

# MOVING TOWARD 2050

## LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION  
CHARLOTTESVILLE - ALBEMARLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION



# Preface

## Disclaimer

This report has been prepared in cooperation with and financed partly by the U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation. The contents of this report reflect the views of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and Charlottesville- Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, the Virginia Department of Transportation, or the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation. This report is not a legal document and does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. Although much care was taken to ensure the accuracy of the information presented in this document, TJPDC does not guarantee its accuracy.

Acceptance of this report as evidence of fulfillment of the objectives of this planning study does not constitute endorsement/approval of the need for any recommended improvement, nor does it constitute approval of their location and design or a commitment to fund any such improvements. Additional project-level environmental impact assessments and/or studies of alternatives may be necessary.

## Nondiscrimination

The TJPDC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For more information or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see <https://tjpd.org/title-vi/> or call (434) 979-7310. Communication material in alternative formats can be arranged, given sufficient notice.

Additional copies of this document may be obtained by contacting the TJPDC at:

401 East Water Street  
P.O. Box 1505  
Charlottesville, VA 22902-1505

(434) 979-7310

info@tjpd.org  
www.campo.tjpd.org

# Acknowledgements

Developing this plan involved cooperation from local government, the public, and technical staff. MPO staff expresses gratitude to those who have assisted with the plan's development and ultimate adoption.

## MPO Staff

- » **Christine Jacobs**, TJPDC/CA-MPO
- » **Lucinda Shannon**, TJPDC/CA-MPO
- » **Sara Pennington**, TJPDC/CA-MPO
- » **Ruth Emerick**, TJPDC

## MPO Policy Board

- » **Ned Gallaway**, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors (Chair)
- » **Brian Pinkston**, Charlottesville City Council (Vice Chair)

## Voting Members

- » **Ann Mallek**, Albemarle County BOS
- » **Natalie Oschrin**, Charlottesville City Council
- » **Sean Nelson**, VDOT Culpeper District
- » **Stacy Londrey**, VDOT Culpeper District (alternate)

## Non-Voting Members

- » **Christine Jacobs**, TJPDC
- » **Lee Kondor**, CTAC
- » **Daniel Koenig**, FTA
- » **Steven Minor**, FHWA
- » **Julia Monteith**, UVA Office of the Architect
- » **Charles Proctor**, VDOT – Culpeper District
- » **Mike Murphy**, Jaunt
- » **Daniel Wagner**, DRPT
- » **Garland Williams**, CAT Transit Director

## MPO Technical Committee

- » **Rory Stolzenberg**, City of Charlottesville Planning Commission (Chair)
- » **Alberic Karina-Plun**, Albemarle County (Vice Chair)

## Voting Members

- » **Luis Carrazana**, Albemarle County Planning Commission
- » **Benjamin Chambers**, City of Charlottesville
- » **Jason Espie**, Jaunt

- » **James Freas**, City of Charlottesville
- » **Jessica Hersh-Ballering**, Albemarle County
- » **Christine Jacobs**, TJPDC
- » **Bill Palmer**, UVA Office of the Architect
- » **Sara Pennington**, Rideshare
- » **Charles Proctor**, VDOT
- » **Daniel Wagner**, DRPT

## **Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)**

- » **Lee Kondor**, Albemarle County (Chair)
- » **Stuart Gardner**, MPO (Vice Chair)

### **Voting Members**

- » **Donna Chen**, MPO
- » **Stuart Gardner**, MPO
- » **Jose Gomez**, Albemarle County
- » **Patrick Healy**, Charlottesville
- » **Ethan Heil**, Charlottesville
- » **Lee Kondor**, Albemarle County
- » **Sarah Medley**, Charlottesville
- » **Marty Meth**, Albemarle County
- » **Nathan Moore**, Albemarle County
- » **Chapman Munn**, MPO
- » **Peter Thompson**, Albemarle County
- » **Greg Weaver**, Charlottesville

### **Special Thanks**

- » **Sandy Shackelford**, former Director of Planning and Transportation, TJPDC
- » **Curtis Scarpignato**, former Regional Planner, TJPDC
- » **Ryan Mickles**, former Regional Planner, TJPDC



# Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	2
Disclaimer .....	2
Nondiscrimination.....	2
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	3
MPO Staff .....	3
MPO Policy Board .....	3
MPO Technical Committee .....	3
Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).....	4
Special Thanks.....	4
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	5
<b>List of Figures, Tables, and Maps</b> .....	9
<b>List of Acronyms</b> .....	12
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	14
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b> .....	15
Overview .....	15
Purpose .....	15
Moving Toward 2050 Process .....	16
Moving Toward 2050 Engagement Efforts .....	16
Moving Toward 2050 Goals.....	17
<b>Chapter 2: Transportation Assessment</b> .....	20
Overview.....	20
MPO Location.....	20
Roadways.....	21
Public Transit.....	25
Bicycle and Pedestrian .....	28
Freight.....	30
Airport.....	32
Travel Demand Management.....	32
National Goals and Performance Measures .....	34
<b>Chapter 3: Transportation Deficiencies Overview</b> .....	41
Overview.....	41
Roads, Freight, Bridges, and Intersections .....	41

