

TRANSPORTATION

Franklin County's transportation planning process involves input through the County Board of Supervisors and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). VDOT is primarily responsible for developing the final plans for construction and implementing the projects for secondary roads. The Board of Supervisors works with VDOT's local Residency office and the VDOT officials in various division in the Salem District Administrative office. The County is represented annually at pre-allocation hearings held in Salem, Virginia, where input is given on various needs and projects involving transportation infrastructure development particularly involving urban, primary and interstate system projects. The VDOT Transportation Planning Division in Richmond is involved along with other VDOT divisions in developing Non-Secondary Six-Year Improvement Programs and other transportation plans and studies. In recent years, VDOT has been involved with the development of long-range type projects under its VTRANS 2025 program, which includes efforts to produce innovative multi-modal projects. The program includes working closely with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, Department of Aviation, and Virginia Ports Authority.

Highway System

One U.S. highway and three Virginia primary highways cross Franklin County, making the use by motor freight carriers convenient and economical for both existing and prospective industries and for the general public in moving from home to job sites. The U. S. Route 220 corridor, a four-lane divided highway, is the single federal primary route in the County which runs from north to south, beginning at the Roanoke County line and continuing to the Henry County line and dividing the County in half. This route is a major connector between Interstate 81 in the Roanoke area and Interstates 40 and 85 in North Carolina and is a major trade route for commercial-industrial movement of goods. Route 220 also connects with U.S. Route 58 in Henry County and, with future superhighway improvements, will become an important connector route to Virginia's ports. Route 220, through Franklin County, links two major metropolitan trade areas, Roanoke-Roanoke County to the north and Greensboro-High Point-Winston Salem to the south.

There are three state primary routes in the County: Route 122 connects Rocky Mount and Bedford County-Bedford City. Route 116 intersects Route 122 at Burnt Chimney and continues northward to the City of Roanoke. These two routes connect the Smith Mountain Lake area with Rocky Mount, Roanoke, and Bedford. The third state primary route is Route 40 that runs through the County east-west and connects the County with U. S. Route 29 in Pittsylvania County; a major north-south trade route. Route 40 also connects with State Route 8 in Patrick County to the west of Franklin County. Locally, Route 40 passes through the center part of the County and provides access to Rocky Mount from eastern and western parts of the County.

The major state secondary routes serving the County by average daily traffic include: Routes 602, 605, 606, 616, 619, 634, 636, 640, 641, 655, 670, 676, 684, 697, 739, 820, 834, 890, 919. These routes were considered in the State's 2030 highway plan and had at or above 1000 vehicles per day average daily traffic.

In 1993, a proposal was advanced to develop a new interstate, Interstate 73, to connect Detroit, Michigan, with Charleston, South Carolina--a new Midwest to South Atlantic connection. Franklin County, the West Piedmont Planning District, and organizations in the Roanoke Valley endorsed a connection for the I-73 corridor that would employ sections of U.S. Route 460, the I-81 and I-581 route, and new roadway generally parallel to U.S. Route 220 through Roanoke, Franklin County, and Henry County. This alternative would provide Franklin County with direct access to the nation's interstate system that the County does not currently have.

The location of the I-73/I-83 corridor will have fundamental and long-range impacts on Franklin County. Traffic patterns will change dramatically as will the role of U.S. Route 220 for commuters. The current growth of highway-oriented business along Route 220 may be altered by an impetus to locate certain types of businesses and services at future interstate interchanges. Similarly, the role of U.S. Route 40 to the east of Rocky Mount may be changed dramatically, depending on the final position of an Interstate 73/Route 40 interchange-

Highway Deficiencies and the Statewide Highway Plan--In 1981, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) developed a status report of Statewide Transportation Facilities Inventory and Local Transportation Issues for the West Piedmont Planning District. The report determined that 12.4 miles of primary roadway and 49.1 miles of secondary roadway had deficiencies. The study employed information on roadway type, pavement width, number of lanes, accident data, and serviceability to make deficiency determinations.

In 2005, VDOT developed a Statewide Highway Plan that consolidated principal primary and secondary routes of the County into a single inventory showing conditions, deficiencies, and recommendations for improvements and priorities for improvements as suggested by the local government and divisions of VDOT's Salem District Administrative office in Salem, VA. The document was abstracted to obtain a list of routes in Franklin County that appear in the Plan; these have been reproduced in this chapter as a table, "Virginia Statewide Highway Plan, Year 2030, Highway Inventory with Recommendations, Franklin County." The projects listed in this table may be located on the map that follows by using the Map Reference Numbers from the table.

Six-Year Plan--The Virginia Department of Transportation develops Six-Year Plans for roadway improvements to urban system roads (Town of Rocky Mount) and primary system roads (Franklin County) on an annual basis, available funding, comments received during annual public hearings, and input for local governing bodies and government leaders. The following improvements were programmed for Franklin County in fall 2005 for the FY 2007 to FY 2012 Program:

Primary Routes:

- In Rocky Mount, VDOT has included work on Route 220/South Main Street in its Six-Year Improvement Program to include replacement of a bridge over the Pigg River that is a bottleneck for traffic and an old facility. Including the bridge approaches which will be widened, the length of the project will be 0.29 miles long. The construction on Route 220/South Main Street will take place from 0.29 miles south of Scuffling Hill Road and proceed north to the Route 220/Scuffling

Hill Road intersection. The total cost of the project will be \$3.868 million. Preliminary engineering is to be underway in 2006 with right of way to be acquired in FY 2006-2007 and Construction anticipated in FY 2009-2011.

- On Route 122, VDOT has plans for the additions of left turn lanes and right turn lanes at the intersection of Route 122 and Route 116. Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition were underway in FY 2006 and construction is anticipated for FY 2007. VDOT's total cost estimate for the work is \$1.216 million.
- VDOT has underway in the Ferrum community improvements to make travel easier for pedestrians and bicyclists. This has involved construction of sidewalks along the Sheriff Shively Bridge, crossings of the Norfolk & Southern Railroad tracks, and Route 805. The project's total funding is estimated at \$463,000. The improvements tie into other community improvements at Ferrum (this was not specifically a construction program item, this was an Enhancement Program project, partially funded by the County and administered by the County).

Interstate Routes—Interstate 73:

The Virginia Department of Transportation has received substantial funding from the Congress and Commonwealth Transportation Board to conduct the necessary studies of Interstate 73 in the 1990's that culminated in detailed environmental impact studies being conducted. By Virginia law, members of the Commonwealth Transportation Board decide where new roads will be located. The Board approved the original I-73 location in June 2001 following intensive environmental review. More than a year after the location was selected, in November 2002, the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places determined that the "Southeast Roanoke Neighborhood" in Roanoke was eligible for historic designation. As a result, the Federal Highway Administration informed the Virginia Department of Transportation that another section [alignment] of I-73 through Roanoke must be chosen to avoid the neighborhood. The Commonwealth Transportation Board then changed the location of a 12-mile section of the Interstate 73 corridor through Roanoke, Roanoke County and northern Franklin County following action. Members of the Board voted unanimously to alter the route to avoid a neighborhood in southeast Roanoke that has been determined to be eligible for historic designation.

The new routing for I-73 begins at Elm Avenue in Roanoke and continues south along existing Route 220 into the Clearbrook area of Roanoke County. The route then veers southeast of Buck Mountain along Route 657 into Franklin County, where it rejoins the original corridor. No other section of the 70-mile corridor is affected by the change. The alignment across Franklin County, where the revised segment terminates, proceeds from near the intersection of Crowell Gap Road/Boones Mill Road southeasterly to a crossing of Red Valley Road, Bonbrook Mill Road, southward to a crossing of Sample Road, Wirtz Road, Kin Vale Road, Angle Plantation Road, Booker T. Washington Highway/Route 122, Old Franklin Turnpike/Route 40, Muse Field Road, Chestnut Hill Road, Doe Run Road, Double Branch Road, Ashpone Tavern Road, Sontag Road, Windy Ridge Road, Goose Dam Road, McNeil Mill Road, then southwesterly to U.S. Route 220, southeasterly to a parallel course with Muddy Fork Road, crossing the Franklin/Henry County line. Potential interchanges on the VDOT proposals were set at Bonbrook Mill Road (west of Route 116), at Wirtz Road, at Old Franklin Turnpike/Route 40, at Sontag Road, at Fork Mountain, and at Route 220; an interchange on Snow Creek Road, near the Franklin/Henry County line is also proposed in Henry County.

The current step in VDOT's I-73 Location Study is to submit the Final Environmental Impact Statement on the selected location to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for approval. FHWA then will issue a Record of Decision (ROD). Once a Record of Decision is issued, and if funds are available, design of construction plans can begin. As of the drafting of this Plan, there are no specific funds relegated to the design work inside the Six-Year Improvement Program of the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

Route 220 Safety Improvements Program

The Virginia Department of Transportation is planning short-term safety improvements at various locations on Route 220 in Roanoke City, Roanoke County, Franklin County, and Henry County. These improvements are not a major reconstruction of Route 220 and are anticipated to be completed within the existing right-of-way. VDOT has budgeted \$8.3 million to make these safety improvements on Route 220. The spot improvements shall include:

- Building additional turn lanes
- Upgrading or closing crossovers
- Installing new, upgraded guardrails
- Adding dynamic message signs to provide incident information to motorists

Turn Lanes--VDOT plans to add turn lanes in each direction to some crossovers on Route 220 as a safety improvement. Adding turn lanes provides drivers with an area to safely wait to turn, away from fast moving, through traffic. Some crossovers on Route 220 have medians that are too narrow for turning vehicles to safely wait for traffic to clear. VDOT plans to add turn lanes or make turn lane improvements at the following locations in the County:

Location	Improvements
Route 220/0.03 mile south of Route 613 [Naff Road]	Installation of northbound and southbound left turn lanes
Route 220/Route 674 [Doe Run Road] exit ramp	Extend southbound exit ramp
Route 220/Route 619 [Sontag Road]	Extend southbound right turn lane
Route 220/Route 756 [Fishburn Mountain Road]	Install southbound right turn lane
Route 220/Route 724 [Goose Dam Road]	Install northbound and southbound right turn lanes
Route 220/North intersection with Route 718 [McNeil Mill Road]	Install northbound left turn lane and extend southbound left turn lane
Route 220/South intersection with Route 718 [Crooked Oak Road]	Install northbound and southbound left turn lanes

Eliminating Crossovers--Eliminating crossovers is another proposed safety improvement VDOT is planning. At a typical crossover, there are thirty-two potential points for drivers to collide when making turn movements. Twenty-six of those points can be eliminated with closing of a crossover. It is safer for drivers to use crossovers with turn lanes, rather than crossovers without turn lanes.

