

**Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Area Congestion Relief Project
DRAFT Stakeholder Team Meeting #4 Summary**

Wednesday, May 21st, 2014, 4 – 7 p.m.

TJPDC's Water Street Center, 407 East Water Street, Charlottesville, Virginia

Facilitated by:

The Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission and
The Institute for Environmental Negotiation, University of Virginia

Executive Summary

The fourth community and resource member Stakeholder Team meeting of the Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Area Congestion Relief Project took place on Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission's (TJPDC) Water Street Center. At this meeting, stakeholders discussed refinements to the alternatives developed at the last meeting to relieve congestion in the US 250 Free Bridge study area. These alternatives will receive further study including an estimation of costs by Rinker Design Associates (RDA), the consultant to the project. Stakeholders also had an opportunity to remove alternatives from further analysis.

The next meeting will be held on July 16th from 4 – 7 p.m. at TJPDC's Water Street Center. An agenda and materials will be provided prior to the meeting.

Goals of the Stakeholder Team:

- Develop a viable project option for improving congestion issues at US 250 Free Bridge.
- Enhance and improve the existing Regional Ecological Framework (REF) Tool.

Goals of Eco-Logical Program Grant:

- Test the Eco-Logical approach for infrastructure planning and development on a local scale.
- Increase awareness of Eco-Logical approach among federal, state, and local transportation and resources agencies.

Introductions and Orientation

Frank Dukes and Kelly Wilder of the Institute for Environmental Negotiation (IEN) at the University of Virginia facilitated the meeting, with support from Wood Hudson and Sarah Rhodes of the TJPDC. John Giometti and Matthew Beales from transportation engineering firm RDA, and Asma Ali from T3 Design, were also in attendance.

Wood opened the meeting and welcomed Frank, who led the group in introductions, reviewed its protocols for working together (documented in past meeting summaries), and clarified IEN's role as facilitator. Kelly then discussed the day's agenda:

- Introductions and orientation
- Engineering firm feasibility analysis presentation
- Question and answer session
 - This time is only for clarifying questions about methodology and the alternatives as presented by RDA, not for comments or suggestions.
- Facilitated group discussion of alternatives
 - Stakeholders will be led through a collaborative discussion of alternatives and have the opportunity to suggest modifications to the existing alternatives.
 - Stakeholders will also select among alternatives any that they would like to see removed from further analysis.
- Overview of next steps
- Public comments and meeting evaluation

Wood then reviewed the goals of the process, and Frank oriented the group to where they are in the context of the entire process. Participants will have an opportunity to modify the previously identified alternatives and even drop those that do not look feasible, prior to RDA conducting an assessment of the costs of the remaining alternatives. During the July meeting we will hear from the consultants and discuss their findings; some time after that a public meeting will allow for further comment and questions. The Stakeholder Team's final meeting to consider recommendations will be in September, with a report due in October.

Wood prefaced the day's work by repeating information that had been shared before the meeting via email, concerning revisions made to a few of the alternatives to increase project feasibility or address topography, existing barriers, and roadway design standards:

- **Alternative C: Driver Signage and Education.** Staff determined that this alternative could be better addressed by working with VDOT to determine what actions would need to occur in order to make this alteration.
- **Alternative E: US15/US33 Ruckersville to Zion Crossroads Bypass Route.** This analysis would be tremendously costly due to its scale, could not be addressed with the REF tool, would address a project outside the MPO boundaries, and involves stakeholders not at the table. Therefore, the MPO could not recommend that this project move forward, but staff are open to ideas for how this project can be addressed outside this process.

- **Alternative B: Transit, Park and Ride, and Bike/Pedestrian.** An optional transit-only road running parallel to trail and railroad and crossing the Rivanna in the vicinity of Riverview Park was added, and an alternative park and ride location on VDOT land at Richmond Road and VDOT Way was identified.
- **Alternative D: Rivanna River Parkway.** Option H: Extension of Olympia Drive has been included as part of this alternative, alignment has been shifted to minimize floodplain impacts and reduce potential impacts to properties, and widening of Rio Road from two lanes to four lanes from Pen Park Lane to the intersection of John Warner Parkway and Rio Road has been considered.
- **Alternative I: Intersection Improvements at US 250/Route 20.** Lanes and turning movements have been reconfigured to include additional lanes to separate the left turn and straight movements for High street crossing US 250 and 20 crossing US 250.

