



**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

---

DRAFT  
CHART Advisory Committee Meeting  
November 4th, 2009 Minutes

**Present**

Members

Stephen Bach  
Bobby Burke  
Jim Currie  
Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair  
Bruce Odell  
John Pfaltz  
Linda Seaman, Chair  
Peggy Westfall

Representing

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

Not Attending

Marc Evans  
Jeff Monroe  
Tom Loach

MPO  
Albemarle County At-Large  
County Planning Commission

Staff:

Sarah Eissler  
Chuck Proctor  
Steve Williams

TJPDC  
VDOT  
TJPDC

Ms. Seaman called the meeting to order and asked committee members to introduce themselves.

**Matters from the Public**

There were no matters from the public.

**Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Lafferty mentioned a few changes which Ms. Eissler noted.

**Upon a motion from Mr. Lafferty, seconded by Mr. Pfaltz, the October 7, 2009 meeting minutes were unanimously approved as amended.**

**Discussion of the Draft Public Participation Presentation**

Ms. Eissler presented a draft of the Public Participation Presentation. This presentation is focused on gleaning as much public comment from participants as possible, within a short period of time. This presentation will briefly explain the role and purpose of the Metropolitan Planning Organization and the CHART Committee. Beyond these basic introductions the presentation will focus on “What Do You Think” questions that deal with major transportation issues in our area. Major topics include Biggest Transportation Issues, Biggest Safety Concerns, and Biggest Congestion Concerns. The presentation also attempted to pinpoint how participants would improve the transportation system, fund improvements to the transportation system and allocate limited funds for significant improvements.

Accompanying this presentation was a hand out that would allow participants to rank options and add personal input. This handout would be the major component for collecting and organizing this public input.

Upon reviewing the presentation and handout, committee members expressed concerned about how questions were worded and what images might better suit the presentation. Most of the committee's concerns focused on slides that discussed funding options and allocation options. The committee concluded that it would be easier for participants to understand that funding issues if there was also a slide that focused on transportation costs. Ms. Eissler stated that she would work to improve this portion of the presentation.

### **Update on the Route 29 Corridor Study**

Mr. Williams stated that a significant amount of public input was gathered regarding this study. Mr. Williams summarized that the recommendations from, the Route 29 Corridor Study that would affect our area included an extension of Leonard Sandridge Drive, a significant flyover at the Hydraulic/route 29/route 250 interchange, and an bypass road that would roughly run along the Albemarle County/Louisa County border. Mr. Williams stated that because of negative public input and negative comments from the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and the City of Charlottesville City Council, all three recommendations have been removed from the Route 29 Corridor Study. Mr. Williams continued, stating that the plan explains that the Charlottesville/Albemarle portion of route 29 corridor offers the most significant issues for the entire route 29 corridor, but currently there are no recommendations in the plan to improve these congestion issues other than the suggestions from the Places29 plan. Mr. Williams stated that the draft Route 29 Corridor Study would be released in the next few weeks and go to the Commonwealth Transportation Board in December. Mr. Williams clarified that the City came out against the Hydraulic Road project because it would result in significant tax loss from business that would be affected by construction.

### **Update on the Downtown Trail Project**

Ms. Eissler stated that she and Albemarle County Planner David Benish went out to the Railroad Bridge that crosses the south fork of the Rivanna River to determine if the Old Railroad Bridge Piers were still intact. Ms. Eissler showed the committee pictures of the piers and discussed that terrain of the area, which is quite steep. Ms. Eissler also stated that much more research is required to determine an appropriate route for a commuter bike trail in this area. Mr. Eissler also mentioned that a there is an existing trail along the Railroad, which might be usable for the project. This trail is currently labeled a Rivanna Trails Foundation trail. Ms. Seaman mentioned that if the trail is a RTF trail that RTF would have documentation on the property. Ms. Eissler stated that she would look into it,

### **Discussion of Committee Guidelines and Responsibilities for New Members**

Ms. Seaman stated that as the committee is transitioning it is appropriate to redefine not only what this committee is about, but also what is expected of new committee members. Ms. Seaman stated that she, Mr. Lafferty and Ms. Eissler got together and drafted guidelines for the Committee to review and discuss. The over-arching goal of these guidelines would be to send these guidelines to the County and City and make them available for new members who are interested in joining CHART. Ms. Eissler also mentioned that in the past months she has been reviewing the logistics of how citizen are appointed to MPO Committees and has determined that the process is fairly disorganized. Ms. Eissler stated that these guidelines are a first step in

attempting to make this process more organized for the MPO. Committee members made suggestions to the draft document and Ms. Eissler stated that she would make the changes.

**Other Business**

Mr. Pfaltz discussed some of the Committee member's efforts regarding establishing a cost/benefit analysis for roadway projects in our area. Mr. Pfaltz suggested that this analysis would be useful if it was also established for Bicycle and Pedestrian issues. Mr. Bach and Mr. Lafferty stated that they would give some thought to the project. Mr. Williams expressed some concern that the source material needed to complete the forms would be extremely difficult to obtain.

**Additional Matters from the Public**

There were no additional matters from the public.