Locations	Crossover Dimensions
0.12 miles south of Route 613 [Naff Road]	59' x 25'
0.46 miles south of Route 613 [Naff Road]	23' x 55'
0.58 miles south of Route 613 [Naff Road]	38' x 50'
0.73 miles south of Route 613 [Naff Road]	27' x 41'
0.20 miles south of Route 824 [Murray Knob Road]	15' x 55'
0.33 miles north of Route 1085 [Commerce Road]	55' x 60'
0.53 miles south of Route 718 [Crooked Oak Road]	40' x 60'

Upgrading Guardrails--VDOT plans to upgrade 38,725 feet of existing guardrail at locations in both Franklin and Henry Counties. Upgrading guardrails will have improved beginning and end terminals and meet today's construction standards. Virginia has been upgrading guardrails to improve road safety, particularly to mitigate the dangers from vehicles colliding with rails and the points where rails terminate.

Installation of Dynamic Message Signs--VDOT is considering installing four dynamic message signs on Route 220 that provide drivers with real-time information about incidents and road conditions during traffic delays. The locations for the signs in Franklin County is off Route 220 northbound near Route 697 [Wirtz Road] and northbound Route 220 south of Sydnorsville. The other two will be in Roanoke City (near Walnut Street Bridge) and Roanoke County (near Route 789/Old Rocky Mount Road). These signs are examples of installation of elements of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies that often employ telemetry, remote sensing, and computer communications, monitoring. The County may want to monitor conditions along its roadways in respect to weather related problems, peak hour congestion, and frequency of accidents and request VDOT consideration of more ITS technology use to improve the County transportation system.

Relation of Route 220 improvements to Interstate 73--During the Interstate 73 location Study public hearings in the year 2000, 8,669 persons made comments and suggestions about the interstate proposal. Of those, 2,839 persons suggested some improvements for Route 220 were needed. Additionally, in response to a question asking citizens to cite benefits and concerns about the I-73 location study, 1,185 people said safety was a concern on existing Route 220. A total of \$8.3 million is budgeted for Route 220 spot improvements. About \$7.3 million of these funds are reallocation federal funds from Interstate 73. The remainder came from other federal sources.

Secondary Road Construction Programs--In addition to a Six-Year Improvement Program listing primary, interstates, and urban system projects, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) holds hearings annually on the construction program for the state-maintained secondary road system in the County. VDOT then submits an annually updated six-year program to the Commonwealth Transportation Board for approval. The last update of the secondary program for Franklin County was approved in December 2005. The current program covers the period from 2006-2007 (first year) through 2011-2012 (sixth year). The next update will cover a six-year period from FY 2007-2008 to FY 2012-2013 and will be developed in the fall of 2006. Adoption of VDOT six-year plans by the Board of Supervisors should be considered as updating and applicable to the Comprehensive Plan.

The following table, entitled "Secondary Road Projects Fiscal Year 2007 through Fiscal Year 2012, By Priority Numbers" summarizes the expenditures projected for each project anticipated for implementation during the specified six-year period. The table

orders the proposed project improvements by perceived need combined with spreading the projects over the County geographically and over time periods so that there is some equity in benefits received by the various communities or neighborhoods across the County. The columns of the tables are set out to: identify the VDOT route numbers and local road names of the projects; the VDOT project number assigned to the project [PPMS number]; provide a brief description of what is to be done; provide the termini for the road segment on which the work will be done; provide the estimated costs of planning/engineering; right-of-way acquisition; other information; VDOT's anticipated advertisement date; and finally, the priority number assigned by VDOT and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations.

The total estimated cost of the thirty-six projects is \$13,616,405. The Planning/Engineering cost is \$1,115,789; the Right-of-Way cost is \$870,000; and the Construction cost is \$11,630,616. One of the larger projects [\$963,600] is on Wades Gap Road/Route 726 involving a mile of reconstruction work in mountain terrain with rock excavation needed. The Hardy Road/Route 634 project [\$3,502,100] involves reconstruction and new alignment over a 0.7-mile course. The Colonial Turnpike/Route 718 project [\$1,431,700] required a bridge replacement and paving approaches in a 0.4-mile segment. The Hardy Ford Bridge/Route 634 project [\$1,212,825] involves bridge and bridge approached development over a 0.1-mile segment. The Old Forge Road/Route 756 project [\$884,610] involves reconstruction over a 2.6-mile segment. The foregoing projects are the five largest projects by cost on the schedule based on Year 2005-dollar estimates.

State Highway Plan, Year 2025 Projects

The Virginia Department of Transportation presented recommendations for road improvements in its State Highway Plan, Year 2025, during its presentation hearings for this document and VTRANS 2025 in 2005. The roads recommended for improvements were addressed for each county across the Commonwealth. There were five routes included for Franklin County in the Plan's list. A segment of Route 40 from Route 793 to the west corporate limits of Rocky Mount for a distance of 16.9 miles would be widened to a full 24-foot pavement width over its length. Another segment of Route 40 from Route 122 to the Franklin/Pittsylvania County line, a distance of 17.9 miles, would be widened on existing two lanes and have two lanes added so that the segment will become a four lane highway with a median. Route 116 from Route 122 to the Franklin/Roanoke County line, a distance of 9.5 miles, would be widened to a full 24-foot pavement width over its length. Route 122 from Route 40 to the Franklin/Bedford County line, a distance of 17.4 miles, would be widened on existing two lanes and have two lanes added so that the segment will become a four-lane highway with a median. Route 220 from the south corporate limits of the Town of Rocky Mount to the Route 220 Bypass interchange, a distance of 1.8 miles, would be widened to a full 24 foot pavement width over its length.

**Secondary Road Projects
Year FY 2007 through Year FY 2012
By Priority Numbers**

Route	Road Name	VDOT PPMS No.	Description	From: To: Length	Costs		Other Information	Anticipated Advertisement Date	Priority No.
756	Old Forge Road	17206	Reconstruction on Rt 756	0.2-mi. N. Rt 806 1.30-mi. S. Rt 806 1.5 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$7,000 27,900 \$412,000 \$446,900	Reconstruction, widen road, straighten curve, improve drainage, sight distance	3-28-2006	1.0
726	Wades Gap Road	17203	Reconstruction	0.94 mi. N. Rt 744 to 1.94 mi. N. Rt 744 1.0 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$80,000 \$18,600 \$865,000 \$963,600	Reconstruction	7-8-2008	2.0
942	Blue Water Drive	50959	Reconstruction	Rt. 616 to 1.84-mi. W. Rt 616 1.8 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$10,000 \$16,800 \$603,000 \$629,800	Reconstruction	7-11-2006	3.0
656	Deer Trail Road	50958	Reconstruct, surface treat non-hardsurface road	Rt 607 to Henry Co. line 1.0 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$0 \$306,000 \$310,000	Reconstruction	9-26-2006	4.0
929	Briar Mtn Road	18355	Reconstruct, surface treat non-hardsurface road	End of maintained section to 0.71 mi. E. of end of maintenance 0.7 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$9,000 \$5,900 \$233,000 \$247,900	Reconstruction	7-24-2007	5.0
644	Flint Hill Road	67069	Surface treat non-hardsurface road	Route 122 to end of maintenance 0.1 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$6,000 \$0 \$35,000 \$41,000	Resurfacing	8-31-2007	6.0

**Secondary Road Projects
Year FY 2007 through Year FY 2012
By Priority Numbers**

Route	Road Name	VDOT PPMS No.	Description	From: To: Length	Costs		Other Information	Anticipated Advertisement Date	Priority No.
699	Angle Plantation Road	67068	Surface Treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 122 to Rt 644 0.1 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$3,000 \$3,200 \$26,000 \$32,200	Resurfacing	8-31-2007	7.0
939	Menefee Road	55467	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 619 to end of state maintenance 0.4 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$4,300 \$37,000 \$45,300	Resurfacing	8-31-2007	8.0
960	Keatts Road	67071	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 890 to end of maintenance 0.3 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$3,800 \$26,000 \$33,800	Resurfacing	8-31-2007	9.0
925	Old Barn Road	67072	Surface treat non-hard surface road	Rt 890 to end of maintenance 0.2 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$3,600 \$21,000 \$28,600	Resurfacing	8-31-2007	10.0
634	Hardy Road	17193	Reconstruction	0.23 mi. S. Rt. 635 South to 0.47 mi. N. Rt 635 North 0.4 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$462,000 \$637,100 \$2,403,000 \$3,502,100	Reconstruction	8-31-2007	11.0
718	Colonial Turnpike	55471	Bridge replacement	Approaches and bridge over Pigg River 0.4 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$170,000 \$4,700 \$1,257,000 \$1,431,700	Bridge replacement	8-12-2008	12.0
695	Isolane Road	55468	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Route 640 to end of state maintenance 1.0 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$8,000 \$0 \$66,000 \$74,000	Resurfacing	7-31-2008	13.0