Transit and Rail .....	46
Bicycle and Pedestrian .....	50
Conclusion .....	55
<b>Chapter 4: Needs Evaluation, Project Identification, and Project Prioritization .....</b>	<b>56</b>
Overview .....	56
Needs Evaluation Process.....	56
Project Identification Process.....	64
Project Prioritization Process .....	64
Conclusion.....	64
<b>Chapter 5: Additional Transportation System Elements .....</b>	<b>65</b>
Overview.....	65
Intersections .....	65
Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Network .....	65
Bridges.....	65
<b>Chapter 6: Planning for Uncertainty .....</b>	<b>66</b>
Overview.....	66
Changing Technologies.....	66
Sustainable and Resilient Transportation Systems.....	69
<b>Chapter 7: Transportation Projects Identified.....</b>	<b>70</b>
Overview.....	70
Funding Estimates.....	70
Funded Projects .....	72
Constrained and Vision Lists by Category .....	72
Conclusion.....	74
<b>Appendix A: Demographics .....</b>	<b>75</b>
Population.....	75
Race & Ethnicity .....	77
Age.....	82
Education .....	83
Income.....	84
Housing .....	85
Vehicle Ownership .....	86
Economy and Employment.....	86
Specialized Communities .....	87
Responsibilities and Strategies.....	89
Growth Projections .....	89

**Appendix B: Project Review Pages**..... 91

**Appendix C: EPA EJScreen Community Reports**.....108

**Appendix D: Relationship to Other Plans**.....117

    Federal Priorities .....117

    Statewide Plans .....117

    Transit Plans .....119

    Regional Plans.....119

    Environmental Plans.....120

    Comprehensive Plans.....120

    Small Area Plans.....121

    Transportation Studies .....121

**Appendix E: List of High Water Roads in Charlottesville-Albemarle (from 2023 TJPDC Hazard Mitigation Plan)** .....122

**Appendix F: Public Participation Record of Input**.....126

**Appendix G: Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO Performance-Based Planning Process**.....153



# List of Figures, Tables, and Maps

Figure 1: Relationship of Lenses, Goals, and Objectives .....	18
Figure 2: CAT Average Daily Ridership by Route (FY 2022) .....	25
Figure 3: Jaunt Annual Ridership (FY 2019 - FY 2022) .....	26
Figure 4: Total Amtrak Station Arrivals & Departures for Top Stations in Virginia (2020-2022) .....	28
Figure 5: Charlottesville Amtrak Station Arrivals & Departures (2016-2022).....	28
Figure 6: Projected Growth in VA Freight Tonnage through 2035.....	32
Figure 7: Fatality Five-Year Averages.....	36
Figure 8: Serious Injury Five-Year Averages .....	36
Figure 9: Needs Prioritization Process .....	58
Figure 10: Age Pyramid (City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County) .....	82
Figure 11: Gross Rent as a Percentage of Monthly Income .....	85
Figure 12: Vehicle Access by Housing Tenure .....	86
Figure 13: Disability Characteristics.....	88
Table 1: MAP-21 National Goals.....	34
Table 2: Highway Infrastructure Performance Targets.....	38
Table 3: Highway System Performance Targets.....	39
Table 4: Transit Asset Management Targets.....	39
Table 5: Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) PTSAP Performance Measures.....	40
Table 6: Jaunt PTSAP Performance Measures.....	40
Table 7: Needs Prioritization Metrics .....	57
Table 8: Safety and Operational Improvement Projects.....	73
Table 9: Transportation Enhancement Projects.....	74
Table 10: Transit Projects .....	74
Table 11: Bridge Projects.....	74
Table 12: Other Ongoing Initiatives to Identify Priorities .....	74
Table 13: Race & Ethnicity .....	77
Table 14: Housing Tenure .....	85
Table 15: Growth Projections .....	89
Map 1: TJPDC/MPO Location (state).....	20
Map 2: TJPDC/MPO Location (region).....	21

Map 3: Roadway Classification (MPO)..... 22

Map 4: Roadway Classification (Charlottesville) ..... 23

Map 5: Existing and Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (MPO)..... 29

Map 6: Existing and Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Charlottesville) ..... 30

Map 7: Virginia’s Inbound/Outbound/Internal Truck Tons (2017)..... 31

Map 8: MPO Park & Ride Lots ..... 33

Map 9: National Highway System (NHS) Maintenance ..... 37

Map 10: 2050 Congestion Levels (MPO) ..... 42

Map 11: 2050 Congestion Levels (Charlottesville) ..... 43

Map 12: Bridges in Poor Condition..... 44

Map 13: High PSI Intersections (MPO)..... 45

Map 14: High PSI Intersections (Charlottesville)..... 45

Map 15: 2050 Population Access to Transit (MPO) ..... 47

Map 16: 2050 Population Access to Transit (Charlottesville)..... 47

Map 17: 2050 Employment Access to Transit (MPO) ..... 48

Map 18: 2050 Employment Access to Transit (Charlottesville)..... 48

Map 19: CAT Transit Routes ..... 49

Map 20: 2050 Population Access to Bicycle Facilities (MPO)..... 51

Map 21: 2050 Population Access to Bicycle Facilities (Charlottesville) ..... 51

Map 22: 2050 Employment Access to Bicycle Facilities (MPO) ..... 52

Map 23: 2050 Employment Access to Bicycle Facilities (Charlottesville)..... 52

Map 24: 2050 Population Access to Pedestrian Facilities (MPO) ..... 53

Map 25: 2050 Population Access to Pedestrian Facilities (Charlottesville)..... 54

