, particularly given that 90 percent of all facilities at present are privately owned (page 10) and market responses are key. This could include exploration of cooperative relationships with private property owners through acts of goodwill or low cost lease arrangements, for instance, and many other options that minimize costs and maximize benefits.

Related to the need for a review of response option alternatives, the study does not provide a process for review of site design alternatives for such options as they would apply to both existing and new facilities. Design features could significantly impact their performance and acceptability, such as pricing and project and location specific amenities and technologies such as gathering places for fellowship, indoor toilettes, food service, etc. The role that these design features play on truck use may be critical in understanding why some trucks are not using available spaces at present (is it related to price, amenity level, and type?), and would be critical to understanding the most cost effective way to identify and design future response actions to address shortages in parking using all available options (can design changes reduce costs and increase benefits?).

Remarkably, the study does not evaluate cost issues even though budget constraints are key to VDOT and cost/benefit performance is a standard policy and project performance indicator. There is no cost effectiveness of response option alternatives to guide policy or project decisions, and no indirect impact evaluation of secondary issues such as community impacts. At this point we still have not received disclosure of the annual operating expenses of the proposed truck stop, and question the accuracy of current cost estimates for a Markham facility by VDOT. We understand also that VDOT has not been able to keep up with maintenance needs of existing facilities due to budget shortfalls. This would seem a major feasibility and policy issue for VDOT and increase the risk that a facility in Markham would not be maintained and result in greater than expected risks and damages than those portrayed by VDOT.

In addition, the VDOT study appears to look at safety issues only through a narrow trucking lens, with focus on hours of rest and other trucker safety requirements as opposed to broader public safety issues. It does not include, for instance, a full set of impacts for both on-road and off-road community level safety. This includes community crime issues identified by state police (local property owners have been advised to expand precautions against crime associated with the site if the facility is built), or the increased risk of vehicle collisions with bears and deer and resulting passenger death and injury (a major issue in Markham this year). Similarly, the the study does not evaluate hidden costs such as impacts on property values and community value from degraded scenery, air and water quality, noise, and light pollution even though media reports associated with I 66 eastbound VDOT facility in Front Royal identified negative impacts according to nearby property owners.

In general, the VDOT study does not appear to connect the dots between specific safety requirements, such as hours of rest for long haul routes, with specific segment level demand for parking spaces and specific response options, and does not establish a clear local relationship with hours of rest needs. For instance, there is no clear assessment of the incremental impact on safety of directing trucks from Marshall to Front Royal and Strasburg as opposed to Markham, a difference of 15-27 minutes under normal driving conditions. Similarly, there is no clear analysis of the overlay of hours of rest requirements for major truck traffic patterns, such as the use of I 66 from the beltway to Manassas, or the transition from route 95 to route 17 to I 66 and I 81. The geographic mapping of safety needs for parking based on specific regulatory requirements is critical to supply side decisions. The VDOT justification for a Markham truck stop requires data that appears either to be lacking or inconsistent.

We have cause for concern that the VDOT study not only lacks necessary detail for local project decisions, but lacks the necessary transparency to resolve some apparent inconsistencies. For instance, as noted earlier, the net demand assessment of 542 spaces needed for the I 66 corridor lacks a time element and flies in the face of the availability of 43 unused spaces somewhere in the corridor. The existence of many unused spaces in Front Royal and Strasburg flies in the face of claims that road side parking is occurring due to a lack of available spaces. We also see reference in the study to 140 parking citations issued statewide in 2011 but no breakdown by location. When spread across the entire state, this does not seem like a large number would likely have occurred in one particular location, such as Marshall.

The statements on roadside parking made by VDOT seem contradictory at times, and suggest a need for further examination. One key question is why truckers are parking on the roadside anywhere, and in particular at the Marshall interchange, when space is available within a short drive. Are they looking for particular amenities? If so which? The VDOT study indicates that commercial trucks strongly prefer high amenity levels (page 10). This could explain local patters of use of lack of use of facilities. For instance, the 7-11 truck stop in Front Royal has a total of 27 carrier (without trailer) spots, 19 of which are typically unused at night. It has nine tractor trailer spaces that are heavily used. Yet across the street in the Wal-Mart and Lowes parking lots, truckers are parking carrier vehicles within site of the 7-11. We

also see that the eastbound I 66 VDOT facility located within one mile of these facilities is significantly underutilized by tractor trailers, and we see higher levels of use for the nearby Liberty parking lot and High Point truck stop in Stephens City, both of which offer amenities.