**Secondary Road Projects
Year FY 2007 through Year FY 2012
By Priority Numbers**

Route	Road Name	VDOT PPMS No.	Description	From: To: Length	Costs		Other Information	Anticipated Advertisement Date	Priority No.
952	Indian Cave Road	18356	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	End of state maintenance to Rt 946 0.9 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$5,600 \$80,000 \$89,600	Resurfacing	7-31-2009	14.0
889	Glade Creek Road	55470	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 646 to end of state maintenance 0.8 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$4,800 \$75,000 \$83,800	Resurfacing	7-31-2008	15.0
682	Valley View Road	10104	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	1.3 mi. S. Rt 681 to Rt. 681 1.3 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$5,000 \$7,400 \$100,000 \$112,400	Resurfacing	7-31-2008	16.0
657	Red Valley Road	50952	Reconstruct, surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt. 635 to Rt 684 1.9 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$10,000 \$15,500 \$676,000 \$701,500	Reconstruction	8-12-2008	17.0
682	Mtn Valley Road	67230	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 116 to 0.9 mi. N. of Rt 116 0.9 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$0 \$75,000 \$79,000	Resurfacing	7-31-2008	18.0
616	Morewood Road	18350	Reconstruction	Rt 122 to 0.53 mi. N Rt 122 0.5 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$20,000 \$25,000 \$505,941 \$550,941	Reconstruction	7-27-2010	19.0
719	Fawndale Road	67231	Reconstruct, surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 609 to Rt 608 0.5 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$7,000 \$7,500 \$187,000 \$201,500	Reconstruction	7-29-2008	20.0

**Secondary Road Projects
Year FY 2007 through Year FY 2012
By Priority Numbers**

Route	Road Name	VDOT PPMS No.	Description	From: To: Length	Costs		Other Information	Anticipated Advertisement Date	Priority No.
910	Thrush Road	67232	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt. 739 to end of state maintenance 0.2 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$11,000 \$4,500 \$55,000 \$70,500	Resurfacing	7-31-2008	21.0
903	Horseshoe Point Road	67073	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 934 to end of state maintenance 0.5 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$4,500 \$42,000 \$50,500	Resurfacing	7-31-2008	22.0
709	Blue Run Road	67233	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt. 919 to 1.0 mi. W. of Rt 919 1.0 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$8,000 \$6,400 \$75,000 \$89,400	Resurfacing	7-31-2008	23.0
728	Leaning Oak Road	726	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt. 693 to 0.5 mi. N. Rt. 693 0.5 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$5,100 \$80,000 \$89,100	Resurfacing	7-31-2009	24.0
970	Wright Road	72502	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 613 to end of maintenance 0.5-mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$4,900 \$41,000 \$49,900	Resurfacing		25.0
643	Adney Gap Road	72504	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 602 to 0.5 mi. E. Rt 602 0.5 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$8,000 \$7,200 \$66,000 \$81,200	Resurfacing		26.0
732	Blankenship Road	72505	Surface treat non- hardsurface road	Rt 641 to end of state maintenance 0.9 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$5,400 \$80,000 \$89,400	Resurfacing		27.0

**Secondary Road Projects
Year FY 2007 through Year FY 2012
By Priority Numbers**

Route	Road Name	VDOT PPMS No.	Description	From: To: Length	Costs		Other Information	Anticipated Advertisement Date	Priority No.
658	Listening Hill Road	72576	Surface treat non-hardsurface road	0.49 mi. S. Rt 912 to end of state maintenance 0.6 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$5,300 \$75,000 \$84,300	Resurfacing		28.0
783	Endicott Hill Road	72506	Surface treat non-hardsurface road	Rt 40 to end of state maintenance 1.2 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$6,000 \$96,000 \$106,000	Resurfacing		29.0
611	Belcher Road	67229	Reconstruct, surface treat non-hardsurface road	Rt. 652 to Rt 651 1.6 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$10,000 \$8,900 \$513,000 \$531,900	Reconstruction	7-28-2009	30.0
634	Hardy Ford Bridge	58890	Franklin Co. bridge approaches	At Smith Mtn Lake crossing 0.1 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$218,289 \$0 \$994,536 \$1,212,825	Bridge replacement	12-12-2006	31.0
640	Five Mile Mtn Road	17196	Reconstruct	1.39 mi. W. Rt 748 to Rt 748 1.4 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$3,000 \$3,000 \$460,729 \$466,729	Reconstruction	8-26-2008	32.0
756	Old Forge Road	18357	Reconstruct	1.30 mi. S. Rt 806 to Rt 640 2.6 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,500 \$9,100 \$871,010 \$884,610		7-12-2005	33.0
620	Campbell Road	50956	Reconstruct	Rt 651 to 0.29 mi. S. Rt 651 0.3 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$8,000 \$192,400 \$204,400	Reconstruction	11-28-2006	34.0

**Secondary Road Projects
Year FY 2007 through Year FY 2012
By Priority Numbers**

Route	Road Name	VDOT PPMS No.	Description	From: To: Length	Costs		Other Information	Anticipated Advertisement Date	Priority No.
657	Crowell Gap Road	-3592	Reconstruct	Rt 684 to 1.0 mi. N. Rt 684 1.0 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0			35.0
670	Burnt Chimney Road	-3599	Reconstruct	0.04 mi. E. of Rt 122 to 0.15 mi. E. of Rt 122 0.1 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0			36.0

Projects Underway in FY 2005

Route	Road Name	VDOT PPMS No.	Description	From: To: Length	Costs		Other Information	Anticipated Advertisement Date	Priority No.
602	Ferrum Mtn Road	17190	Reconstruct	0.1-mi. S. Rt 748 0.28-mi. N. Rt 748 0.4 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$4,000 \$5,700 \$105,000 \$114,700	Reconstruction, straighten curve	9-27-2005	0.0
635	Mount Airy Rd	18360	Reconstruct, surface treat non-hard surface road	Rt. 678 to 0.58 mi N Rt 678 0.6 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$25,000 \$10,000 \$417,000 \$452,000	Reconstruction southern end Rt 678 rural rustic road northern end Rt 680; no improvements on middle segment	7-26-2005	0.0
635	Mount Airy Rd	75932	Rt. 635-rural rustic road, surface treat non- hardsurface	Rt. 680 to 0.25 mi S Rt 680 0.3 mi.	PE RW CN TO	\$5,000 \$0 \$42,000 \$47,000	Resurfacing		0.0

It should be noted that the State Highway Plan is a long-range planning effort and that the projects listed are not necessarily in the Six-Year Improvement Program for funding. The County would need to press for their inclusion in the Six Year Improvement Program during the pre-allocation phases, and the Commonwealth Transportation Board and VDOT would have to be able to identify funding sources and mechanisms before their inclusion takes place. However, the State Highway Plan looks at deficiencies on key routes and has chosen to identify the projects cited. These segments have been considered locally over the years and are fairly representative of needs and priorities. The County will want to participate in future updates of the State Highway Plan so that other projects can be considered for addition if they can meet the planning criteria that VDOT and the Commonwealth Transportation Board employs.

Route 122 Study

In 2001, the County in association with West Piedmont PPlanning District Commission, consultant firm URS, and the Virginia Department of Transportation carried out a corridor study on State Route 122 for development and recommendation of alternatives for improving the route to address anticipated future traffic increases. Following that study, participants also worked on a corridor overlay effort to improve the interaction of transportation and land use. The Route 122 Corridor Study focused attention on the segment of roadway in the Westlake Corner area since the most intense commercial development was occurring at that point along the road corridor. The other commercial note considered was at Burnt Chimney at vicinity of the Route 122/Route 116 intersection. Over the intervening years several substantial developments with proposed entry onto Route 122 have been considered and produced more concern for traffic impacts on the route. These developments are in locations outside the Westlake Corner and Burnt Chimney areas; commercial components are included in these projects and would likely place more commercial development along the right of way.

Smith Mountain Lake Area Transportation Studies

In early 2006, the Virginia Department of Transportation announced plans to conduct a study of primary and feeder roads that area motorists employ to get to and from the Smith Mountain Lake area. The study may occupy two years of work and has an estimated expenditure of \$250,000. The study will assess the principal pathways used for ingress and egress from the Lake area, the amount of traffic, and the growth in traffic. Traffic data collection will need to consider both peak and off-peak time of travel during a day and during the week; land use development issues and population growth will need to be addressed in terms of impact on traffic and roadway mobility.

The study will look at short-term, mid-term, and long-term alternatives for making improvements in mobility. Alternatives may include recommendations for: installations of turn lanes, widening critical segments, renovations on roadways, and possible new construction. Focal points will need to include Route 40, Route 122, and Route 616 where much land use activity has already occurred.

The new planning effort follows an earlier effort from the 1990's to develop transportation information and recommendations that was undertaken through the efforts of VDOT, West Piedmont Planning District Commission, Roanoke Valley

Alleghany Regional Commission, and Region 2000 Regional Commission. The previous study occurred over a period of years and supplied valuable information; the new study will be able to study the entire lake area in one snapshot with a shorter planning period.

