**MPO Technical Committee**

**Draft Minutes: March 19, 2019**

**Committee – Voting Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gast-Bray</td>
<td>Albemarle County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Palmer</td>
<td>UVA Office of the Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin McDermott</td>
<td>Albemarle County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Bivins</td>
<td>Albemarle Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca Askey</td>
<td>DRPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rory Stolzenberg</td>
<td>City of Charlottesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin McDermott (FY19 Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Albemarle County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Janiczek</td>
<td>City of Charlottesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Proctor</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TJPDC Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jakob zumFelde</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Thomas</td>
<td>Admin Asst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Call to Order**

Mr. McDermott called the meeting to order at 10:06 AM

**Matters from the Public**

There were no matters from the public.

**Approval of Draft January 19 Minutes**

Mr. zumFelde reported that because of a loss of staff who took minutes at the last meeting and no audio recording because it was saved to a computer that crashed, the minutes are less detailed than usual. Because of this, the January draft minutes do not need to be approved. Mr. zumFelde got an accounting of who was in attendance at the January meeting so he could update the minutes.

Ms. Thomas read the names of those who were in attendance: John Jones, Rory Stolzenberg, Julian Bivins, Kevin McDermott, Andrew Gast-Bray, Bill Palmer, Jeanette Janiczek, Jakob zumFelde, Wood Hudson and Chuck Proctor.

Mr. zumFelde said the minutes from January will reflect that change.

**LRTP**

Mr. zumFelde reported that the committee and staff were at Stage 7 (constraining projects based on available money) in the LRTP process.

Mr. McDermott mentioned that he sent a comment to Staff for inclusion in the plan and Mr. zumFelde said it is reflected in the document.

Mr. Bivins referred to the Hydraulic Panel meeting in which they discussed the best way to move forward. Mr. Bivins voiced his support to consider the Zan Road area improvements as a separate opportunity for improvement.
Mr. McDermott asked if the region is going to be able to use the $18 million to go towards the Zan Road project.

Mr. zumFelde asked Mr. Proctor to give background on the Panel meeting.

Mr. Proctor said the MPO held a follow-up meeting with the original members of the Hydraulic Panel to discuss what to do with that money. Diantha McKeel expressed an interest to move Zan Road forward with the entire $18 million. That money is the balance of what is available from the Solutions 29 group of projects.

Lastly, he said as long as it is on the constrained list, that is all that counts at this point. If the localities want to move it forward themselves, they can without applying for additional funding.

Mr. McDermott asked about the possibility of it being a revenue sharing project this year with the $18 million as a match.

Mr. Proctor said no, the match would be the difference between $18 million and the total cost of the project. For example, if the project was $25 million and you apply the $18 million, the match would be $3.5 million each.

Mr. McDermott said that with that scenario, it could be $1.75 million per locality.

Mr. McDermott asked if the Tech committee should ask the Policy Board (Policy Board) to look at the cost estimation and get a further evaluation.

Mr. Proctor said it would be beneficial. He said the Policy Board has not had a meeting since the Panel met, so they will be giving guidance on what way to go with the money.

Mr. Stolzenberg asked if the money is not used if it would disappear.

Mr. Proctor said that since it is statewide funding that was put on the project by SmartScale. Generally what happens is, after 2018, any money that wasn’t on a fully-funded project basically gets swept away – so, in short, the money could disappear if the project doesn’t move forward.

Mr. Stozenberg asked if there were alternative applications for money.

Mr. Proctor said that is what the Panel was trying to work out.

Mr. McDermott said that the money could be applied to any piece of the Hydraulic/29 project and, after talking with Kathy Galvin from City Council, Ms. McKeel said the Zan Road was a priority for both of them. The general consensus of the panel was also in favor of moving Zan Road forward.

There was continued discussion about the benefits of the Zan Road project for both the City, the County, the private sector and the community.

Mr. Gast-Bray noted that transit needs to be a part of the system on that project and bike/ped should be tied to transit.
Mr. Bivins said it was his understanding that the project would be multi-modal.

Mr. Bivins suggested to put a motion to the Policy Board for them to give consideration to Option D (Zan Road Bike/Ped bridge) as a project to be funded. He requested the Policy Board give guidance about what to do with available funds from 29 Solutions and to explore contributions from the County and the City and potential beneficiary companies.

Ms. Janiczek asked if the committee would consider Option H, extending eastbound US250 with a left turn lane at Hydraulic. She noted it costs less money and would help with the commuter bike trail on 250.

Mr. Bivins said perhaps the committee should ask the Policy Board to consider both Option D and Option H.

Mr. McDermott made a motion to recommend that the Policy Board evaluate Option D (including pedestrian/bike/vehicle/transit) as a stand-alone project to be a candidate for the $18 million Smart Scale funding.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Ms. Janiczek made a motion to recommend that the Policy Board evaluate Option H as a fully-funded project.

Mr. Palmer seconded the motion. Mr. Jones, Mr. Bivins, Mr. Gast-Bray, and Mr. McDermott opposed and the motion did not pass.

After discussion on how to move forward, Mr. McDermott made a motion to recommend to the Policy Board that they consider Option D first and then consider Option H.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion. Mr. McDermott, Mr. Gast-Bray, Mr. Blevins and Mr. Palmer voted for the motion and Mr. Stolzenberg and Ms. Janiczek opposed. The motion passed. Mr. Stolzenberg wanted it known that he wants Option D only.

Mr. zumFelde said he would bring these motions to the Policy Board meeting and asked if someone from the Tech committee would be in attendance. Mr. McDermott said he would be available to speak to the issue at the next Policy Board meeting.

Mr. McDermott refocused the meeting on the LRTP’s visioning list.

Ms. McDermott asked if the Sunset/Fontaine connector (R12) was in the UVA master plan and Mr. Palmer said it was not.

Ms. Janiczek said that UVA did not like that the Panel was discussing it as an option, but the Panel respectfully disagreed.

Mr. McDermott said he was hoping that UVA will work with the County to get this completed. Mr. zumFelde went on to review the intersection constrained list and the roadway constrained list without discussion.
Ms. Askey remarked about the “commuter bus” to Crozet. She said if there is a desire for federal money for this project, it cannot be primarily a commuter service and cannot be advertised as such. It can stop at multiple places, but the verbiage cannot include “commuter”. The words “transit service” or “bus service” would be a better use of words.

She went on to invite the committee to a DRPT meeting on both the 27th in Ashland and the 28th in Lynchburg.

Mr. Proctor said to make it more generic in the LRTP.

Mr. zumFelde asked if the committee had any comments on Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, or 6. Mr. Bivins and Mr. McDermott said they would review them and send any comments they have via email.

Mr. Bivins said to be more inclusive of the County in the paragraph in the Overview. He said to add wineries and breweries and distilleries and the airport. He also said to note the transportation network (taxi, limo, Uber, Lyft, etc.)

Mr. zumFelde said if anyone else had any additional comments to please send them to him.

Mr. zumFelde reviewed the timeline for the LRTP process.

**Staff Updates**

**Hydraulic Planning Advisory Panel**
This was discussed earlier in the meeting.

**Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**
Mr. zumFelde reported that the Bike/Ped plan was approved by the MPO and the PDC. There will be continuing discussion about it in the future with a presentation and public hearing for Albemarle County’s Board. The City has also requested a presentation. The City, County, UVA and the PDC are working together to determine projects for further study.

**Regional Transit Partnership**
Mr. zumFelde said there was no major update. There was a work session last month with lots of energy and interest.

**Additional Matters from the Public:**
There were no additional matters from the public.

Meeting adjourned at 11:54 AM