Engineering Firm Feasibility Analysis Presentation

RDA was contracted by TJPDC to analyze the feasibility of the alternatives that stakeholders envisioned at the March meeting. (At the July meeting, RDA will present cost estimates based on modifications that were offered.) John from RDA progressed through each of the six alternatives, providing insight into its feasibility in terms of constructability congestion relief, initial estimated cost, property impacts, utility impacts, maintenance of traffic impacts, and other project impacts that RDA accounted for in its project impacts matrix (these matrices can be found on the Eco-Logical website).

The table below summarizes RDA’s findings on constructability, congestion relief, and cost:

	Construction Feasibility	Congestion Relief	Cost
Alternative A	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
Alternative B	MOD	LOW	MOD
Alternative D	MOD	LOW/MOD	HIGH
Alternative F	MOD	LOW	LOW
Alternative G	HIGH	LOW	MOD
Alternative I	HIGH	LOW	LOW

During and following the presentation, the following questions and comments about each alternative were offered:

Alternative A: Free Bridge Overpass/Expressway

- Q: With the low clearance of Free Bridge, how does this alternative work during floods?
 - A: This is problematic due to the low clearance. Periodic flooding would be an issue.

Alternative B: Transit, Park and Ride, and Bike/Pedestrian

- Q: Could enough fill could be found if the option of filling in the quarry and making it into a park and ride lot was pursued?
 - A: With the quarry being 175 feet deep, finding enough fill would indeed be a major impediment.
- Q: How would this option interact with the Jefferson Memorial Foundation property and Riverside Park?
 - A: There would be impacts to the Foundation property that would be challenging to overcome. This option would tie into Riverside Park and its trail system, and users could then tap into the city bus system to continue their commutes.
- Q: Would cars be allowed on a bridge over the Rivanna?
 - A: No, only pedestrians, bikes, and buses.
- Q: Based on Charlottesville's size, is it true that we just don't have the population density to make transit effective?
 - A: Yes, this is likely.
- Q: Does the "moderate cost" assigned to this option incorporate the construction of the additional roadways up to Martha Jefferson and down into the quarry?
 - A: Yes, it does.
- Q: How are "low," "moderate," and "high" cost defined in the analysis?
 - A: They are rough estimates defined simply in reference to one another.

Refinements suggested:

- A participant asked whether, if route timing were calibrated, a one-lane bridge would be sufficient.
- The option of running buses parallel to the rail line was suggested.

Alternative D: Rivanna River Parkway

- Q: Does this option account for the 100-year floodway?
 - A: Yes.
- Q: Are wetlands and other environment impacts considered in relation to this alternative?
 - They would be with the REF Tool analysis.

- Q: What is the donut shaped object on the map?
 - A: The old sewage treatment plant.
- Q: What would happen to Free Bridge Lane?
 - A: It would cul-de-sac sooner or would require another bridge.

Refinements suggested:

- Could this option tie into the existing road in Darden Towe Park?

Alternative F: HOV/Reversing Lane on US 250 Free Bridge

- Q: Please clarify how this works.
 - A: The only way to make this concept work was to reverse and use HOV on the left turn lanes only.
- Q: Could you do reverse flow only, without HOV?
 - A: Yes, but this was not part of the alternative proposed at the last meeting that we were charged with analyzing.

Alternative G: South Pantops Drive Connector Bridge

- Q: Does this option have to continue into Grace Street, or could it be shifted to alleviate concerns about through traffic?
 - A: Yes, it could be shifted, but then you have concerns about locating it too close to the light at High Street and 250.