Access Management Planning Efforts

In addition to the new Lake area transportation planning initiative over the next several years, the County is pursuing the development of a study to address access management along highways that are receiving the greatest growth and land use development pressure. A general guidebook is being sought to help the County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors assess the conditions, applying specified criteria, in which it is advisable to create an overlay district. The overlay district would extend over the critical road segments and their rights-of-way that district are identified. The guidebook would include prescriptions for techniques to be used inside the overlay district to mitigate traffic conflicts and congestion, while improving safety conditions. The County, in concert with West Piedmont Planning District Commission, will seek VDOT assistance in developing the guidance effort desired in the future. This effort will also integrate later with efforts to update the County's zoning and subdivision ordinances.

Franklin County Priority Projects Presented to Commonwealth Transportation Board

The Board of Supervisors annually develops a list of project priorities for presentation to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. These projects are directed at improvements on the state and federal primary system of roads; secondary routes are handled in a separate process. These primary system projects can be either long-range projects or short-range projects depending on when each one is eventually placed in the Commonwealth of Virginia's Six-Year Improvement Program by VDOT and the Commonwealth Transportation Board. It should be recognized that projects entered onto the Six-Year Improvement Program might have to be spread out over a number of years due to the inadequacy of funding for both maintenance and new construction when considering all of the needs over the nine VDOT administrative districts in Virginia. Projects will typically proceed stepwise to Planning and Design, to Right-of-Way acquisition, and finally into Construction. Each step may need to be spread over a number of fiscal years, proceeding along with funding made available to that particular project in often a constrained rate of expenditure.

The following items indicate the desired primary road system projects that the County desires the Commonwealth to pursue in the future and thus are basic items of the County Comprehensive Plan's Transportation Element:

Franklin County

- 1) Pursue all safety improvements on Route 220, north and south, with special consideration for the route through Boones Mill north to the Franklin County/Roanoke County line.
- 2) Pursue all available funding for the expedited completion of construction for Interstate 73.

- 3) Support for improving the alignment and widening of Route 122, from the Route 116 intersection out to Hales Ford Bridge, at the County line along with realignment of Route 116 and Route 122 intersection in Burnt Chimney.
- 4) Support for a feasibility study to construct a Route 40 bypass of Rocky Mount, from Route 220 North over to Route 40 West at the Route 40 and Route 640 intersection.
- 5) Support a feasibility study to four-lane Route 40 East, from the east corporate limits of the Town of Rocky Mount out to the County Line, and ultimately, out to the U.S. Route 29 Corridor in Pittsylvania County.
- 6) Support for a Route 116 improvements feasibility study, including Route 116/Route 681 intersection.
- 7) Accommodate pedestrian and bicycle access where feasible in future road improvements in conjunction with the Franklin County Trails Plan.
- 8) Support return of passenger rail service to the Roanoke Valley and construction of a new Intermodal facility to enhance the region.

Rocky Mount

- 1) Replace existing bridge on South Main Street (US 220 Business) over Pigg River.
- 2) Widening and street improvements (including curb, guttering, and sidewalks) on Route 40 West from intersection of Floyd Avenue to west corporate limits, to include safety improvements at the intersection of Floyd Avenue/Franklin Street, and include replacement of bridge over Furnace Creek.
- 3) The creation of a commercial grade connector road from VA. Rt. 40 East to U.S. 220 North.
- 4) Support the efforts to upgrade Route 220 in order to make it a safer highway.
- 5) Support of development of Interstate 73 from Roanoke to the Virginia/North Carolina line.
- 6) Support for Franklin County proposal to study and design a Route 40 East/40 West bypass to lessen large volume truck traffic through the central business district.
- 7) Altering Franklin Street alignment at intersection of High Street to improve sight visibility and elimination of safety hazard.
- 8) Safety improvements/sidewalks along Scuffling Hill Road.
- 9) Extension of Diamond Avenue to future Route 40 bypass.

Other Existing Transportation Modes

Rail Network--The County's only railroad route is the Norfolk-Southern line that enters the County on the north side near Boones Mill. The line generally parallels the Route 220 corridor and upon reaching Rocky Mount proceeds along the west Route 40 corridor to Ferrum in the southwestern part of the County and then proceeds south to Henry County along state secondary Route 767.

Daily rail freight service is provided to Ferrum, Rocky Mount, and Boones Mill by the Norfolk-Southern Corporation--formed by the merged Norfolk and Western Railway and the Southern Railway corporations--on its route from Winston-Salem, North Carolina, to Roanoke, Virginia. The yards at Roanoke provide readily accessible rail transportation for Franklin County to all parts of the nation.

A public team track is available in Rocky Mount. This provides weekday service that includes set-offs and pick-ups. Located along the Norfolk Southern Railway's main North/South line, this track provides the Franklin County Industrial Park with connective services to the ports of Hampton Roads and Baltimore and all major markets East of the Mississippi River. Spurs could be made available at the Franklin County-Rocky Mount Industrial Park in the future. The Norfolk Southern Corporation specializes in bulk and mixed freight service.

The Norfolk-Southern Corporation specializes in bulk and mixed freight service. In a 1981 study, the Corporation was the most profitable rail system in the United States and the fourth largest. Reporting on its year 2005 operations, Norfolk Southern's CEO noted record revenues of \$8.5 billion and record earnings of \$3.11 per share. Its key markets include coal, metal, construction, Intermodal operations, merchandise, and chemicals. The system covers the midwest, southern, and eastern markets extending from Montreal, Canada, south to Florida and west to Omaha, Nebraska.

Air Service--Only 28 miles to the north of Rocky Mount is Roanoke Regional Airport which offers four air carriers [US Air Express, United Express, Delta, and Northwest airlines] and over 70 scheduled flights a day. The airport is situated near Interstate 81 and U. S. Route 11, three miles northwest of Roanoke. The airport has two hard-surfaced runways; the east-west runway is 6,800 feet in length and the north-south runway is 5,800 feet in length. It is attended 24 hours a day and is equipped with hangars, administration building and terminal, instrument landing system for low-visibility conditions, and high-intensity runway lighting and rotating beacon which operate from dusk to dawn. A new 96,000 square foot, dual level terminal opened in September 1989. Services offered by the airport include fueling, surface transportation, five car rental firms, charter service, flight instruction, gift shop, food and beverage shop, paging, travel services, and a restaurant and lodging nearby. Air cargo and private charter services are available as well as limousine and car rental service. The terminal is handicapped accessible. The terminal also provides for free wireless Internet services via WI-FI connection.

The Roanoke airport also provides for General Aviation services that include: a pilot lounge, boardroom, executive terminal, refueling, tie-down spaces, hangar and heated hangar storage, airplane and parts sales, Beechcraft warranty covered repairs, and private charter services.

Located at Moneta in neighboring Bedford County is Smith Mountain Airport--a light air-service facility. The airport maintains a 3,050-foot runway that is attended during daylight hours and offers fuel, surface transportation, and charter air service. Hangars, fuel, and dusk-to-dawn runway lights and rotating beacon are among specific facilities provided at the airfield.

Blue Ridge Airport is located approximately 30 miles southwest of Rocky Mount in Henry County. The existing runway is 5,000 feet long and can accommodate aircraft weighing up to 60,000 pounds Maximum Gross Weight. The facility has been upgraded to a classification of Basic Transport, with the runway being lengthened to 5,000 feet and the pavement of the runway and taxiways strengthened to accommodate higher weight aircraft. Currently the hangar space is for 49 units with 20 tie-down spaces. Numerous corporate and privately owned aircraft are based at Blue Ridge Airport.

Commercial air service is also provided through the Danville Regional Airport, located in neighboring Pittsylvania County. Danville Regional Airport is a full service facility with ILS approach. Commercial passenger flights and airfreight are available through the airport. The airport features one runway 5,000 feet in length.

The Piedmont Triad International Airport is located approximately 75 miles south of Rocky Mount and provides commercial service. The facility offers a wide variety of commercial passenger flights. In addition, major airfreight firms serving the airport can ship nearly anything, nearly anywhere in the free world.

The Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina, Airport is located approximately 125 miles southeast of Rocky Mount. This facility offers a wide variety of commercial passenger flights. Major airfreight companies serving the airport can also ship nearly anything, anywhere in the free world. The airport is a Port-of-Entry facility.

Air Transportation Plan--Air Service--In 1977, Wilbur Smith and Associates prepared the *Blue Ridge Air Transportation System Study* (BRATSS) for a 16-county area in four planning districts including Franklin County in the West Piedmont Planning District. The primary objective of the BRATS Study was to present the aviation facilities required to meet the immediate and future air transportation needs of the study area. The recommended plan provided a planning framework for future regional decisions regarding air transportation and was designed to facilitate orderly and timely implementation of airport facilities to meet projected aviation demands.

The BRATS Study includes a recommendation for an airport, to be located northeast of the Town of Rocky Mount. The runway was proposed to be oriented in a north-south direction, north of Blackwater River just west of Route 122. During the immediate range, it was recommended that a sponsor be firmly established and a master plan developed. Once a plan is finalized and an exact site chosen, the necessary property for development of the airport should be purchased. Preliminary estimates indicated that approximately 300 acres would be required at a total cost of about \$150,000. Actual development for the facility would include construction of a 3,400-foot runway, taxiway, small terminal building, hangars, a parking lot, apron space, and the installation of appropriate NAVAIDS. The cost of these items was estimated at \$1,450,000. Later, in the long-range phase, it was anticipated that the runway should be extended by 750 feet. Also, additional NAVAIDS, terminal area, apron space, and hangars would be required. The estimated cost of these improvements would be approximately \$300,000.

The study notes that no airspace conflicts or obstruction would be anticipated at the site and no displacements would be required for implementation. The study recommends that the administrating body of the airport should be the Town of Rocky Mount. Alternatively, Rocky Mount and Franklin County could form a joint venture to provide an administrator for the airport. Obviously, these arrangements would be subject to change in the future.

