



**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
January 7, 2009 Minutes

Present

Members

Stephen Bach
Bobby Burke
Jim Currie
Marc Evans
Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair
John Pfaltz
Linda Seaman, Chair

Representing

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

Not Attending:

James Burton City At-Large
Jay Gauldin MPO
Tom Loach County Planning Commission
Jon Schroeder City At-Large
Bill Wuensch MPO

Staff:

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

Ms. Seaman called the meeting to order and introduced new TJPDC staff member Will Cockrell.

Matters from the Public

There were no matters from the public.

Approval of the Minutes

Upon a motion from Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Mr. Lafferty, the December 3, 2008 meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Upon a motion from Mr. Bach, seconded by Mr. Burke, the October 1, 2008 meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

UnJAM 2035 CLRP Update and Year of Expenditure Discussion

Ms. Whitham presented the recently revised CLRP Project List. The list was recently updated to show project cost estimates in future year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. The YOE cost estimates caused the fiscally constrained project list to exceed its anticipated federal funding allocation by \$50 million.

Ms. Whitham asked the Committee to review the CLRP project list and determine which projects could be moved to the Vision List or reduced in scope to reduce the deficit. The Committee's suggestions will be conveyed to the MPO Policy Board for consideration.

Mr. Burke asked if the recent budgetary changes to the Six-Year Program (SYP) affected the CLRP project list. Ms. Barlow stated that most of the SYP budget cuts had affected major projects in the Culpepper and Staunton districts.

Mr. Pfaltz stated that the new bridge listed in US 250 East Pantops Master Plan Improvements project was only considered by the City in tandem with the Eastern Connector Study. Since the Eastern Connector has been removed from the CLRP, he suggested that the bridge portion of the project be removed. The Committee agreed.

Ms. Barlow stressed that MPO staff has not yet met with City and County planning staff to discuss projects that could be shifted to the Vision List.

Mr. Pfaltz then suggested I-31 stating that the bridge was recently replaced. Mr. Proctor clarified that the deck of the bridge was replaced not the entire bridge. Mr. Pfaltz asked if the planned I-31 project would be two lanes wide. Mr. Proctor stated that it would.

Ms. Barlow suggested that the Proffit Road project could be shifted to the Vision List and asked the committee if they had any objections. The Committee agreed to recommend the Proffit Road Improvements project for the Vision List.

Mr. Currie asked about the costs for the I-64 Exit 118 project. He wanted to know if the \$33 million cost estimate had to do with safety improvements. Mr. Proctor stated that safety was a concern for this project noting especially the dangerous on and off-ramp weaving movements in the eastbound direction. Mr. Evans asked if Mr. Proctor had any data concerning vehicular accidents at this location. Mr. Proctor stated that there were other safety issues to consider beside vehicular accidents. Mr. Currie asked if interchange projects have a better chance of receiving funding. Ms. Barlow responded that there is more federal funding available for interstate and primary roads projects than secondary road projects.

Ms. Seaman asked for clarification regarding the University of Virginia's development requirements from VDOT. She wanted to know if the University is required to fund access improvements when it constructs a new facility. Mr. Proctor responded that the University typically funds alternative modes of transits and promotes satellite parking facilities instead of constructing new parking areas in conjunction with new building projects.

Mr. Currie asked if the \$2 million cost estimate for the US 29 Bypass project is necessary. Mr. Proctor responded that the \$2 million only covers the cost of managing the properties that VDOT acquired in the potential Bypass right of way, not acquiring additional right of way.

Ms. Whitham suggested shifting the Route 20 Improvements project to the Vision List. Mr. Proctor stated that many of the necessary improvements will be funded by a developer. The Committee agreed to move the project to the vision list.

Ms. Seaman asked if the current cuts discussed are sufficient for CHART's recommendations to MPO Policy Board. Ms. Barlow stated yes, but encouraged the Committee to consider other projects to give the City more options when the TJPDC talks with them to discuss removing projects from the CLRP project list. Mr. Lafferty asked Mr. Proctor if he could see any other projects that could be removed or reduced. Mr. Proctor stated that he could not.