These apparent inconsistencies raise further questions of where, exactly, truckers have been reportedly parking on route 17 near Marshall. My examination of the interchange and full segment of route 17 indicated that the only location between Warrenton and Marshall northbound on route 17 with No Parking signs was Great Meadows state park (probably to manage events), and there was no evidence of parking or debris on the roadside going north near the Marshall interchange. This could indicate the lack of a problem or the lack of enforcement. In contrast, No Parking signs had been heavily posted on southbound exit segment of route 17 from I 66 and debris was present, suggesting that the roadside parking issue at the Marshall interchange is associated with *eastbound* traffic from I 66, not *westbound* traffic (used by VDOT to justify a Markham rest area). Again, this is odd given that VDOT built a truck stop on I 66 eastbound within a short drive, yet the facility is underused and parking and trash issues may still persist on the southbound route in Marshall.

We note that the stated net demand for 542 parking spaces on I 66 would translate to about ten trucks per exit along the corridor with nowhere to go, except the roadside. We do not see this happening, and would like much more clarity around the timing and procedures for the demand assessment. We also wonder how this squares with the statement that demand for freight transfer in the Northern Virginia region is expected to double by 2035. Does this indicate the time frame assumed in the demand assessment?

We also note that the long term demand for I 66, if it falls proportionately on the Marshall to Strasburg segment (which is unclear), is driven by commercial long haul freight that prefers facilities with high levels of amenities. These cannot be provided in Markham, and points to the need for a larger modern facility in the long term in the Front Royal or Strasburg areas. This area is already a parking cluster for trucks, and a number of sites appear to be available for such a facility. We would like to see an evaluation of several potential options in this area to save and better spend the \$700,000 upfront cost to develop the Markham site, as well as future maintenance costs. It may be that more cost effective options exist.

Many other technical questions emerge from the VDOT study that are beyond the scope of this note and could be addressed through additional opportunities for review and a more detailed local study. I have attached a series of excerpts from the study at the end of this letter that underscore the need for further discussion.

Murky Public Policy

One of the advantages of an overarching VDOT policy to guide planning and project implementation is the establishment and targeting of high priority public policy objectives that can be carried out in a consistent and efficient manner. This typically includes set of decision criteria for program and project decisions, and the use of appropriate collaborative processes for stakeholder involvement and fact finding. It is our understanding that VDOT does not have such a policy for the public financing of commercial use truck stop facilities of the sort contemplated for Markham. Absent these guidelines, VDOT may not be following a consistent or comprehensive approach to such decisions when making local decisions and may, by default, be looking too narrowly at key issues to make sound budget decisions.

The 2015 VDOT study itself does not establish a set of objectives or collaborative procedures by which they can be implemented, and instead references a select set of safety rules for compliance. It does not lay out a set of objectives that would include a full set of public safety issues (including risks that new facilities cause to the community as opposed to sole focus on road safety); direct and indirect cost considerations, including comparative costs of all alternatives as well as hidden costs such as damage to property values and the environment; a full set of benefits beyond those only applicable to truck safety rules, such as community small business enterprise development; or meaningful public input that would include involvement in decisions by more than the “usual suspects” listed in the VDOT study to ensure alignment of policy and public interest.

It is our understanding that VDOT is leaning away from public funding of passenger car rest stops in deference to commercial facilities and local enterprise, and specifically is avoiding public expenditures that would stand in the way of this private supply response. This raises immediate questions of policy consistency across transportation programs; it is not clear why trucks and passenger vehicles should be treated differently. Given that 90 percent of truck facilities are private, this also raises the question of why VDOT is trying to expand public facilities rather than enhancing and incentivizing private sector responses. As noted, we understand that VDOT has not been able to keep up with the maintenance needs of existing rest areas, particularly those newly constructed, and this raises questions about the efficacy budget allocations and timing.

We would feel more comfortable if decisions on truck stop facilities on I 66, particularly for the Markham to Strasburg segment, were approached in a more holistic and open manner that provides consistency across public policies at the state and local levels and addresses a broader set of public needs. We prefer that local policies be fully considered by VDOT and that an appropriately full range of alternatives and impacts be considered to avoid conflicts that are unnecessary. For instance, the proposed VDOT truck stop facility may contradict Fauquier County land use plans and landscape protection incentives for Markham over past decades, as residents explained in the public meeting.