Current Franklin County Aviation Services Plans--An airport development committee was formed in the past and had obtained funds from the Federal Aviation Administration/Virginia Department of Aviation for the development of a master plan for an airport in the County. It was assumed that the general aviation facility would provide

another alternative to aircraft owners who have based their aircraft at Roanoke Regional Airport to the north or other smaller airports in the region. The Virginia Department of Aviation had for some time earmarked funds for their portion of the master plan. Feasibility and master planning had been accomplished and County efforts then progressed to the development of the required environmental studies. A public participation phase of the effort proceeded in order for the public to voice its input on the various site alternatives considered in the planning process. A proposal to build the general aviation airport in the Sontag area of the County was identified. In early 2006, following a public meeting on the airport development proposal at the Sontag site, the Board of Supervisors voted to drop the plan to build the airport; concern for economic benefits were cited as well as the eminent domain issue.

Bus Service/Mass Transit--The governing bodies of Franklin County and Rocky Mount do not provide an areawide public bus transportation system due to the predominantly rural nature of the community and the financial responsibility of such a system without major governmental subsidy.

The Franklin County Department of Aging Services provides van services for senior citizens in the community. In response for concerns for Americans with Disabilities, handicapped persons generally, and aid to the elderly, the Board of Supervisors joined in a regional study for the Coordination of Human Services Transportation with Martinsville, Henry County, and Patrick County. Subsequent to the study, a coordinating committee was formed to work on ways to improve the routing of buses and vans carrying the client groups, coordinate services, repair, insurance, and driver training. Over time, it is anticipated that savings can also be realized by a more coordinated program of use of buses and vans.

Special Bus Transportation Routes--The West Piedmont Planning District Commission worked with the County Administrator, Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, and RADAR of Roanoke on feasibility to provide bus services from Rocky Mount to Roanoke. Later, in coordination with Ferrum College and Valley Metro of Roanoke, bus routes have been established that allows Ferrum College students and citizens transportation and opportunity to visit businesses and entertainment opportunities in Rocky Mount as well as Roanoke, where they can connect with other bus programs to visit local colleges, the airport and more. Roanoke citizens can also take the Ferrum Express to visit shops in the Franklin County area. Students began utilizing the Ferrum Express bus service, with improved service in Franklin County, several years ago. The bus service includes service on Thursday nights, with increased frequency in its Rocky Mount destinations as well as a stop at the bowling alley. This service is offered free to the public due to the contributions of Ferrum College, the Franklin County Board of Supervisors, and the Rocky Mount Town Council.

The Ferrum Express begins its route from the Ferrum College campus in front of the lake and Stanley Library Annex and then continues to Rocky Mount, where it makes stops in the downtown market area, at the Eagle Cinema movie theater, Wal-Mart and the Rocky Mount Bowling Center. From Rocky Mount, the bus travels to the bus depot near the Roanoke Market in downtown Roanoke and then begins its journey back to Ferrum College.

A map in PDF form of the service area and stops of the Ferrum Express can be found at on a Ferrum College website. A schedule is also online at website.

Truck Lines--The County is located between two major interstate routes, Interstate 81 to the north and Interstate 85/Interstate 40 to the south. Freight to and from the County can be routed to faraway markets using a number of truck lines that serve the County and Rocky Mount. Franklin County-Rocky Mount Industrial Park and Commerce Center Industrial Park are located just off U.S. Route 220 and in close proximity to Interstate 81, making both parks accessible by a number of major freight carriers.

Special Transportation Programs

Rural Addition Program--The *Code of Virginia* authorizes counties to recommend to the Virginia Department of Transportation that a street be taken into the secondary system as a rural addition. Rural addition projects are constructed under funds allocated in the VDOT Six Year Secondary Improvement Program (100% State funding). Streets added to the state system shall be constructed to the Department's standards for the traffic served.

Revenue Sharing Program—This program was modified by the General Assembly in 2006 to structure funding in four tiers, with Tier One being funded first and the remaining funding being utilized for Tier Two. Any remaining funds are then considered for Tier Three and so forth. These tiers are described as follows:

- Tier one applications are those with the governing body committing **more than** \$1 million in general funds for a \$1 million match for revenue sharing projects. The locality's total requests are considered for tier one funding. If requests exceed funds available, tier one requests will be prioritized based on the amount of local funds committed above the matching funds. In the case of a tie, funds for those localities will be prorated. For example, if four localities commit \$1.1 million but only \$3 million remains in the Revenue Sharing Fund, each of the four localities will receive \$750,000. Tier one projects can be locally administered or VDOT administered. (Existing or new projects).

For tiers two through four, projects will be prioritized individually. For tiers two through four, if requests within a tier exceed available revenue sharing funds, all projects within that tier will be prorated based on the total requests for that tier.

- Tier two provides funding when the project is administered by the city, county, or town. Local administration must include all remaining phases of the project.
- Tier three projects may receive funds when the allocation will accelerate an existing project in the Six-Year Improvement Program or the locality's capital plans. Tier three projects are VDOT administered.
- Tier four projects include any other requests that the governing body has offered a matching allocation for. These are funded from any funds remaining.

Economic Development Access Fund (Formerly Industrial Access Fund)--The General Assembly has amended Section 33.1-221 of the *Code of Virginia* (1950)

relating to the fund for the construction of industrial access roads to focus on economic development sites within the counties, cities and towns of the Commonwealth as follows:

1. The use of economic development access funds shall be limited to: (1) providing adequate access to economic development sites on which new or substantially expanding manufacturing, processing, research and development facilities, distribution centers, regional service centers, corporate headquarters or other establishments that also meet basic employer criteria as determined by the Virginia Economic Development Partnership in consultation with the Virginia Department of Business Assistance; and (2) improving existing roads that may not be adequate to serve the establishments as described in (1).

2. Economic development access funds shall not be used for the acquisition of rights of way or adjustment of utilities. These funds are to be used only for the actual construction and engineering of a road facility adequate to serve the traffic generated by the new or expanding eligible establishments.

3. Economic development access funds may not be used for the construction of access roads to schools, hospitals, libraries, airports, armories, speculative office buildings, shopping centers, apartment buildings, professional offices, residential developments, churches, hotels, motels, government installations, or similar facilities, whether public or private. (Access roads to licensed, public-use airports, while provided for in Section 33.1-221, are funded and administered separately).

4. No cost incurred prior to this Board's approval of an allocation from the economic development access fund may be reimbursed by such funds. Economic development access funds shall be authorized only after certification that the economic development establishment as listed or meeting the criteria as described will be built under firm contract, or is already constructed, or upon presentation of acceptable surety in accordance with paragraph (a) of Section 33.1-221, as amended, of the *Code of Virginia*(1950).

5. When an eligible establishment is not yet constructed or under firm contract and a local governing body guarantees by bond or other acceptable surety that such will occur, the maximum time limit for such bond shall be five years, beginning on the date of the allocation of the economic development access funds by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. At the end of the five-year period the amount of economic development access funds expended on the project and not justified by eligible capital outlay of one or more eligible establishments acceptable to the Board shall be reimbursed to the Department of Transportation voluntarily by the locality or by forfeiture of the surety. In the event that, after the Department of Transportation has been reimbursed, but still within 24 months immediately following the end of the five-year period, the access funds expended come to be justified by eligible capital outlay of one or more eligible establishments, then the locality may request a refund of one-half of the sum reimbursed to the Department of Transportation, which request may be granted if funds are available, on a first-come, first-served basis in competition with applications for access funds from other localities.

6. Economic development access funds shall not be used to construct or improve roads on a privately owned economic development site. Nor shall the construction of a new access road to serve any economic development site on a parcel of land which abuts a road constituting a part of the systems of state highways or the road system of the locality in which it is located be eligible for economic development access funds, unless the existing road is a limited access highway and no other access exists. Further, where the existing road is part of the road system of the locality in which it is located, or the secondary system of state highways, economic development funds may be used to upgrade the existing road only to the extent required to meet the needs of traffic generated by new or expanding eligible establishment. In the event an economic development site has access according to the foregoing provisions of this policy, but it can be determined that such access is not adequate in that it does not provide for safe and efficient movement of the traffic generated by the eligible establishment on the site or that the site's traffic conflicts with the surrounding road network to the extent that it poses a safety hazard to the general public, consideration will be given to funding additional improvements. Such projects shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis upon request, by resolution, from the local governing body. Localities are encouraged to establish planning policies which will discourage incompatible mixes such as industrial and residential traffic.

7. Not more than \$300,000 of unmatched economic development access funds may be allocated in any fiscal year for use in any county, city or town which receives highway maintenance payments under Section 33.1-41.1, *Code of Virginia*. A town whose streets are maintained under either Section 33.1-79 or 33.1-82, *Code of Virginia*, shall be considered as part of the county in which it is located. The maximum eligibility of unmatched funds shall be limited to 10% of the capital outlay of the designated eligible establishments. The unmatched eligibility may be supplemented with additional economic development access funds, in which case the supplemental access funds shall not be more than \$150,000, to be matched dollar-for-dollar from funds other than those administered by this Board. The supplemental economic development access funds over and above the unmatched eligibility shall be limited to 5% of the capital outlay of eligible establishments as previously described. Such supplemental funds shall be considered only if the total estimated cost of eligible items for the economic development access improvement exceeds \$300,000. If an eligible site is owned by a regional industrial facility authority, as defined in §15.2-6400 et seq. of the *Code of Virginia*, funds may be allocated for construction of an access road project to that site without penalty to the jurisdiction in which the site is located. This provision may be applied to one regional project per fiscal year in any jurisdiction, with the same funding limitations as prescribed for other individual projects.