Alternative I: Intersection improvements at US 250/Route 20

- Q: Has VDOT analyzed similar intersection improvements in the past?
 - A: Project staff will try and check with the VDOT Charlottesville Residency for more information on past intersection analyses at 20 and High Street.
- Q: Are there studies on split-phase and what it does to accident rates?
 - A: Removing split-phase reduces congestion and improves safety.
- Q: Could this option be used in conjunction with the other options?
 - A: Yes. The final recommendations may well include some combination of these alternatives.
- Q: What is the status of the new development slated for the northeast corner of US 250 and Route 20
 - A: The preliminary site plan has been approved since one of the parcels was rezoned from residential to commercial use. Proffers include constructing a private road through the site and adding a second north bound lane to Route 20 along the frontage of the property.

Following their presentation, PDC explained that the alternatives will be further refined based on stakeholder input, and preliminary cost estimates will be developed. The following questions were asked during the Q&A session following RDA's presentation.

Question and Answer Session

- Q: What do you consider to be park impacts?
 - A: Fumes, noise impacts, visual impacts, etc. – these are the types of environmental impacts TJPDC is going to look into.
- Q: Have you considered raising Free Bridge to allow for more than a nine-foot clearance?
 - A: That is technically an option.
- Q: Following up from the last meeting, we need to know the results of traffic studies about where traffic originates and ends up.
 - A: We simply do not have sufficient data to address this question exactly.
 - We have some of this information from the modeling studies: 22 percent of trips crossing Free Bridge travel to or from the US 29 north corridor, 22 percent of trips crossing Free Bridge travel to or from the city, 24 percent of trips crossing Free Bridge travel to or from the Pantops area, and 32 percent of trips crossing Free Bridge travel to or from other areas of the county. This information can be found on page 8 of this study:
<http://www.tjpd.org/pdf/ecologic/1%29%20FINAL%20TDM%20Analysis.pdf>.
- Q: Can this group inspire traffic studies?
 - A: Yes, this could be a recommendation coming from the Stakeholder Team. Detailed traffic studies would also be required as part of any projects further development.

Facilitated Group Discussion of Alternatives

After RDA's presentation, the meeting progressed into a group discussion around refinements to the alternatives. Kelly clarified for participants the difference between refinements and wholesale changes to an option. She proposed starting with alternative A and moving around the room, and asked people to begin sharing their ideas. Refinements to each alternative are summarized below:

Alternative A: Free Bridge Overpass and Intersection Improvements

Comments:

- Make this alternative into two distinct projects
 1. Overpass
 2. Intersection improvements (jug handle concept)
- Exit ramp left at River Road
- Left exit from 250 onto High Street by passing through High Street/250 intersection and then making a right to circle back to River Road
- Eliminate jug-handles
- Explore the options of a quadrant intersection
- Run the overpass express lanes one way during rush hour

Modifications/Revisions:

- Remove the jug handle as depicted that would route vehicle traffic under Free Bridge
- Make into two separate projects
 1. (A1) Overpass Lanes
 2. (A2) Intersection improvements (jug handle-like concept)

Staff Notes:

Advance this project as two separate concepts: (A1) overpass and (A2) intersection improvements at 250 and High Street. Note: Staff are following up with stakeholders on two possible jug handle options. You can provide feedback on the jug handle options here: <http://tinyurl.com/lozux9c>.

Alternative B: Transit, Park and Ride and Bik/Pedestrian

Comments:

- Remove park and ride lot from quarry, remove bus but keep bike and pedestrian options
- Shorten hiker-biker trail and reduce transit only roadway to one lane
- Is there any existing trail use information (patronage)?
- How would you size a park and ride lot?
- Explore extending the trail concept to Glenmore
- Reduce focus to just a pedestrian bridge crossing the Rivanna River

Modifications/Revisions:

- Remove bus and rail component of project
- Remove park and ride lot at the Luck Stone quarry from concept

Staff Notes:

Advance this project without the transit components. The alternative now will include a bike/ped trail parallel to the railroad tracks that would cross the Rivanna River in the vicinity of Riverview Park. The hard surface trail will skirt the western edge of the Luck Stone Quarry and end at 250 Richmond Road. Explore providing a park and ride lot on the VDOT property. Provide a pedestrian traffic signal to facilitate crossing 250.

