



Appendix B

Public Meetings and Comments

Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization

Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission

August 2013 - May 2014

This page intentionally left blank

Public Workshops and Other Opportunities to Provide Input

Aug '13

- *Tues, 13th: City and County Planning Commission Meeting: LRTP 101 discussion*
- *Wed, 28th: PUBLIC OUTREACH, 3rd Round Scenarios.*

Sept '13

- *Wed, 4th: CHART Citizen Advisory Committee*
- *Tues, 10th: City and County Planning Commission Meeting*
- *Tues, 17th: MPO Technical Committee Meeting*
- *Wed, 24th: MPO Policy Board Meeting*

Oct '13

- *Wed, 23rd: PUBLIC OUTREACH, Preferred Scenario (capacity-building only), non-capacity improvements*

Nov '13

- *Tues, 12th: City and County Planning Commission Meeting*
- *Tues, 19th: MPO Technical Committee*
- *TBD: MPO Policy Board Meeting*

Jan '14

- *Wed, 8th: CHART Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting*
- *Tues, 21st: MPO Technical Committee Meeting*
- *Wed, 22nd: MPO Policy Board Meeting*

Feb '14

- *Wed, 5th: PUBLIC OUTREACH, Draft Fiscal Constraint*

Mar '14

- *Wed, 5th: CHART Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting*
- *Tues, 18th: MPO Technical Committee Meeting*
- *Wed, 26th: MPO Policy Board Meeting, FIRST PUBLIC HEARING*

May '14

- *Wed, 7th: CHART Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting*
- *Tues, 20th: MPO Technical Committee Meeting*
- *Wed, 28th: MPO Policy Board Meeting, FINAL PUBLIC HEARING*

Comments could also be sent to MPO Program Manager, Sarah Rhodes at srhodes@tjpc.org

Public Input Meeting I

Third Round Scenario Review

August 28th 2013, 5pm – 7pm

Third Round Scenarios

The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO kicked off its 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) public input process on August 28th 2013, from 5pm to 7pm at the Water Street Center. The public was invited to see MPO's progress with the 2040 LRTP and to provide input on which major transportation projects are most important, and how they should be included in the 2040 LRTP.

For this public outreach event, the 2040 LRTP capacity improvements and process were presented via video recording, and staff was positioned throughout the Center to answer questions as attendees read through informational posters and provided comment via written forms.

Attendance

In total, 45 people attended the meeting, 22 of which filled out and submitted comment forms.

Summary of Feedback

Comments were submitted by email before this workshop, and via hard copy input questionnaires which were distributed to attendees and collected during the workshop event. The public noted concerns with the existing at-grade intersections of railroad and arterial road in the Woolen Mills neighborhood; congestion on US 29 and the adverse impacts of the proposed US 29 Bypass; and the difficulty in understanding the impacts of projects and scenarios, especially should the Bypass be rejected. Positive feedback was given in response to transit and bike improvements; Berkmar Drive Extended; and improvements at the Rio Road and Hydraulic Road Interchange.

Public Input Meeting 2

Draft Preferred Scenario and Non-Capacity Projects

October 23rd 2013, 5pm – 7pm

Draft Preferred Scenario Review & Non-Capacity Improvements

The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO held its second 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) public input workshop on October 23rd 2013, from 5pm to 7pm at the Water Street Center. The public was invited to see MPO's progress with the 2040 LRTP and to provide input on the Draft Preferred Scenario of Capacity-building road and transit projects, as well as initial project lists for all non-capacity-building improvements like bike and pedestrian projects.

For this public outreach event, a review of the 2040 LRTP progress to-date, as well as an overview of the Preferred Scenario of Capacity-building improvements and Non-capacity-building improvements, was presented via video recording. Like in the first workshop, staff was positioned throughout the Center to answer questions as attendees read through informational posters and provided comment via written forms.

Attendance

In total, 13 people attended the meeting, 7 of which filled out and submitted comment forms.