8. Eligible items of construction and engineering shall be limited to those which are essential to providing an adequate facility to serve the anticipated traffic while meeting all appropriate CTB and state policies and standards. However, additional pavement width or other features may be eligible where necessary to qualify the road facility in a city or town for maintenance payments under Section 33.1-41.1, as amended, of the *Code of Virginia*.

9. It is the intent of the Board that economic development access funds not be anticipated from year to year. Unused eligibility cannot be allowed to accumulate and be carried forward from one fiscal year to another.

10. The Commonwealth Transportation Board will consult and work closely with the Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) and the Department of Business Assistance (DBA) in determining the use of economic development access funds and will rely on the recommendations of the VEDP and the DBA in making decisions as to the allocation of these funds. In making its recommendations to this Board, the VEDP and the DBA will take into consideration the impact of the proposed facility on the employment and tax base of both the area in which the facility is to be located and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

11. Prior to the formal request for the use of economic development access funds to provide access to new or expanding eligible establishments, the location of the access road shall be submitted for approval by the Virginia Department of Transportation. VDOT shall take into consideration the cost of the facility as it relates to the location and as it relates to the possibility of the future extension of the road to serve other possible eligible establishments, as well as the future development of the area traversed.

12. Prior to this Board's allocation of funds for such construction or road improvements to an eligible economic development establishment proposing to locate or expand in a county, city or town, the governing body shall by resolution request the access funds and shall be responsible for the preliminary negotiations with the eligible establishment and others interested. Engineers of the Virginia Department of Transportation will be available for consultation with the governing bodies and others, and may prepare surveys, plans, engineering studies, and cost estimates.

13. The Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner is directed to establish administrative procedures to assure the provisions of this policy and legislative directives are adhered to and complied with. It is possible that industries locating on sites fronting on inadequate secondary roads or requiring on-site access roads may have these roads built or improved through the Virginia Industrial Access Road Fund. The General Assembly has allocated as much as \$2.5 million a year to the fund with aid being determined on an industry-by-industry basis.

Once constructed, the roads are owned and maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation at no cost to the industry.

Enhancement Projects

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 was the beginning of a new era in federal transportation legislation. With this act, Congress introduced the Transportation Enhancement Program, which required each state to set aside 10 percent of its Surface Transportation Program funds for transportation enhancement projects. This program continued with enactment of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) in 1998 and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in 2005. SAFETEA-LU builds on the initiatives established by ISTEA and TEA-21. This legislation stresses mobility and protection of the environment, community preservation, sustainability and livability. The Transportation Enhancement program is a reimbursement program administered by VDOT. It requires adherence to all state and federal regulations including the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design standards and the Americans with Disabilities

Act (ADA) guidelines. The program provides reimbursement up to a maximum 80% of the eligible project costs and requires a minimum 20% local match – which can be provided for in cash, land value, donations and volunteer labor. To qualify for federal Transportation Enhancement funds a project must have a relationship to surface transportation and must qualify under one or more of the 12 eligible Enhancement activities. These 12 eligible activities were established for the purpose of improving non-motorized transportation, enhancing the public’s traveling experience, revitalizing communities and improving the quality of life. The funds cannot be used for roadway improvements or traditional highway projects. These projects include - but are not limited to - rehabilitation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities, landscaping and scenic beautification and bicycle and pedestrian safety and educational activities. Transportation Enhancement projects provide opportunities to improve the transportation experience in local communities.

Level of Service Conditions for Franklin County Roadways

Level of Service, abbreviated as LOS, is a standard method to measure traffic operations; it reflects congestion and delays experienced by motorists. It is expressed a letter from: “A” to “F” where “A” represents good conditions and “F” the worst conditions. The following gives more explanation in terms of road conditions:

Level of Service A: Represents free flow, freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is high.

Level of Service B: Reasonably free, stable flow conditions, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds are relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decrease from LOS A to maneuver within the traffic stream.

Level of Service C: Operation and flow is stable, but interactions with other drivers in traffic stream begin to affect vehicle operations.

Level of Service D: Represents high-density, but stable flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience.

Level of Service E: Represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is usually extremely difficult. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.

Level of Service F: Represents the breakdown of traffic flow. The condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the capacity of the structure. Queues form behind such locations and vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclic fashion.

The following table, “Level of Service Data for Franklin County, Year 2003,” was created from a database the VDOT staff has created for use in evaluating their facilities in the future.

The VDOT Salem District Administrative office supplied some measures of Level of Service for a sample of sections of both primary and secondary roads across Franklin County. This data is presented in the table entitled “Level of Service Data for Franklin County.” This is planning level data and should be used accordingly and thus should

not be used for analysis and decision-making at this point and until the data is fully verified. The Department of Transportation usually considers LOS A through LOS C to be desirable; in effect, when studying improvements for a roadway VDOT tries to develop them so that they will result in the roadway having a rating of LOS C or better. The route segments in the table entitled "Level of Service Data for Franklin County, Year 2003" include the designations of LOS A, B, C, D, E, or F as in original data received from VDOT. It is anticipated that the segments, identified as LOS D or worse, will be given further study in future years and that, those that do not test as problematic will be targeted for possible improvement consideration in the future.

Level of Service Data for Franklin County Year 2003

Route	Segment From:	Segment To:	Length (miles)	Analysis Type	Flow Rate	Vehicles Per Day / Daily Service Volume	Operating Level of Service
40	PATRICK CL	RTE 860	1.28	R2	36	0.02	C
40	RTE 860	RTE 793	3.06	R2	79	0.05	C
40	RTE 793	RTE 605	4	R2	437	0.26	D
40	RTE 605	RTE 752	1.44	R2	345	0.2	C
40	RTE 752	RTE 602	2.62	R2	345	0.2	C
40	RTE 602	RTE 805	0.53	R2	422	0.25	C
40	RTE 805	RTE 607	3.54	R2	406	0.24	D
40	RTE 607	RTE 640	3.62	UA	397	0.39	B
40	RTE 640	WCL ROCKY MOUNT	1.1	UA	299	0.3	B
40	ECL ROCKY MOUNT	RTE I-73	0.34	R2	610	0.36	D
40	RTE I-73	RTE 655	2.14	R2	610	0.36	D
40	RTE 655	RTE 718	3.88	R2	385	0.23	D
40	RTE 718	RTE 661	4.33	R2	383	0.23	D
40	RTE 661	RTE 890	4.16	R2	394	0.23	C
40	RTE 890	PITTSYLVANIA CL	0.63	R2	246	0.14	D
48	FLOYD CL	FLOYD CL	1.51	R2			
116	RTE 122	RTE 635	3.45	R2	371	0.22	D
116	RTE 635	RTE 678	2.47	R2	371	0.22	D
116	RTE 678	ROANOKE CL	3.58	R2	323	0.19	D
122	ECL ROCKY MOUNT	RTE 644	2.4	R2	365	0.21	C
122	RTE 644	RTE 697	3.23	R2	358	0.21	D
122	RTE 697	RTE 116	1.15	R2	357	0.21	D
122	RTE 116	RTE 634	3.7	R2	419	0.25	D
122	RTE 634	RTE 616	2.95	UA	456	0.45	B
122	RTE 616	BEDFORD CL	3.61	UA	365	0.36	B
220	HENRY CL	RTE 605	1.9	RM	493	0.32	A
220	RTE 605	RTE 718 NORTH	4.5	RM	472	0.3	A
220	RTE 718 NORTH	RTE 827	2.09	RM	470	0.3	A
220	RTE 827	RTE 220 BUS	4.07	RM	457	0.29	A
220	RTE 220 BUS	SCL ROCKY MOUNT	2.01	FE	437	0.24	A