No Real Discussion of Local Impacts

Before a decision is made, the people who would bear the brunt of the decision would appreciate a chance to discuss their concerns and ideas and participate in a process to address those concerns and be proactively involved in crafting solutions. Here are just a few of the issues that are brought up in local conversations whenever the subject of the truck stop is raised:

- Potential for increased crime. As noted in the public meeting, Belle Meade Drive winds around the back of the proposed site and is a concern for crime based on the experience of other such facility configurations. In February, I was advised by a state trooper on the site that local property owners would need to take extra precautions against crime generated by the facility. We have already had difficulty with night time crime and crime off road on Belle Meade Drive. He also said that his department did not favor the proposed plan due to concerns about safety and crime. The proposed facility would be remote and unsupervised and create conditions conducive to crime on site and nearby.
- Public safety. As noted, vehicle collisions with bears and deer are already a problem. In February 2016 a passenger was killed when a car struck a bear in front of the proposed site. In the first two weeks of June two additional bears were killed. Research indicates that a multiple of bears (and deer) are hit by vehicles for each killed on the road. The existence of portable toilettes and trash cans at the Markham site would likely attract more bears. Fencing may not be effective and both bears and deer are likely to enter the site where trucks enter off of I 66 based on

experience with other facilities. This is not a good area for any form of development that could increase vehicle-animal collisions.

- Water quality and watershed impacts. One of the longstanding issues with the site is runoff and water quality impairment to Goose Creek. The area does not perk and frequently has standing water after heavy rains. We suspect that the cost of avoiding water damage to parking areas will be higher than VDOT current suggests because the trucks will be parked on top of what amounts to a sponge. We also know that trucks leave residues and other runoff that find their way into local water supplies. Degradation of the water supply and watershed is likely.
- Air quality impacts from idling trucks. Idling trucks burn large quantities of diesel fuel and produce significant concentrations of local air pollutants. In an ideal world trucks would be prohibited from idling and or have access to electric charging units to provide power assist for heating, air conditioning, internet, and engine starting. However, these power assist units require a central power source that is beyond the scope of the Markham site and more easily provided in a location such as Front Royal. An added benefit of such units is that they save truckers the expense of burning several gallons of fuel while idling; for independent truckers who bear the full cost of fuel expenses, this could be particularly helpful.
- Lighting. We remained concerned that the type of lighting proposed, and perhaps any lighting that is effective at addressing truckers needs, will impair the view shed of the scenic corridor in which the Markham site is located. Lighting will be installed in an otherwise dark area that is easily seen by passersby and residents in a wide radius.
- Screening, fences, and barbed wire. The type of screening used by VDOT for the eastbound I 66 facility completely blocks the view of the area and would block the existing view of an expansive natural area appreciated by residents and passersby on Belle Meade Drive and I 66. Combined with elevated chain link fencing and barbed wire, it dramatically changes the natural and scenic character of the area.
- Property values and litigation. We note that mere presence of the facility in Front Royal was reportedly enough to drive values down, even with partial use of the ten parking spots. We are aware also of successful litigation brought in another Northern Virginia location in response to property devaluation from a truck stop. These impacts and outcomes are entirely relevant and possible in Markham.
- Community branding. In addition to devaluation of local property, the Markham community itself is not likely to benefit from becoming known as a designated truck stop. I'm sure that everyone would prefer that the area be known for more positive and aesthetic reasons.
- Tradeoffs for other uses of funds. As was said in the public meeting, residents are frustrated that VDOT cannot keep up with local maintenance and safety needs while proposing to spend new funds on new facilities. This is personal issue for some. One resident reportedly lost her father to a vehicle collision (involving a friend) at the intersection of routes 55 and 688 some years ago due to a blind spot. The family requested a flashing light or some other intervention for a long time but nothing happened. To place available funds into a new facility based on a safety rationale and continue to ignore long standing community safety needs seems insensitive, inconsistent, and short sighted.
- Goodwill, breaking of public trust. We trust that VDOT cares about its relationship with the public (writ large) and our representatives. The proposed truck stop and the notification process by which it has been pursued have eroded trust badly and created friction between the private

and public sectors. Now would be a good time to work openly with the community and take a sincere, second look at legitimate safety needs and solutions in a community context.

