



**Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization
of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission**
POB 1505, 401 E. Water St, Charlottesville, VA 22902 www.tjpd.org
(434) 979-7310 phone • (434) 979-1597 fax • info@tjpd.org email

CHART Advisory Committee Meeting
September 3, 2008 Minutes

Present

Members

Stephen Bach
Bobby Burke
James Currie
Marc Evans
Jay Gauldin
Jeff Monroe
John Pfaltz,
Jon Schroeder
Linda Seaman, Chair
Bill Wuensch

Representing

MPO, Bicycling
MPO, Pedestrian
Albemarle County, Environment
MPO
MPO
Albemarle County At-Large
City At-Large
City At-Large
City At-Large
MPO

Not Attending:

James Burton City At-Large
Mac Lafferty Albemarle County At-Large
Tom Loach Albemarle County Planning Commission

Staff:

Melissa Barlow TJPDC
Sarah Eissler TJPDC
Chuck Proctor VDOT
Ann Whitham TJPDC

Ms. Seaman called the meeting to order.

Matters from the Public:

There were no matters from the public.

Approval of the August 6, 2008 Minutes:

Upon a motion by Mr. Currie, seconded by Mr. Bach, the August 2008 minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

Draft UnJAM 2035 Regional Vision Discussion:

Ms. Whitham introduced the memorandum and explained staff's process for reviewing CHART Committee suggestions and developing a draft regional vision statement.

Mr. Currie expressed a belief that the vision statement needs to fundamentally change to address the current energy and environmental situation. He and Mr. Bach requested a statement that fundamentally changes the direction of the document and addresses peak oil.

Mr. Gauldin disagreed with the factuality of the opening statement. Mr. Wuensch agreed with Mr. Gauldin and stated that the vision statement is subjective and has an activist tone. Mr. Evans agreed and felt that addressing a changing world can appear in the goals or objectives.

Ms. Seaman suggested that the opening statement presented by Mr. Currie could serve as a preamble to the vision statement itself. She also noted that vision statements are typically short. Mr. Gauldin agrees that vision statements are supposed to be brief and enduring. Mr. Burke agreed. Mr. Currie also agreed with the inclusion of a preamble.

Mr. Pfaltz felt that the preamble is appropriate, but added that roads are still an important part of the mix of transportation choices in the Plan.

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Mr. Bach, the Committee unanimously agreed to include a preamble to the regional vision statement.

Ms. Seaman suggested that the preamble should refer to the fact that the age cheap oil is over, climate change is a reality, and modes of transportation will change.

Mr. Gauldin stated that he does not agree with the veracity of the opening statement. He does think that we should acknowledge that environmental damage has been done.

Mr. Currie disagrees and feels that there is national consensus on this issue. Mr. Wuensch feels that it is a political statement.

Mr. Burke suggested changing the word “cheap” in the statement.

Mr. Pfaltz suggested agreeing to the content of the preamble. Ms. Seaman suggested a statement that “our petroleum-based trans system will be changing in the next 25 years.”

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Mr. Gauldin, the Committee agreed to a preamble using Mr. Currie’s suggested opening statement. The motion carried with 3 nays and 1 abstention.

Mr. Currie feels that the staff-recommended statement is satisfactory if preceded by his preamble. The Committee agreed.

UnJAM 2035 Draft Fiscally-Constrained Project List Discussion

Ms. Whitham provided a summary of the memo and previous work done by the CHART and MPO Tech Committees.

Mr. Proctor noted that there are far more secondary roads projects in the list than available funding, while the reverse is true for interstate road projects. Ms. Seaman asked if CHART is being asked to identify projects that involve the interstate because they are more likely to be funded. Mr. Proctor responded that there is more federal funding available for interstate projects than secondary road projects.

Mr. Pfaltz would like to begin with which projects should be added to the list.

Mr. Gauldin feels that the plan should not be passive and reactive, but responsive to future hotspots. Ms. Barlow responded that this is often difficult to achieve when there are existing needs still unmet. Mr. Wuensch noted that the state of Florida has a concurrency system and is not nearly as reactive as Virginia is in response to growth and development.

Ms. Whitham noted the memo with the MPO Tech Committee suggested additions to the list as a starting point.

Mr. Gauldin suggested using interstate funds to create an interchange specifically for the new Martha Jefferson System.

Ms. Seaman suggested a redesign of the I-64 eastbound interchange at US 29 (Exit 118 B).

Mr. Evans asked if we could use interstate monies to improve the bike and pedestrian crossings over or under I-64. Mr. Monroe noted a future connection of the Rivanna Trail to the Monticello trail as a possibility.

Mr. Pfaltz suggested extending Ashwood Boulevard from the stub out across county land for 1/3 mile to connect to Polo Grounds road. He also suggested Redfields Route 1288 to Sherwood Farms via Cedarwood Drive and Overlook Drive.

Ms. Barlow asked the Committee to consider new vision projects.

Mr. Pfaltz proposed designating one lane on US 29 for High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) and/or transit.

Ms. Seaman suggested making the Meadowcreek Parkway HOV and transit only during peak hours.

Mr. Evans brought up ITS. Mr. Pfaltz suggested funding cameras at intersections. Mr. Evans would like to see integration of system timing controls between City and County traffic signals.

Ms. Seaman mentioned the substantial increase in freight traffic in the future. She suggested a study of railroad and road intersections, minimizing at-grade crossings. Mr. Pfaltz added that most railroads would like to limit at-grade crossings as well.

Mr. Pfaltz suggested removing project I-8, widening of Old Ivy Road. He noted that he brought this up at MPO Tech as well. Mr. Evans thinks the County needs to find a better way to get cyclists and pedestrians over the railroad. Not a widening project, a reconfiguration.

Mr. Pfaltz also suggested removing Proffit Road, I-10. Mr. Wuensch disagreed, noting that we have not seen safety studies, peak hour movements or other information. He drives this road and feels that it is very dangerous and would benefit from a safety study. Mr. Wuensch requested safety study data for the road be brought to the Committee.

Mr. Pfaltz suggested having the Committee formally question the large expenditure of \$\$ for I-8 and I-10 and suggest that the money could be better spent elsewhere. Mr. Wuensch feels that we should proceed cautiously with safety projects. Ms. Barlow requested safety data on these two intersections from VDOT. Also information on what the estimate includes.

Ms. Seaman asked if the projects in the plan are supportive of an RTA. She suggested that the RTA study and the UnJAM 2035 Plan should complement each other. Ms. Barlow noted projects that are transit-supportive. Mr. Bach would like to increase the annual funding for transit operations.

Ms. Barlow asked Committee members to examine these areas when we travel around and think about what the update might have been.

Mr. Proctor noted that V-15 addresses the I-64 interchanges suggested earlier in the discussion.

Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting was adjourned.