220	NCL ROCKY MOUNT	RTE 697 SOUTH	3.41	RM	744	0.48	B
220	RTE 697 SOUTH	RTE 919	3.53	RM	731	0.47	B
220	RTE 919	RTE 824	1.98	RM	806	0.52	B
220	RTE 824	ROANOKE CL	1.32	RM	876	0.57	B
220	RTE 220 BYPASS	RTE 1024	1.15	R2	561	0.33	D
220	RTE 1024	SCL ROCKY MOUNT	0.61	R2	519	0.31	E
602	RTE 40	.74 MI NORTH RE 40	0.74	R2	393	0.23	E
602	.74 MI NORTH RTE 40	RTE 640	3.8	R2	50	0.03	C
602	RTE 640	RTE 748	2.28	R2	97	0.06	C
605	RTE 220	RTE 607 WEST	1.43	R2	265	0.16	C
605	RTE 607 WEST	.60 MI EAST RTE 606	2.79	R2	127	0.07	C
605	.60 MI EAST RTE 606	RTE 606 EAST	0.6	R2	182	0.11	C
605	RTE 606 EAST	HENRY CL	0.24	R2	182	0.11	C
605	HENRY CL	ROUTE 648	3.17	R2	162	0.1	B
605	ROUTE 648	RTE 623 EAST	2.77	R2	156	0.09	B
605	RTE 623 EAST	ROUTE 40	1.76	R2	128	0.08	C
606	HENRY CL	RTE 605 WEST	0.15	R2	126	0.07	C
606	RTE 605 EAST	ROUTE 767	1.15	R2	91	0.05	C
607	ROUTE 606	ROUTE 40	1.87	R2	104	0.06	A
613	ROUTE 220	ROUTE 852	1.1	R2	194	0.11	D
613	ROUTE 852	1.6 MI N. WEST RTE 852	1.6	R2	182	0.11	D
613	1.6 M N. WEST RTE 852	ROANOKE CL	2.25	R2	223	0.13	C
616	RTE 122 EAST	RTE 834	0.77	UA	582	0.59	B
616	RTE 834	RTE 940	7.02	R2	491	0.29	C
619	ROUTE 40	RTE 756 SOUTH	3.59	R2	121	0.07	A
619	RTE 756 SOUTH	RTE 220 SOUTH	2.12	R2	246	0.14	B
619	RTE 220 NORTH	RTE 718 WEST	4.47	R2	363	0.21	C
619	RTE 718 WEST	RTE 989 SOUTH	3.56	R2	325	0.19	C
619	RTE 989 SOUTH	.42 MI NORTH RTE 924	3.27	R2	192	0.11	B
619	.42 MI NORTH RTE 924	RTE 890	0.47	R2	183	0.11	C
623	ROUTE 805	ROUTE 865	0.05	R2	192	0.11	C
623	ROUTE 865	ROUTE 778	2.58	R2	161	0.09	C
623	ROUTE 778	RTE 605 NORTH	1.4	R2	99	0.06	B
623	RTE 605 SOUTH	PATRICK CL	4.06	R2	55	0.03	C
634	BEDFORD CL	RTE 635 SOUTH	0.77	R2	437	0.26	D
634	RTE 635 SOUTH	RTE 676	1.33	R2	391	0.23	D
634	RTE 676	.20 MI SOUTH RTE 676	0.2	R2	131	0.08	A
634	.20 MI SOUTH RTE 676	ROUTE 804	1.41	R2	82	0.05	A
634	ROUTE 804	RTE 678 WEST	3.3	R2	44	0.03	A
634	RTE 678 WEST	ROUTE 122	2.02	R2	163	0.1	D
635	RTE 634 SOUTH	RTE 681	0.37	R2	213	0.13	B
635	RTE 116	RTE 657	0.74	R2	87	0.05	B
635	RTE 657	RTE 687	1.05	R2	100	0.06	B
635	RTE 687	RTE 697	3.85	R2	154	0.09	C
635	RTE 697	RTE 220	1.64	R2	239	0.14	C
636	ROUTE 122	RTE 678 SOUTH	2.18	R2	324	0.19	D
636	RTE 678 SOUTH	RTE 676 NORTH	0.56	R2	332	0.2	D

640	WCL ROCKY MOUNT	RTE 40	0.68	UA	271	0.27	B
640	RTE 40	RTE 756	3.61	UA	347	0.34	B
641	RTE 734 EAST	RTE 740	3.88	R2	285	0.17	C
641	RTE 740	RTE 602	2.27	R2	266	0.16	D
643	RTE 640	RTE 821	1.84	R2	226	0.13	B
643	RTE 641	RTE 739 EAST	1.76	R2	192	0.11	B
646	RTE 890	RTE 673	1.87	R2	190	0.11	B
646	RTE 673	RTE 718	3.77	R2	206	0.12	C
646	RTE 718	RTE 674	2.15	R2	68	0.04	A
655	RTE 40	RTE 834	3.57	R2	176	0.1	D
663	RTE 945	RTE 1101	2.57	R2	148	0.09	A
670	RTE 944	RTE 834	3.29	R2	389	0.23	B
670	RTE 834	RTE 868	3.23	R2	338	0.2	D
670	RTE 868	RTE 122	1.19	R2	419	0.25	D
671	RTE 655	RTE 834	3.94	R2	225	0.13	B
674	RTE 220 BUS	RTE 646	5.84	R2	380	0.22	C
676	RTE 634	RTE 636	3.48	R2	352	0.21	D
678	RTE 116	RTE 679 EAST	3.23	R2	184	0.11	D
678	RTE 680	RTE 634 WEST	0.85	R2	154	0.09	C
679	RTE 680	RTE 678 EAST	1.13	R2	134	0.08	D
680	RTE 678	RTE 679	1.21	R2	174	0.1	C
681	RTE 116	RTE 635	5.08	R2	159	0.09	B
684	RTE 220	ECL BOONES MILL	0.62	R2	354	0.21	D
684	ECL BOONES MILL	RTE 686	1.65	R2	306	0.18	D
684	RTE 686	RTE 116	4.51	R2	136	0.08	C
697	RTE 122	RTE 635	3.69	R2	364	0.21	C
697	RTE 635	RTE 692	0.89	R2	394	0.23	D
697	RTE 692	RTE 220 EAST	0.61	R2	404	0.24	D
718	RTE 40	RTE 646 NORTH	2.33	R2	325	0.19	C
718	RTE 646 NORTH	RTE 721	3.44	R2	101	0.06	B
718	RTE 721	RTE 619 NORTH	1.74	R2	175	0.1	C
739	RTE 220	RTE T-1609	0.16	R2	399	0.23	E
739	RTE 1609	RTE 986	4.66	R2	376	0.22	C
739	RTE 986	RTE 643 SOUTH	1.2	R2	225	0.13	C
739	RTE 643 SOUTH	RTE 742 WEST	2.94	R2	98	0.06	A
756	RTE 640	RTE 641	4.9	R2	117	0.07	A
767	RTE 606	RTE 690	3.11	R2	72	0.04	C
767	RTE 690	RTE 805	3.07	R2	99	0.06	C
775	RTE 919	RTE 220	3.59	R2	127	0.07	C
775	RTE 220	RTE 697	0.43	R2	126	0.07	D
805	RTE 40	RTE 623	0.18	R2	384	0.23	D
820	WCL ROCKY MOUNT	ROUTE 1012	0.63	R2	174	0.1	B
834	RTE 40	RTE 840	0.98	R2	216	0.13	C
834	RTE 840	RTE 655	2.88	R2	248	0.15	C
834	RTE 655	.7 MI NORTH RTE 914	1.88	R2	295	0.17	C
834	RTE 670	RTE 616	2.9	R2	302	0.18	C
860	RTE 40	FLOYD CL	2.85	R2	33	0.02	C
890	HENRY CL	RTE 619 WEST	5.24	R2	339	0.2	D

890	RTE 619 WEST	RTE 630	4.06	R2	218	0.13	C
890	RTE 630	RTE 646	3.15	R2	169	0.1	D
890	RTE 646	RTE 627	2.4	R2	228	0.13	C
890	RTE 627	RTE 40	5.68	R2	138	0.08	C
906	RTE 820	RTE 1037	0.58	R2	96	0.06	A
919	WCL ROCKY MOUNT	RTE 709	1.61	R2	391	0.23	D
919	RTE 709	RTE 641	1.91	R2	367	0.22	C
919	RTE 641	RTE 697	2.02	R2	203	0.12	C
919	RTE 697	RTE 220	3.15	R2	322	0.19	B
945	RTE 40	RTE 663	1.56	R2	236	0.14	B
969	RTE 890	PITTSYLVANIA CL	3.16	R2	87	0.05	A

Source: VA Department of Transportation, Salem, VA Office.

Level of Service for Signalized Intersections

The source of the following data is the Highway Capacity Manual 2000 published by the Transportation Research Board, National Research Council:

'Level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort and frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. Specifically, level-of-service (LOS) criteria are stated in terms of the average stopped delay per vehicle for a 15-min analysis period. The criteria are given in the table below. Delay may be measured in the field or estimated using procedures presented in the Highway Capacity Manual of the Transportation Research Board. Delay is a complex measure and is dependent on a number of variables, including the quality of progression, the cycle length, the green ratio, and the v/c ratio for the lane group in question.' [v/c= vehicle to capacity ratio.]

'LOS A describes operations with very low delay, up to 10 seconds per vehicle. This level of service occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.'

'LOS B describes operations with delay greater than 10 and up to 20 seconds per vehicle. This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay.'

Level-of-Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

LEVEL OF SERVICE	STOPPED DELAY PER VEHICLE (seconds)
A	≤ 10.0
B	> 10.0 and ≤ 20.0
C	> 20.0 and ≤ 35.0
D	> 35.0 and ≤ 55.0
E	> 55.0 and ≤ 80.0
F	> 80.0

'LOS C describes operations with delay greater than 20 and up to 35 seconds per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.'

'LOS D describes operations with delay greater than 35 and up to 55 seconds per vehicle. At level D, the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.'

'LOS E describes operations with delay greater than 55 and up to 80 seconds per vehicle. This level is considered by many agencies to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.'

'LOS F describes operations with delay in excess of 80 seconds per vehicle. This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with oversaturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high v/c ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels.'

Level of Service Criteria for Stop Sign Controlled Intersections

The source of the following data is the Highway Capacity Manual 2000 published by the Transportation Research Board, National Research Council:

"The level of service criteria are given in table below. As used here, control delay is defined as the total elapsed time from the time a vehicle stops at the end of the queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line; this time includes the time required for the vehicle to travel from the last-in-queue position to the first-in-queue position, including deceleration of vehicles from free-flow speed to the speed of vehicles in queue.'

'The average total delay for any particular minor movement is a function of the service rate or capacity of the approach and the degree of saturation.'

Level of Service Criteria for Two-Way Stop-Controlled (TWSC) Intersections

LEVEL OF SERVICE	AVERAGE CONTROL DELAY (seconds/vehicle)
A	≤ 10
B	> 10 and ≤ 15
C	> 15 and ≤ 25
D	> 25 and ≤ 35
E	> 35 and ≤ 50
F	> 50

'Average total delay less than 10 seconds/vehicle is defined as Level of Service (LOS) A. Follow-up times of less than 5 seconds have been measured when there is no conflicting traffic for a minor street movement, so control delays of less than 10 seconds/vehicle are appropriate for low flow conditions. To remain consistent with the All-Way Stop-Controlled (AWSC) intersection analysis procedure described later in this chapter, a total delay of 50 seconds/vehicle is assumed as the break point between LOS E and F.'