Summary of Feedback

Comments were submitted via hard copy input questionnaires which were distributed to attendees and collected during the workshop event. The public noted concerns with the US 29 and US 250 widening; transit only-lanes on Free Bridge; and new crossings of the Rivanna. Positive feedback was given in response to BRT and enhanced multimodal options; connections to the CHO airport; and Berkmar Drive Extended. Respondents either supported or did not indicate a preference regarding a corridor study that focused on all intersections in the US 29 or US 250 Corridor.

Public Input Meeting 3

Draft Fiscal Constraint

February 5th 2013, 5pm – 7pm

Preferred Scenario Review & Non-Capacity Improvements

The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO held its third 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) public input workshop on February 5th 2014, from 5pm to 7pm at the Water Street Center. The public was invited to see MPO's progress with the 2040 LRTP and to provide input on the fiscal-constraint process; specifically the MPO was asking attendees how they would prioritize projects for the available funding.

For this public outreach event, a review of the 2040 LRTP Preferred Scenario was presented. Also presented was a list of projects by mode and the total amount of funding available to fund these projects. Attendees were presented with the choice of which projects they would fund given the budget constraints. Like in the first and second workshop, staff was positioned throughout the Center to answer questions as attendees read through informational posters and provided comment via written forms.

Attendance

In total, 22 people attended the meeting. Comment forms were separated by mode and submitted as such. Attendees had the option of completing any combination of the questionnaires. In total, MPO staff received: 11 Roadway forms; 8 Transit forms; 8 Bike/Ped forms; and 9 Intersection forms.

Summary of Feedback

Comments were submitted via hard copy input questionnaires which were distributed to attendees and collected during the workshop event. Questions were more targeted toward specific projects, and less-open ended for detailed comment. Of the few comments submitted, most were in reference to bike/ped or intersection improvements. Specifics of the comments varied.

Comments Submitted at MPO Policy Board Meetings

January 2013 – March 2014

Meeting Date	Name	Organization	Comments
27-Mar-13	Morgan Butler	Southern Environmental Law Center	<p>Mr. Butler stated that he would like to comment about LRTP items on today's agendas. Mr. Butler stated that he had some concerns about the current project scenarios and wanted to know if these three scenarios under consideration were the final scenarios. Mr. Butler also stated that he liked the multimodal option but thought it should include Berkmar Drive Extended. Mr. Butler stated that he also had some questions about the performance measures. He thought that a Vehicle Miles Traveled measure or VMT would be useful in measuring the effectiveness of the transportation network. Mr. Butler also stated that he hoped the land use measure would also consider induced development.</p>
27-Mar-13	Morgan Butler	Southern Environmental Law Center	<p>Mr. Butler stated that he would suggest the LRTP performance measure for water quality include the waterways that are being affected by the run off and the type of run off that is affecting this water way. Mr. Butler also asked for some clarification regarding the LRTP project list. Mr. Butler asked if the projects that are currently in the plan would remain in the plan, like Berkmar Drive Extended.</p>
22-May-13	Morgan Butler	Southern Environmental Law Center	<p>Mr. Butler said that the performance measures and Level of Service maps discussed in connection with the LRTP are a good and useful tool, but he wanted to caution against concluding that congestion problems would be solved along the stretch of Route 29 between the northern terminus of the proposed 29 Bypass and the US29/US250 Interchange based on the lack of Level of Service "F" along that stretch in the 2040 base modeling scenario. Mr. Butler indicated his understanding that the travel demand model is determining the LOS on stretches of the road between intersections with traffic lights, and is not accounting for delays or LOS at the intersections, themselves. He suggested that this is an important point to keep in mind as the LRTP update process continues, as the traffic modeling VDOT did for the Route 29 Bypass Environmental Assessment showed that there will still be significant peak hour delays at certain intersections like Rio and Hydraulic even if the bypass is built, and that converting those intersections to grade-separated interchanges would reduce those delays by a much greater amount than the bypass. Mr. Butler offered that intersection LOS and delay are important factors to consider when planning for Route 29, and he said he hoped those would be considered as part of developing the package of LRTP improvements that are not focused on capacity building.</p>