- Longstanding opposition. The Middleton family was faced with condemnation of their land when VDOT acquired it, and has never been granted the opportunity to buy the land back since the 1970's while the site was unused. During this entire period local residents have voiced opposition to development of the site when they have become aware of plans. We see no reason today that the circumstances favor a truck stop versus better use of the land.
- Natural heritage. The Markham site serves as a valuable and highly appreciated natural area. On January 2, for instance, I watched five bald eagles feed on a downed deer just across Belle Meade in view of the site. This was both an amazing occurrence given that 40 years ago eagles were absent due to pesticide pollution, and an indication of the natural heritage value of this area.
- Future changes. Looking forward to the next 40 years, it is difficult to understand why this location is preferred. It is not supported by a full set of trend lines and options. The fact that VDOT owns the land does not change is, as VDOT owns many other properties and has other options that could be explored as more cost effective use of public funds.

In short, we are frustrated and believe there is a better way to address legitimate safety needs in combination with other key considerations. This is simply not the way decisions should get made, and there is still time to achieve a better outcome. We also believe this is a perfect opportunity for some teamwork on solutions. We request that the current process underway by VDOT be replaced by an appropriate community collaboration and supplemental study of comprehensive options.

Excerpts from the VDOT Study

"The primary purpose of this study was to identify the frequency of trucks parking on ramps near interchanges, rest areas, and welcome centers on the CoSS; and to determine where truck parking is needed. Starting with the latest interstate truck parking research in Virginia, "Estimation of the Demand for Commercial Truck Parking on Interstate Highways in Virginia" (2004) conducted by the Virginia Center for Transportation and Innovation Research (VCTIR), this study documents the supply of truck parking spaces throughout the state, including public and private facilities, and estimates truck parking demand for each CoSS using a methodology established by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in "Study of Adequacy of Commercial Truck Parking Facilities" (2002).

(page 1)

Locations where trucks park in undesignated areas, such as mainline and ramp shoulders, were identified through the stakeholder surveys... In addition, many truck parking facilities are not designed to meet the current size requirements for truck, which creates other maintenance challenges.

(page 2)

Accessibility of truck parking spaces in both public and private facilities is the most frequently reported challenge to truckers.

- Over 85% of truck drivers believe that there are areas at public and private truck parking facilities that are not accessible to them.

- Many of Virginia’s existing parking facilities are functionally obsolete—they were designed and built when trucks were much smaller (in length, width, and weight)—making maneuverability a challenge for today’s larger trucks. The situation is unsafe, resulting in property damage to trucks and parking facilities.

A major generator of truck traffic on the I-66 corridor is the Virginia Inland Port, which is located in Front Royal in northwest Virginia.

(page 3)

“The regional truck parking needs include the truck staging areas by major truck generators, such as rail terminals, warehouse districts, and distribution centers.”

(page 4)

Given the HOS requirements and the existing truck parking inventory, increasing the supply of truck parking spaces in appropriate areas will have a significant impact in mitigating truck parking in undesirable locations.

(page 5)

Recommendation 1 - Partner with private industry and local governments to increase capacity and related improvements.

“VDOT should identify and prioritize truck parking improvements in congested areas, specifically in the regions identified in this study with high truck parking supply deficits, and collaborate with stakeholders to establish additional truck parking spaces.”

“VDOT should partner with the private sector and localities to identify opportunities to expand existing truck parking facilities or develop new truck parking facilities by:

- Examining the possibilities of creating special incentives for the private sector to develop truck parking facilities
- Creating tax abatements or low-cost loans for new or expanded truck parking facilities along the high- demand and low-supply corridors identified in this report”

(pages 6 and 7)

“VDOT should create a multi-disciplinary task force to assess and develop solutions for existing and future truck parking challenges.

- Potential Task Force participants should include VDOT, Virginia State Police, truck stop owners (NATSO), trucker advocacy groups such as VTA and OOIDA, and other industry stakeholders. As part of the Task Force, VDOT should hold a workshop to review the findings from this study and collectively develop implementable strategies and action items.
- VDOT should work with neighboring states, the I-95 Corridor Coalition, and the I-81 Corridor Coalition to develop regional truck parking solutions.
- VDOT should develop a new Informational and Instructional Memoranda (I&IM) that would focus on truck accessibility when planning for and/or designing roadway facilities, such as ramps, shoulders, or truck parking areas.”

(page 7)

“Commercial vehicle (CMV) operators preferred commercial truck stops and travel plazas for activities that required them to park their vehicles, but preferred public rest areas when stopping for a short nap.”

“The estimated truck parking demand at public facilities far outweighed the supply, while the private commercial facility truck parking supply seemed sufficient to meet estimated demand.”

(page 10)

“In addition, this study found the freight tonnage moving into, out of, and within Virginia is expected to roughly double by 2035.”

