



Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization
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
March 11th 2010 Minutes

Present

Members

Stephen Bach
Dan Freudberg
Alec Gosse
Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair
Bruce Odell
John Pfaltz
Linda Seaman, Chair

Representing

MPO, Bicycling
MPO
MPO
Albemarle County Planning Commission
City At-Large
City At-Large
City At-Large

Not Attending

Bobby Burke MPO, Pedestrian
Jeff Monroe Albemarle County At-Large
Peggy Westfall City At-Large
Bill Wuensch MPO

Staff:

Sarah Eissler TJPDC
Chuck Proctor VDOT
Bill Watterson CTS
Steve Williams TJPDC

Ms. Seaman called the meeting to order.

Matters from the Public

There were no matters from the public.

Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Lafferty stated that his title had not been changed in the members list of the February minutes. Ms. Eissler stated that she would correct the error.

Upon a motion from Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Mr. Bach, February 3rd, 2010 meeting minutes were unanimously approved, as amended.

Introduction of new CHART Members

Mr. Seaman introduced the MPO's newly appointed CHART members Dan Freudberg and Alec Gosse. The other present committee members and staff also introduced themselves.

Transit Discussion with Bill Watterson of CTS

Mr. Watterson introduced himself and handed out materials regarding CTS' routes and schedules. Mr. Watterson invited committee members to two separate poetry readings sponsored by CTS that focus on transit-oriented and environmentally-aware topics.

Mr. Watterson presented on CTS' basic fixed-route service model and identified CTS' individual routes and the service they provide. Mr. Watterson also mentioned that CTS' ridership has grown significantly in the last few years. Mr. Pfaltz asked if CTS' ridership growth has resulted in expanded service. Mr. Watterson stated that the growth this year has not resulted in expanded service, but CTS has worked to improve ridership opportunities and types of available fares in order to make the current service more efficient. Mr. Pfaltz asked if revenues were increasing with these new fare opportunities. Mr. Watterson stated that the model was designed so fare revenues would stay flat, however he believes that fare revenues are moderately increasing. Mr. Odell asked what the total revenue was from fares. Mr. Watterson stated that next year's fare revenue total is projected to be \$535,000, which includes the money from the University of Virginia for both the Fare-Free Agreement and the Free Trolley.

Mr. Watterson continued, stating that CTS has greatly outgrown its operations facility and has constructed a new LEED-Certified facility, which can accommodate the CTS fleet and staff. Mr. Watterson also discussed the current CTS fleet and the efforts to replace older buses and trolleys. Mr. Watterson stated that CTS is working to replace the current GILLIG fleet with slightly smaller hybrid buses.

Mr. Watterson also stated that CTS is continually trying to improve the efficiency of its routes, but the nature of the route's service and the location of the population can make efficiency difficult, particularly for the hourly/neighborhood routes. Mr. Watterson also mentioned that CTS is trying to consolidate its night service routes to be more efficient.

Mr. Watterson also mentioned challenges for CTS service, including the number of single anchor routes (routes that have only one major destination). Mr. Watterson also mentioned that Charlottesville's road network is tricky for bus route planning because so many roads are narrow. Both of these issues add to CTS' more circuitous routing issues. Mr. Watterson also mentioned that he has been trying to minimize the number of looping routes, in favor of more bi-directional routes.

Mr. Watterson also stated that CTS has recently presented new route options to City Council that will allow service in the southern portion of the urbanized area. Mr. Watterson stated that these new routes are cross-jurisdictional, which is an issue that has been very difficult for CTS. Extending CTS' service means bringing more service into the County and at this time the County is not in a position to fund more service. Mr. Watterson continued stating that in most cases bus routes are either entirely funded by city match or county match. Only one route is funded by cost-sharing mechanism where the match is split evenly between the City and County, route 2B.

Mr. Watterson also mentioned that numerous social services agencies are moving out from the urban core to the fringes of the urbanized area. Not only does this result in cross-jurisdictional service, but it also results in CTS having to alter routes to make these social services accessible. This can be problematic with CTS's efforts to make more efficient service routes. Mr. Odell asked if social service agencies and PVCC could also set up a fare-free agreement like the agreement with UVa. Mr. Watterson stated that he would like to have more of these agreements in place, but these agencies do not feel able to commit the lump sum cost that is required to set up this type of agreement. Mr. Watterson also stated that he knows that some of these agencies are exploring Travel Demand Management practices and considering how the cost of parking affects their budget's compared to the cost of transit. Mr. Watterson continued, stating that when it is time for a new model he is hopeful that these new ideas will come to fruition.

Mr. Lafferty asked Mr. Watterson to clarify the funding model. Mr. Watterson stated that when he first arrived he worked to try and determine how the costs are allocated, particularly the local match. Mr. Watterson stated that he determined that the County was paying very little considering the service that was being provided. Mr. Watterson stated that a significant number of costs were being paid for by the City, but benefitted the County. Mr. Watterson thought it best to open a dialog in order to determine a more equitable distribution of costs. Mr. Watterson stated federal operating grants and local share pay for

the bulk of operations. When the County pays for routes the breakdown is the same, however this cost does not fully cover administrative costs.

Mr. Odell asked if it was possible to enhance current fixed-route service by providing small demand-response service into neighborhoods. Mr. Odell thought that this might allow opportunity to bring more people to the main bus routes. Mr. Watterson stated that currently CTS has a service known as Link, which does provide demand response service for smaller neighborhoods in the City.

Public Participation Outreach

Mr. Williams stated that TJPDC staff took the CHART public participation presentation to the MPO Technical Executive Committee and the committee had numerous edits for the presentation. The alternative strategies slide will be expanded to include projects not in the CLRP. Also, the committee requested a slide explaining the relationship between Land Use and Transportation planning. The committee also asked for a representation of local funding options and changes. Because of these numerous changes staff has decided to review the project and will not present the presentation to the MPO Technical Committee or the MPO Policy Board Committee until a later date. Mr. Williams also mentioned that the MPO Technical Executive Committee also wanted CHART to consider the groups that would receive the presentation in order to ensure that these public participation efforts actually seek a boarder audience.

Other Business

Mr. Williams mentioned that the City, County and the MPO are working on submitting a congressional request to pay for improvements to the Route 29/ Route 250 interchange.

Additional Matters from the Public

There were no additional matters from the public.