'The proposed level of service criteria for Two-Way Stop-Controlled (TWSC) intersections are somewhat different from the criteria used for signalized intersections. The primary reason for this difference is that drivers expect different levels of performance from different kinds of transportation facilities. The expectation is that a signalized intersection is designed to carry higher traffic volumes than an unsignalized intersection. Additionally, several driver behavior considerations combine to make delays at signalized intersections less onerous than at unsignalized intersections. For example, drivers at signalized intersections are able to relax during the red interval, whereas drivers on the minor approaches to unsignalized intersections must remain attentive to the task of identifying acceptable gaps and vehicle conflicts. Also, there is often much more variability in the amount of delay experienced by individual drivers at unsignalized than signalized intersections. For these reasons, it is considered that the total delay threshold for any given level of service is less for an unsignalized intersection than for a signalized intersection.'

'LOS F exists when there are insufficient gaps of suitable size to allow a side street demand to cross safely through a major street traffic stream. This level of service is generally evident from extremely long total delays experienced by side street traffic and by queuing on the minor approaches. The method, however, is based on a constant critical gap size - that is, the critical gap remains constant, no matter how long the side street motorist waits. LOS F may also appear in the form of side street vehicles' selecting smaller-than-usual gaps. In such cases, safety may be a problem and some disruption to the major traffic stream may result. It is important to note that

LOS F may not always result in long queues but may result in adjustments to normal gap acceptance behavior. The latter is more difficult to observe on the field than queuing, which is more obvious.'

Scenic Byways

The County has a number of scenic byway segments that have been designated. The routes across the County that have current byways byway designation are shown on the map County of Franklin Scenic Byways. The purpose of the state byways program is to identify road corridors containing aesthetic or cultural value near areas of historical, natural or recreational significance. The program and maps promoting byways are expected to encourage travel to interesting destinations and away from high-traffic corridors.

Byways are thought to stimulate local economies by attracting visitors to lesser-known destinations. A study has shown that visitors spent \$1.8 billion in counties adjacent to the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia and North Carolina. This supported nearly 75,009 jobs and generated more than \$147 million in tax revenues in the region.

To be considered for byway status the segment of roadway must substantially meet the following criteria:

- The byway route provides important scenic values and experiences.
- There is a diversity of experiences, as in transition from one landscape scene to another.
- The route links together or provides access to scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, natural, and archeological elements.
- The byway route bypasses major roads or provides opportunities to leave high-speed routes for variety and leisure in motoring. Landscape control or management along the route is feasible.
- The byway route allows for additional features that will enhance the motorist's experiences and improve safety.
- Local government(s) has/have initiated zoning or other land-use controls, so as to reasonably protect the aesthetic and cultural value of the highway.

Other considerations regarding byway status should be observed. A byway designation by Virginia gives localities the opportunity to participate in the National Scenic Byway Program. Designation might limit the placement of outdoor advertising signs. Designation does not affect land use controls. It does not limit road improvements in the future.

The steps to designation are as follows:

- Anyone can request byway designation, but local government must adopt a resolution of support.
- Upon receipt of a request and historical documentation from an interested party/local government, the Virginia Department of Transportation and the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation collect information on local zoning laws, traffic volumes and accident reports before evaluating the roads according to the criteria.

- Based on a joint review, according to the criteria, the DCR Director recommends qualifying roads for consideration by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.
- Before the Commonwealth Transportation Board acts, VDOT offers the local government the opportunity to hold a public hearing. If a public hearing is requested, VDOT's Local Assistance Division and DRA will provide assistance.
- After the public hearing, or if no hearing was requested, the Commonwealth Transportation Board officially designates the byway at their next scheduled meeting. Subsequently, signs are posted, and changes are made to the appropriate maps.

Bicycle Plans, Trails Plans

Franklin County has adopted a trails plan that includes various maps and illustrations of the existing and anticipated trails spread across the County. The trails plan also addressed bicycle routes and these can complement the trail system as it is built. In addition to the trails plan developed in recent years, the County has also cooperated with the West Piedmont Planning District Commission staff as they worked with the consultant firm of Kimley Horn to develop a regional bicycle plan in the 2004-2005 period. The final plan included extensive bicycle routes for Franklin County and there was significant interest on behalf of the general public in developing bicycle facilities in the future. The plan includes proposed bicycle routes in adjacent Henry County, Patrick County, and Pittsylvania County so it is possible to ascertain opportunities to link County bicycle routes into regional routes. Plans for trails and bicycle routes have been also developed for the localities of the Roanoke Valley including adjacent Roanoke County so that region-serving facilities can be developed between Franklin County and localities to the north.

Trails plans for the County can be found in the Recreation and Planning department offices; the regional bicycle plan can be found at these offices and the West Piedmont Planning District Commission office in Martinsville. Websites also provide opportunities to view valuable materials to inform the public on trails and bicycle routes.

Transportation Summary

- The County has excellent primary highway routes that make connections with two major metropolitan centers--Roanoke, Virginia, and Greensboro, North Carolina, both of which have regional airports. The Norfolk and Southern Railway system, one of the nation's largest rail corporations, supplies rail service to the County. All of these facilities will be important as the County promotes new industrial development. In addition, the location of Interstate 73 will aid in promoting future economic growth in the County.
- The Roanoke Regional Airport is an excellent airport with up to date facilities for air carrier service to Franklin County and the surrounding region. General aviation services to support commerce and industry are also excellent and near the County's developing areas.
- The Smith Mountain Airport, a light air-service facility located in Moneta in neighboring Bedford County, provides charter air service. This facility has had runway improvements made in recent years. Blue Ridge Airport is an excellent

facility easily accessible to south County residents. A number of small landing strips around the County provide places for aviators to store and fly their aircraft.

- While the County has an extensive network of secondary roads that are well maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation, the list of projects on the secondary road system *Six-Year Improvement Program* indicates that numerous road segments on the secondary routes are deficient and project work is needed. The County's combinations of conditions including rising traffic loads over certain routes, terrain, and weather effects lead to deterioration and resultant needs for diligent maintenance, repair, and widening projects. In effect, both maintenance and improvement programs are essential in the County's future.
- The Virginia Department of Transportation has included a number of route projects plus other activities planned on the secondary system from Fiscal Year 2007 to Fiscal Year 2012. The amount of highway funding for Franklin County is projected to decrease over the six-year program period when compared to the six-year period spending cited in the last Comprehensive Plan. In the last Plan, the amount of spending was \$12,388,648, whereas the estimate for the next six-years is \$9,798,297. Funding was reduced in June of 2006. Significant changes will need to be made to future Secondary Six-Year Plans to accommodate the reduction in funding.
- Franklin County should encourage continued state funding support for the Rural Addition Program and Economic Development Access Program. The County likely has some remaining mileage of roads being used by the public, which are not in the state maintenance program. The County also needs to continue emphasizing industrial development through new sites for industry and these sites will need appropriate roadways to provide access to external markets.
- Franklin County has a number of key road improvement related projects on the lists with VDOT, which need to be encouraged toward implementation. These include work on Route 122, Route 122/Route 116 intersection, safety improvements on the Route 220 corridor, Route 220 Business from Rocky Mount to the interchange with Route 220 South bypass, Route 40/Ferrum area improvements. The listed projects being presented as priorities to the Commonwealth Transportation Board each year such as Route 40 widening toward U.S. Route 29 to the east need to continue to be encouraged. Interstate 73 is a project that also needs consistent support with its potential for aiding the regional and local economy and in recognition that funding for the highway's construction has yet to be identified.
- Franklin County, in coordination with the Planning District Commissions, (West Piedmont and the Roanoke Valley-Allegheny Planning Commissions), has moved forward in planning for trails and bicycle routes. These do not provide alternatives to the 20-mile automobile work commute that many residents make each morning for many in the work force. However, they do provide recreational and fitness alternatives that are needed very much today. Trails and bicycle routes and the plans that encourage their development also indicate to potential business prospects that the County is looking toward raising the bar for

improving the local quality of life and thus enhances the County's economic development chances.

- As a result of the Virginia Department of Transportation's development of its State Highway Plan, Year 2025, certain long-range projects are identified that have not been placed on the Six Year Improvement Program but that are obvious projects for the County to give great attention to over the next years. They will need strong support from the public, business and industry, local development community, and local elected officials, state elected officials, and our federal representatives. Funding is not available for any of these projects, but this should give reason for the County's active participation on finding statewide solutions to the problem of finding sufficient road funding for both maintenance and construction. The projects identified include: widening Route 40 from Route 793 out to the west corporate limits of Rocky Mount; widening Route 40 East from the Route 122 intersection out to the Franklin/Pittsylvania County line; widening Route 116 from the Route 122 intersection out to the Franklin/Roanoke County line; widening Route 122 from the Route 40 East intersection out to the Franklin/Bedford County line; widening Route 220 from Rocky Mount south corporate limits out to the Route 220 Bypass interchange. Not included but a project area that will need continued attention is the U.S. Route 220 corridor from Rocky Mount to the Franklin/Roanoke County line. As noted earlier in this Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, there is a list of work items underway currently for Route 220; however, until Interstate 73 is constructed, it can be expected that safety, access management, intersection, signalization, and other improvements will be needed along this critical roadway.

NOTE: This Transportation Chapter of the Franklin County Comprehensive Plan was prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and the Virginia Department of Transportation. The contents of this section reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration or the Virginia Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation. FHWA acceptance of this report as evidence of fulfillment of the objectives of this planning study does not constitute endorsement/approval of their location and design or a commitment to fund any such improvements. Additional project level environmental impact assessment and/or studies of alternatives may be necessary.