(page 19)

“Virginia Study:

The study developed a 12-point strategy to address the truck parking challenges in the state. The 12 points were further categorized as: Partnering, Policy, Planning and Finance, and Technology and Design.

Partnering

Advance Technical Advisory Committee study recommendations by forming a public-private task force
Collaborate with neighboring states to forge regional solutions
Explore opportunities for expanding truck parking capacity and local economic development through dual-use facilities, brownfield reuse, and provision of parking at truck-oriented developments”

“Northern Virginia Corridor

The Northern Virginia Corridor is primarily defined by I-66, which is a four- to eight-lane interstate located in the northern part of Virginia. This corridor traverses urban, suburban, and rural areas over the course of its approximate 75- mile length. The western limit of I-66 is located at I-81 near Strasburg, Virginia, and the eastern limit is at the border of the District of Columbia in Arlington, Virginia. I-66 is primarily a commuting corridor used to connect residential areas in the west to employment centers in the east.”

(page 34)

“A total of 7,464 truck parking spaces were reported, of which approximately 90% were provided in private facilities, while the remaining 10% were provided at VDOT safety rest areas and welcome centers.”

(page 36)

“Truck parking in undesignated locations, specifically on shoulders of entrance ramps and mainline roadway is a safety concern and presents higher risks to the traveling public as well as the parked trucks. In an attempt to understand quality and quantity of these risks, five key stakeholder groups were targeted for outreach efforts.

Virginia State Troopers

VDOT Residency Staff

VDOT Rest Area Staff

Truckers who travel on Virginia roads Owners/operators of Virginia truck stops”

(page 45)

“State trooper respondents offered a variety of suggestions for truck parking to improve safety, including:

- Increasing the quantity of truck parking spaces
- Increasing the size and accessibility of truck parking spaces
- Adding more No Parking signs along shoulders
- Removing time restrictions from lots
- Increasing truck driver education related to safety risks caused by parking on ramps and shoulders”

(page 46)

“Methodology

In late October 2013, VDOT distributed a 5- to 7-minute online survey to all VDOT Residency Administrators. Survey responses were received from 16 of the 43 Residency Administrators, with representation as follows:

I-64, between Richmond and Hampton Roads

Near the intersection of I-95, I-85 and US 460 near Petersburg I-95 near Washington, D.C.

Isolated interchanges on I-66

Isolated interchanges on I-81

Near the intersection of I-81 and I-64, near Lexington, Virginia

Identify specific locations where truckers are parking in areas that are not designated for truck parking, such as:

- Ramp shoulders
- Mainline shoulders
- Other undesignated areas

Understand the circumstances and extent for which the occurrence of parking in undesignated areas happens and what challenges are presented”

“VDOT Residency Staff: Due to the small sample size, these results were considered more qualitative in nature.”

(page 49)

“Truck parking at the reviewed rest areas is being utilized to the fullest extent possible. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the rest areas are at or over capacity for truck parking”

(page 50)

“Demand Methodology

In this phase of the study, truck parking data collection was not considered, but to calculate a more accurate demand, additional data collection and analysis should be completed. To obtain the most accurate demand results detailed parking duration studies would need to be completed at facilities along each of the study corridors to obtain peak hours and average parking duration.”

(page 56)

“A majority of respondents reported having parked in undesignated areas, specifically shoulders of ramps and mainlines, to fulfill both short-term and long-term parking needs; however, respondents reported that parking in undesignated areas is infrequent”

“For short-term parking, truckers prefer VDOT rest areas (33%) over private truck stops (26%). For long-term parking, truckers prefer, by a wide margin, to use private truck stops (49%) over VDOT rest areas (15%)”

(page 52)

“Identifying Demand Indicators from Surveys

The results from the Virginia State Troopers and Virginia Truckers surveys were used to indicate locations and corridors where truck parking needs are perceived to be greatest. The responses are subjective in nature and should only be used in conjunction with the calculated demand and identified gaps.”

(page 59)

“Recommendation 1 - Partner with private industry and local governments to increase capacity and related improvements.

VDOT should identify and prioritize truck parking improvements in congested areas, specifically in the regions identified in this study with high truck parking supply deficits, and collaborate with stakeholders to establish additional truck parking spaces.

VDOT should partner with the private sector and localities to identify opportunities to expand existing truck parking facilities or develop new truck parking facilities by:

- Examining the possibilities of creating special incentives for the private sector to develop truck parking facilities
- Creating tax abatements or low-cost loans for new or expanded truck parking facilities along the high-demand and low-supply corridors identified in this report”

(page 68)