Alternative D: Transit, Park and Ride and Bike/Pedestrian

Comments:

- Explore using the existing Elk Drive alignment from Route 20 into the park
- Drop this alternative
- There is value in exploring this further. Cost and traffic impacts might provide useful information

Modifications/Revisions:

- Add Elk Drive route
- Calculate cost for existing alignment and Elk Drive alignment separately

Staff Notes:

Advance this alternative with the addition of an Elk Drive alignment option. See if it's possible to get cost estimates for current and Elk Drive alignments separately

Alternative F: HOV Reversing Lane on US 250 Free Bridge

Comments:

- Calibration with 250/High Street
- Turning movement and lane direction based on time of day
- Need east bound to be two lanes
- Four lanes inbound during AM rush
- Four lanes outbound during PM rush
- Option proves difficult to configure with intersection movements at 250 and 20
- Move sidewalks to a footbridge to gain lane space on bridge
- There is value in exploring this further, cost and traffic impacts might provide useful information

Modifications/Revisions:

- Drop HOV restrictions from concept

Staff Notes:

Continue to refine this vision with HOV restrictions omitted. Use lane as a reversing lane to “gain extra capacity during rush hour times.” Note: Staff are following up with stakeholders on revisions to this alternative. You can provide feedback on these potential alternatives revisions here: <http://tinyurl.com/lozux9c>.

Alternative G: South Pantops Connector Bridge

Comments:

- Adjust intersection with High Street to align with Willow Drive
- Extend project to include improvements to South Pantops Drive from bridge to Riverbend Drive
- Is there data on left turn traffic?

Modifications/Revisions:

- Adjust intersection with High Street to align with Willow Drive
- Focus on improving South Pantops Drive through the Pantops Shopping Center

Staff Notes:

Revise alternative to have bridge intersect High Street at Willow Drive. Extend project improvements from New House drive to Riverbend Drive through the Pantops Shopping Center.

Alternative I: Route 20 and High Street Intersection Improvements

Comments:

- We like this alternative
- Explore ways that these improvements could work with others

Modifications/Revisions:

- No modifications

Staff Notes:

Look at ways of combining these improvements with others to enhance traffic congestion relief over the short and longer term.

Although the group had originally hoped to discuss which, if any, options to drop, Sarah weighed in that dropping ideas was less important than deciding on refinements to propose. Therefore, with limited time remaining in the meeting, participants concluded their input and transitioned into wrapping up the meeting.

Meeting Wrap Up and Evaluation

The next meeting will be held on July 16th, again at the Water Street Center from 4 – 7 p.m. RDA will be in attendance to share updates on modifications to the alternatives as well as preliminary cost estimates.

The meeting concluded with a “Plus/Delta” activity facilitated by IEN to share positive qualities (+) and things that could be changed for future meetings (Δ). These included the following:

+

- The meeting location was great.
- Interaction among participants and presenters was good.
- The presentation and material on alternatives were good.

Δ

- More people need to be attending the meetings.

Meeting Participants

Kirk Bowers, Sierra Club
Ken Boyd, Albemarle County BOS
Morgan Butler, Southern Environmental Law Center
Missy Creasy, City of Charlottesville
Dennis Duttere, Albemarle County -Citizen Representative
Elaine Echols, County Staff
Bill Emory, City of Charlottesville – Citizen Representative
Chris Gensic, City Parks and Rec
David Hannah, Streamwatch
John Jones, Charlottesville Area Transit
Mac Lafferty, Planning Commission CTAC
John Pfaltz, City of Charlottesville – Citizen Representative
Chuck Proctor, VDOT, Culpeper District
Donna Shaunesey, JAUNT
Jeff Werner, Piedmont Environmental Council
Clara Belle Wheeler, Albemarle County – Citizen Representative

Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Congestion Relief Project Stakeholder Team

Free Bridge Area Congestion Relief Study: Construction Feasibility Assessment

May 21, 2014

Charlottesville Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) and The Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission



Alternative A



Feasibility Assessment

Process

1. Review previous studies and stakeholder alternatives
2. Obtain and review GIS data
3. Develop preliminary concept drawings using aerial photography base mapping
4. Conduct site visits
5. Utility conflict analysis
6. Refine concept drawings based on site visits and input from TJPDC staff.
7. Develop an evaluation matrix for each alternative that summarizes key elements that can impact construction feasibility.

