



**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  
November 7, 2007 Minutes

**Present**

Members

Stephen Bach  
Bobby Burke  
James Burton  
James Currie, Chair  
Marc Evans  
Jay Gauldin  
Ann Mallek  
John Pfaltz, Vice Chair  
Linda Seaman

Representing

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

Members Absent

Stan Binsted  
Steve Bolton  
Calvin Morris  
Tricia Traugott

Representing

County At- Large, Small Business  
City At-Large  
Planning Commission, Albemarle County  
MPO

Staff

Kellem Emanuele  
Ann Whitham  
John Giometti

Representing

TJPDC  
TJPDC  
VDOT

Mr. Currie called the meeting to order.

**Matters from the Public**

There were no matters from the public

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Ms. Mallek, the October meeting minutes were unanimously approved, as amended.**

**Review Proposed TIP Amendments**

Ms. Emanuele circulated a memo summarizing the additional Long Range Plan (UnJAM) amendments that will reviewed at a public hearing during the November 21 MPO Policy Board meeting. The proposed amendments include projects already in the FY06 TIP (Interstate projects), one new project (bridge of CSX railroad at Shadwell), and to revise the description of Project I-16.

Mr. Giometti elaborated on the US 29 Extended Corridor Study, explaining that approximately 16% of the proposed I-66 to Amherst County study area falls within the MPO area. As such, the project needs to be in the TIP and UnJAM. Approximately 16% of the total project cost, or \$250,000, needs to be covered by the MPO.

The Committee expressed concern about the Corridor Study being paid for solely by Culpeper District, even though the study area covers multiple VDOT districts, but supported the LRP amendment.

Ms. Emanuele and Mr. Giometti introduced the other LRP amendments, the revised description of project I-16 and replacing the bridge over the CSX railroad at Shadwell. The bridge project must be in the LRP in order for it to be eligible for federal bridge funds.

Mr. Giometti suggested having a discussion with the CHART at a future meeting about expanding the emphasis on Interstate and bridge projects in UnJAM. This work will be included in the UnJAM update, UnJAM 2025.

Ms. Emanuele summarized that staff will draft a memo stating the Committee's concern about the corridor study, and Jim Currie will comment during the public hearing at the November MPO Policy Board meeting.

**Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Ms. Mallek, the CHART Committee unanimously supported the Long Range Plan amendments, with reservations about the Extended US 29 Corridor Study project.**

Ms. Emanuele introduced the proposed TIP Amendments.

Mr. Burton expressed concern about the addition of a lane on the 250 Bypass in Project UPC85708, which he feels will make the area even more dangerous. Mr. Giometti stated that he shares Mr. Burton's concerns and emphasized that there are still many opportunities work through the project design. The project has not yet completed the preliminary engineering (PE) phase. Mr. Burton referenced I-64 exit 118A-B as another example of a dangerous traffic weaving area. Mr. Giometti noted that this exit is worth considering as a project for the next LRP. Mr. Burton would also like to see the right turn lane onto 250 from Hydraulic extended.

The Committee agreed to express the same reservation about the TIP Amendment for the extended Route 29 Corridor Study as they expressed for the UnJAM amendment for the same project.

**Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaltz seconded by Ms. Mallek, the Committee unanimously supported the TIP Amendments, with reservations about the Extended Long Range Corridor Project.**

### **Connectivity Discussion**

Mr. Pfaltz introduced his list of potential connections between subdivisions, noting that all the suggested connections make sense, although many are strongly opposed by the residents in these neighborhoods. He felt that in the context of a fiscally constrained LRP, these are inexpensive upgrades to improve the area's transportation network. Mr. Pfaltz would like the Committee to

formally request that the MPO Technical Committee provide CHART with more information about the estimated costs to construct these connections.

Mr. Burton would like to see an Avon to 5<sup>th</sup> Street extended connection for emergency vehicles, the Southern Parkway. He would also like to see a Cleveland Ave to Cleveland Ave connection.

Ms. Seaman also noted that connecting Greenbrier to Greenbrier is another politically infeasible road connection, but that perhaps a bike/pedestrian trail would be useful.

Mr. Currie expressed concern about having City and County staff spend time on this.

Mr. Giometti informed the Committee that the VDOT subdivision street requirements are being revised. The new regulations, called secondary street acceptance requirements, list requirements that streets must meet before they are accepted into the state system. One of the requirements is connectivity and is measured by a connectivity index. Subdivisions will have to meet a certain level of connectivity in order to be accepted into the system for state maintenance funds.

**Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Ms. Mallek, the Committee approved a request to MPO Tech for approximate cost estimates for the list of connections, with Ms. Seaman dissenting.**

#### **Continued Review of Preliminary 2007 Benchmark Data**

Ms. Emanuele introduced the packet items and updates to the benchmark data; including that the full group quarters data has been included and the new “thumbnail” format.

Mr. Currie found the thumbnail map layout very helpful. He provided staff with corrections to the data. Mr. Pfaltz suggested that the UVA district data should not be included because it appears to be flawed. Mr. Gauldin asked about the accuracy of the 1998 data. Ms. Emanuele explained that the 1998 data was derived during the previous modeling process and in some cases was based on multipliers. Mr. Pfaltz suggested an explanation to the public as “this data is the best available from the City and County.”

In addition to employment data, Mr. Currie would like to see data showing where employees commute from. Mr. Bach stated that the public has a limited ability to digest data. He is not sure to what extent people will actually focus on the figures compared to their daily experience of problem areas in the MPO. As an alternative, Mr. Gauldin suggested a map graphic showing areas of population growth. Ms. Mallek suggested maps showing 1998-2007 growth. Mr. Pfaltz agreed. Mr. Gauldin also suggested indicating future developments not yet built on the map.

Ms. Emanuele noted that a technical appendix is a suggested update to the LRP with maps and figures such as those suggested by CHART.

#### **Review of Fuel Pricing Discussion Summary**

Ms. Emanuele introduced the summary of the previous Committee discussion and requested feedback from the Committee about the document.

Mr. Bach commented that the Department of Energy’s work and modeling has received a great deal of criticism. He will provide staff with a website listing alternative fuel pricing and availability projections.

The Committee discussed the data provided in the charts comparing ridership on local transit to the cost of fuel. Mr. Pfaltz stated that it is interesting and worthwhile to include in the technical appendix.

**Other Business:**

**Coordinated Human Service Mobility Plan**: Ms. Emanuele introduced the Plan and the upcoming Phase II workshop to be held November 30 at TJPDC. Any local or state agency applying for grant funding from three federal human service transportation grant programs must now have a “locally developed coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan.” These three programs are the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities Program, the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program, and the New Freedom Program. Ms. Emanuele welcomed comments about the draft Plan included in the meeting materials.

Mr. Emanuele requested that any comments be provided to TJPDC staff no later than November 18.

**Matters from the Public:**

There were no Matters from the Public.

The meeting was adjourned.