Ms. Seaman asked if the CLRP project list was intended to be a guide for the possible economic stimulus funding, or if that process would be separate. Ms. Barlow stated that the process would be separate. Mr. Proctor stated that the possible stimulus funds would focus on "shovel-ready projects." Ms. Seaman asked if a project on the CLRP would be removed if it was funded and constructed with stimulus money. Mr. Proctor stated that would be the case. Ms. Barlow added that that the CLRP project list cannot show a deficit even if project funding from alternative sources is anticipated.

Ms. Barlow summarized the CHART Committee's suggestions. She stated that the Committee suggested moving the Proffit Road and and Route 20 Improvements projects to the Vision List, and reducing the project scope for the Pantops Master Plan Improvements. She stated that the Committee suggested improving some of the New Construction project descriptions and emphasizing connectivity within those descriptions.

UnJAM Public Participation Phase II Planning

Ms. Whitham introduced the agenda item and gave the Committee a brief summary of the timeline for completing the UnJAM 2035 update. She stated that new information on the draft document and project list should be available to the public by mid-February. TJPDC will use March to make presentations to the City and County Planning Commissions. Ms. Whitham explained that the that CLRP will be a major feature of UnJAM 2035 via an interactive map on the www.unjam.org website.

Ms. Whitham asked the Committee for feedback on implementing the Phase II Public Outreach component of the UnJAM 2035.

Mr. Lafferty thought the idea of a map was a good one but suggested that an interactive map would be a lot of work. Mr. Pfaltz suggested showing the CLRP project list as is, but making the project titles link to a map showing the project location. Ms. Whitham stated that the creation of the map was not a major concern but that putting the map on the website might cause issues for some users with slower connections. Mr. Evans suggested using scalable graphics but also stated that that might be time consuming. He also suggested integrating the project list with Google Maps, but was unsure of software compatibility. Ms. Barlow suggested having a PDF option for users with a slower internet connection.

Ms. Whitham also asked the Committee what portions of the UnJAM 2035 document should be highlighted for the public. Mr. Pfaltz asked if public meetings were going to be held. Ms. Whitham stated that the document would be taken to Planning Commissions but that no separate

public meetings were planned. Ms. Barlow mentioned that only the MPO portion of UnJAM 2035 must be completed by May and that the Rural Long Range Plan was on schedule to be complete by the end of 2009.

Mr. Pfaltz stated that in his experience the best public participation forums allow people to have a discussion. Mr. Pfaltz stated that the website would not engender the best discussion forum and suggested having an individual explain what major issues are discussed in UnJAM 2035 and once explained asked citizens what they think about those issues. Ms. Seaman suggested using Public Access Channel 10 as a medium for explaining the UnJAM 2035 document. Mr. Burke suggested recording the presentation at CitySpace. Mr. Currie suggested emailing people the time and date that the broadcast would air. Ms. Barlow suggested letting TJPDC staff consider the idea internally to create a more complete plan and see if the concept matches FHWA public participation requirements.

Other Business

RTA: Ms. Barlow stated that the letter took the form of a short memo. Ms. Seaman asked if the letter has already been mailed. Ms. Barlow said that it had.

Project Tracking Matrix: Mr. Pfaltz stated that he asked Jeannie Alexander to present data on item 6 at the next CHART meeting. Ms. Barlow stated that she would look into that as a possibility.

TJPDC Executive Director Search: Mr. Bach asked for an update concerning the TJPDC's search for an executive director. Ms. Barlow stated that two rounds of interviews have been conducted and that the Commission was not satisfied with the candidates. The Commission is now re-advertising the position.

Mr. Pfaltz stated that he would like to make a note of appreciation to Chuck Proctor for all his hard work on the CLRP project list. The committee members concurred.

Matters from the Public

There were no matters.

The meeting was adjourned.