2

Alternative A - Example of an elevated structure



Alternative A

Free Bridge Overpass and Intersection improvements at US 250 and High Street

This alternative includes construction of an elevated structure that would route two lanes of 250 east and west bound traffic over the intersections of US 250/20 and US 250 and High Street. The existing intersections and bridge will remain below the flyover structure.

Alternative A - Example of an elevated structure



Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Congestion Relief Project Stakeholder Team

Alternative A – Free Bridge clearance



Alternative B



Alternative A Evaluation Matrix

Free Bridge Overpass and Intersection improvements at US 250 and High Street

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Property Impacts			X
Access Impacts			X
Utility Impacts			X
Park Impacts	X		
Trail Impacts		X	
Railroad Impacts	X		
Maintenance of Traffic Impacts			X
Bridges			X
Floodway Influence		X	
Drainage Structures i.e. Box Culvert, Stormwater Management Facilities	X		
Earthwork/Terrain	X		
Retaining Walls			X
Construction Feasibility	X		
Expected Congestion Relief @ Free Bridge			X
Expected Cost			X

Alternative B



Alternative B

Transit, Park and Ride, and Bike/Pedestrian

This alternative includes a new park and ride lot in the vicinity of the US 250/22 (Shadwell) intersection and limited stop transit service (fixed Rail or bus) from the lot to Martha Jefferson Hospital, Downtown Charlottesville and UVA Grounds. This alternative will also include paving the existing bike/pedestrian trail on the Albemarle County side of the Rivanna River (Old Mills Trail), construction of a bridge crossing in the vicinity of Riverside Avenue (Riverview Park), bike/pedestrian trail access from the park and ride lot to the Old Mills Trail system, and improvements to the Old Mills Trail.

Another option for Alternative B would add a roadway restricted to bus transit that would connect the Commuter Lot, Martha Jefferson Hospital, and Riverview Park. The Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) could extend or modify either the Route 1 (currently serves the Riverview Park area) or the Route 10 (currently serves Pantops) to provide service to the Commuter Lot. Another option for the Commuter Lot would be to use the VDOT property across Route 250 from the Luck Stone Quarry.

Alternative B



Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Congestion Relief Project Stakeholder Team

Alternative B Evaluation Matrix

Transit, Park and Ride, and Bike/Pedestrian

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Property Impacts			X
Access Impacts	X		
Utility Impacts	X		
Park Impacts		X	
Trail Impacts	X		
Railroad Impacts			X
Maintenance of Traffic Impacts	X		
Bridges		X	
Floodway Influence		X	
Drainage Structures I.e. Box Culvert, Stormwater Management Facilities		X	
Earthwork			X
Retaining Walls	X		
Construction Feasibility		X	
Expected Congestion Relief @ Free Bridge	X		
Expected Cost		X	

Alternative D



Alternative D

Rivanna River Parkway

This alternative includes construction of a new road linking Route 20 with Rio Road. This new road would have two vehicle travel lanes with two bike shoulder lanes (similar to the John Warner Parkway). This alternative also includes improvements to Pen Park Lane, and widening Rio Road to four lanes from Pen Park Lane to the John Warner Parkway intersection and the Olympia Drive extension.

Alternative D



Alternative D



Alternative D – Darden Towe Park Looking South



Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Congestion Relief Project Stakeholder Team

Alternative D – Darden Towle Park Looking Northwest



Alternative F



Alternative D Evaluation Matrix

Rivanna River Parkway

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Property Impacts			X
Access Impacts	X		
Utility Impacts			X
Park Impacts			X
Trail Impacts	X		
Railroad Impacts	X		
Maintenance of Traffic Impacts		X	
Bridges			X
Floodway Influence			X
Drainage Structures I.e. Box Culvert, Stormwater Management Facilities			X
Earthwork/Terrain			X
Retaining Walls			X
Construction Feasibility		X	
Expected Congestion Relief @ Free Bridge	X	X	
Expected Cost			X

Alternative F - Looking West



Alternative F

HOV/Reversing lane on US 250 Free Bridge

This alternative includes an additional east/west vehicle travel lane on the US250 Free Bridge crossing the Rivanna River. This lane could extend from the Route 20 intersection through the High Street intersection. Evaluation of this alternative should look at ways of adding the lane without reconstruction of the bridge, e.g. removing a sidewalk and reducing lane widths.

