



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
May 5th 2010 Minutes

Present

Members

Stephen Bach
Bobby Burke
Dan Freudberg
Alec Gosse
Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair
Bruce Odell
John Pfaltz
David Shreve
Linda Seaman, Chair
Peggy Westfall

Representing

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

Not Attending

Jeff Monroe County At-Large
Bill Wuensch MPO

Staff:

Sarah Eissler TJPDC
Chuck Proctor VDOT
Steve Williams TJPDC

Ms. Seaman called the meeting to order and asked for committee members to introduce themselves. Ms. Seaman also welcomed new member David Shreve.

Matters from the Public

Vince Caristo: Mr. Caristo stated that the City of Charlottesville is implementing a new biking infrastructure planning method known as *Road Diets*, which would allow for a reduction in travel-lane width and parking-lane width in order to create space for bike lanes. Mr. Caristo stated that in the City of Charlottesville the standard travel-lane width is 11 feet. Mr. Caristo continued stating most cities have found 10 feet to be a sufficient travel width. Mr. Caristo also mentioned that parking lanes would be reduced, as well, to a 7 foot width, which has also been found to be sufficient. Mr. Caristo stated that he wanted to introduce this concept to the CHART Committee so that the Committee members were aware of this new initiative. Mr. Caristo also mentioned that three *Road Diet* routes are currently in the works in the City.

Mr. Lafferty asked Mr. Proctor if a *Roads Diet* program could be implemented in the County. Mr. Proctor stated that a *Roads Diet* program could be implemented but it is somewhat redundant with the Secondary Roadway Standards requirements. Mr. Proctor also mentioned that roadways in the rural areas are often very narrow, well below standard widths, so implementing a *Roads Diets* program would be difficult.

Mr. Bach asked Mr. Proctor if new private development roads were required to have bike lanes. Mr. Proctor stated that these roadways were not required to have bike lanes but these roadways were required to be built to state standards.

Approval of the March 3rd Meeting Minutes

On a motion from Mr. Lafferty, seconded by Mr. Pfaltz, the March 3rd 2010 meeting meetings were approved. Mr. Burke abstained.

Public Participation Presentation

Ms. Eissler stated that this would be the final CHART Committee run through of the Public Participation Presentation, and that MPO staff will take this presentation to the MPO Technical Committee and the MPO Policy Board later on this month. Ms. Eissler then proceeded to go through the draft presentation slide by slide taking notes and edits from committee members throughout the review.

Committee members had a few grammatical edits, especially focused on tightening and clarifying the descriptive language. The committee also reviewed the public participation hand out and how that hand out connected to the presentation overall.

Regarding the presentation the committee offered numerous edits that tightened the language of the presentation and made certain concepts clearer. Regarding the hand out the committee suggested numerous edits that resulted in clearer question phrasing and better connection between the presentation and the hand out.

Mr. Shreve suggested that the first funding slide be clarified to describe the fuels tax as inelastic and regressive in that the taxing model is typically unable to keep pace with population and economic growth. Ms. Eissler stated that she would alter the corresponding language.

Mr. Shreve also suggested removing the federal fuels tax information, because it made the fuels tax numbers a bit difficult to understand. Ms. Eissler stated that she would remove the federal numbers.

Mr. Shreve suggested that the “purchasing power” slide be altered to reflect what the gas tax has lost in value, instead of what the gas tax should be today to match its initial purchasing power. Mr. Shreve continued stating that value loss is less likely to imply any advocacy for increasing the gas tax.

Ms. Seaman stated that the presentation has a lot of slides that focus on the gas tax, which seems excessive, especially since the Committee is not advocating the gas tax. Mr. Gosse stated that the issue is not so much the gas tax, but that the gas tax has not changed. Mr. Gosse continued stating that the issue we are trying to highlight is not what do you want to add to the transportation system, but how do you suggest paying for the transportation system you do have, especially when the gas tax has lost purchasing power. Mr. Williams suggested that Ms. Eissler work on manipulating the fuels tax data to illustrate the loss in fuels tax value.

Mr. Proctor expressed concern that the US 29/US 250 interchange project listed on the “committed projects” slide was not the same project as the recent earmark request for improvements to this interchange. Mr. Proctor thought it important to distinguish these two projects so that members of the public were not confused. Ms. Eissler stated that she would make that note in the presentation.

Mr. Shreve suggested that the “tax type” slide clarify which taxes are local-level and which taxes are state-level. Ms. Eissler stated that she would be happy to make those changes.

Mr. Lafferty asked if there would be an accompanying flyer with additional information regarding who to contact about local transportation issues. Ms. Eissler stated that she is currently working on an information flyer.

On a motion from Mr. Pfaltz, seconded by Mr. Odell, the CHART Committee unanimously approved as the final version of the Public Participation Presentation.

Ms. Seaman suggested that the committee members present the CHART presentation to the MPO Technical Committee and MPO Policy Board.

Public Participation Outreach

Ms. Eissler stated that the Senior Statesmen of Virginia have put the CHART Public Participation Presentation on their October Agenda.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Additional Matters from the Public

There were no additional matters.