24-Jul-13	Morgan Butler	Southern Environmental Law Center	Mr. Butler wished to clarify the points made under his name in the May 2013 meeting minutes. He explained that Mr. Williams' statement that the congestion on US 29 was alleviated with the proposed roadway improvements in the scenarios was not entirely accurate since the model could not study the level of service at the intersections and wanted this point clarified in the minutes.
24-Jul-13	Morgan Butler	Southern Environmental Law Center	Mr. Butler noted that the TDM model was not appropriate for analyzing intersections, transit, Park & Rides or other non-capacity improvements and felt that these were important pieces being left out of the process. He also asked if the deadline was statutory, and whether the FHWA would grant an extension to study these areas further.
25-Sep-13	Jeff Werner	The Piedmont Environmental Council	Mr. Werner noted that we are paying for the sprawl in Fluvanna and Louisa County and that it is disappointing to see. He stated that there needs to be a better way to manage it. He would like to know what is in the constrained plan, what's in the new LRTP, and just try to say "where are we, actually?" He stated that what is clear is that the Western Bypass is being done in addition to everything else, not in lieu of it. He stated that, including the Western Bypass, if we were to do all these projects, we are looking at maybe over a billion dollars to do all of it. He has a difficult time understanding that. Lastly, he had a question regarding the list of bridges for the non-capacity improvements in the LRTP. He did not see the bridge on Ivy Road, Old Ivy Road or the railroad bridge over the 250 bypass. He knows that VDOT pulled them out to save money on the Western Bypass, but widening these is critical. In the \$105 million that you have for the widening of the 250 bypass, is the replacement of those three bridges in that money?
6-Mar-14	Morgan Butler	Southern Environmental Law Center	Mr. Butler suggested that it is important to see what the state decides to do before making decisions on the bypass in the LRTP. He recommended that funding be taken from the bypass and apply it to four specific projects to be included in the LRTP. In other words, if the county asks that those projects be prioritized and funded, let's be certain that it can actually happen. He gave examples of the projects he suggest to be funded: Hillsdale Drive Extended, Berkmar Drive Extended and the intersection of Rio and Hydraulic (preliminary engineering funding).
6-Mar-14	Kirk Bowers	Sierra Club	Mr. Bowers encouraged the city to look at the Hydraulic Road/US 29 intersection and include it in the LRTP. All VDOT studies indicate that we cannot bring the level of service up to level B. As a civil engineer, he said he knows we can build these intersections compactly so it minimizes the disruption to the businesses in that area.

Comments Submitted at MPO Policy Board Public Hearings

March 26th 2014

Morgan Butler (Southern Environmental Law Center): Ms. Butler stated that the SELC plans to submit some written comments, but have not had a chance to review the LRTP thoroughly enough to justify commenting yet.

Veena Saville: Asked where to find the LRTP online. Ms. Rhodes stated that if you go to <http://www.tjpd.org/LRTP/index.asp>, you can find it there.

Neil Williamson (Free Enterprise Forum): He applauded the board for working through the process, but stated he disliked the process. He is aware that the board cannot remove the Western Bypass because of the rules and the deadline. He assumes that if someone from the public wanted to have another project removed, the same would be true of that project as well. He noted that it is somewhat disingenuous, and not the fault of the staff of the board, the manner in which the process is set up is broken. He does not believe the public knows that in the LRTP there is an interchange that is projected at Rio Road. He knows that it has been a part of the Places 29 discussion, and he knows that staff has done a good job at reaching out the public to get them to the LRTP meetings, it is simply a huge document that is federally-mandated, and because the manner in which the process must be done, it is a flawed document from the moment you enact it.

May 28th 2014

To Be Included...