Alternative F Evaluation Matrix

HOV/Reversing lane on US 250 Free Bridge

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Property Impacts	X		
Access Impacts	X		
Utility Impacts	X		
Park Impacts	X		
Trail Impacts	X		
Railroad Impacts	X		
Maintenance of Traffic Impacts			X
Bridges	X		
Floodway Influence	X		
Drainage Structures I.e. Box Culvert, Stormwater Management Facilities	X		
Earthwork/Terrain	X		
Retaining Walls	X		
Construction Feasibility		X	
Expected Congestion Relief @ Free Bridge	X		
Expected Cost	X		

Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Congestion Relief Project Stakeholder Team

Alternative G

South Pantops Drive Connector Bridge

This alternative includes a new bridge connection between New House Drive/South Pantops Drive and East High Street. The bridge would be a two lane urban style bridge with appropriate bike and pedestrian facility accommodations. Additional considerations include a new intersection at High Street and New House Drive/South Pantops Drive.

Alternative G Evaluation Matrix

South Pantops Drive Connector Bridge

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Property Impacts			X
Access Impacts		X	
Utility Impacts	X		
Park Impacts	X		
Trail Impacts	X		
Railroad Impacts	X		
Maintenance of Traffic Impacts	X		
Bridges		X	
Floodway Influence		X	
Drainage Structures (i.e. Box Culvert, Stormwater Management Facilities)	X		
Earthwork/Terrain	X		
Retaining Walls		X	
Construction Feasibility			X
Expected Congestion Relief @ Free Bridge	X		
Expected Cost		X	

Alternative G



Alternative I

Intersection improvements at US 250/Route 20

This alternative consists of intersection improvements improve left turns from US 250 onto RT 20 and right turns from US 250 Westbound onto Route 20. This alternative assumes that the 250 Express Lanes in Alternative 1 would be in place.

Additional improvements to be considered would eliminate the Split Phase Signalization. These additional improvements would include intersection improvements at both US 250/20 and US 250/High Street to increase throughput and allow for smoother turning movements.

Alternative G – Looking Southwest at S. Pantops Drive



Alternative I



Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) Eco-Logical Pilot – Free Bridge Congestion Relief Project Stakeholder Team

Alternative I Evaluation Matrix

Intersection improvements at US 250/Route 20

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Property Impacts		X	
Access Impacts	X		
Utility Impacts		X	
Park Impacts	X		
Trail Impacts	X		
Railroad Impacts	X		
Maintenance of Traffic Impacts	X		
Bridges	X		
Floodway Influence	X		
Drainage Structures (i.e. Box Culvert, Stormwater Management Facilities)	X		
Earthwork/Terrain	X		
Retaining Walls		X	
Construction Feasibility			X
Expected Congestion Relief @ Free Bridge	X		
Expected Cost	X		

Expected Cost Summary

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Alternative A			X
Alternative B		X	
Alternative D			X
Alternative F	X		
Alternative G		X	
Alternative I	X		

Construction Feasibility Summary

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Alternative A	X		
Alternative B		X	
Alternative D		X	
Alternative F		X	
Alternative G			X
Alternative I			X

Summary

	Construction Feasibility	Congestion Relief	Cost
Alternative A	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
Alternative B	MOD	LOW	MOD
Alternative D	MOD	LOW/MOD	HIGH
Alternative F	MOD	LOW	LOW
Alternative G	HIGH	LOW	MOD
Alternative I	HIGH	LOW	LOW

Expected Congestion Relief Summary

	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Alternative A			X
Alternative B	X		
Alternative D	X	X	
Alternative F	X		
Alternative G	X		
Alternative I	X		

Next Steps

1. Further refinement of alternatives based on Stakeholder feedback
2. Develop Preliminary Cost Estimates to include Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, and Construction
3. Presentation of Cost Estimates to Stakeholders on July 16
4. Final Report to be completed October 31, 2014