Map 26: 2050 Employment Access to Pedestrian Facilities (MPO) ..... 54

Map 27: 2050 Employment Access to Pedestrian Facilities (Charlottesville) ..... 55

Map 28: Road Segments by Aggregate Need Score (MPO)..... 58

Map 29: Road Segments by Aggregate Need Score (Charlottesville) ..... 59

Map 30: Public Engagement Heat Map (MPO) ..... 60

Map 31: Public Engagement Heat Map (Charlottesville) ..... 61

Map 32: 2050 Levels of Service (MPO) ..... 62

Map 33: 2050 Levels of Service (Charlottesville) ..... 62

Map 34: PSI Intersections and Segments (2016-2020, 2017-2021) (MPO) ..... 63

Map 35: PSI Intersections and Segments (2016-2020, 2017-2021) (Charlottesville) ..... 63

Map 36: Total Population..... 75

Map 37: Population Density ..... 76

Map 38: Race/Ethnicity - Asian ..... 78

Map 39: Race/Ethnicity - Black or African American ..... 79  
Map 40: Race/Ethnicity - Hispanic or Latino ..... 80  
Map 41: Race/Ethnicity - White ..... 81  
Map 42: Percent of Population with a Bachelor’s Degree or Higher ..... 83  
Map 43: Median Household Income ..... 84

# List of Acronyms

<b>AADT</b>	Average Annual Daily Traffic
<b>AASHTO</b>	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
<b>ACS</b>	American Community Survey
<b>ADA</b>	Americans with Disabilities Act
<b>BMP</b>	Best Management Practice
<b>BRT</b>	Bus Rapid Transit
<b>CAT</b>	Charlottesville Area Transit
<b>CLRP</b>	Constrained Long-Range Plan
<b>CMAQ</b>	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
<b>CSR</b>	Center for Survey Research
<b>CTAC</b>	Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee
<b>CTF</b>	Commonwealth Transportation Fund
<b>DDI</b>	Diverging Diamond Interchange
<b>DEQ</b>	Department of Environmental Quality, Virginia
<b>DMV</b>	Department of Motor Vehicles
<b>E+C</b>	Existing and Committed
<b>EJ</b>	Environmental Justice
<b>EPA</b>	Environmental Protection Agency
<b>FEMA</b>	Federal Emergency Management Agency
<b>FHWA</b>	Federal Highway Administration
<b>FTA</b>	Federal Transit Administration
<b>FY</b>	Fiscal Year (refers to the state fiscal year July 1 - June 30)
<b>GA</b>	General Aviation
<b>GSI</b>	Grade Separated Interchange
<b>HSIP</b>	Highway Safety Improvement Program
<b>HUD</b>	Housing and Urban Development, U.S. Department of
<b>ISTEA</b>	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
<b>LAB</b>	League of American Bicyclists
<b>LOS</b>	Level of Service
<b>L RTP</b>	Long-Range Transportation Plan, also referred to as Moving Toward 2050
<b>LRT</b>	Light Rail Transit
<b>MAP-21</b>	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
<b>MOVES</b>	Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator
<b>MPO</b>	Metropolitan Planning Organization
<b>NGIC</b>	National Ground Intelligence Center
<b>NHPP</b>	National Highway Performance Program
<b>NHS</b>	National Highway System
<b>OTAQ</b>	Office of Transportation and Air Quality
<b>PDC</b>	Planning District Commission
<b>PE</b>	Preliminary Engineering
<b>REF</b>	Regional Ecological Framework
<b>RTA</b>	Regional Transit Authority

<b>SAFETEA-LU</b>	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act
<b>SHRP2</b>	Second Strategic Highway Research Program
<b>SHSP</b>	State Strategic Highway Safety Plan
<b>SPR</b>	State Planning and Research Funding (used by VDOT to support MPO)
<b>STP</b>	Surface Transportation Program
<b>SYIP</b>	Six-Year Improvement Program
<b>TA</b>	Transportation Alternatives
<b>TCAPP</b>	Transportation for Communities - Advancing Projects through Partnerships
<b>TDM</b>	Travel Demand Management
<b>TDP</b>	Transit Development Plan (for CAT and Jaunt)
<b>TEA-21</b>	Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century
<b>TIP</b>	Transportation Improvement Program
<b>TJPDC</b>	Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission
<b>TMPD</b>	VDOT Transportation and Mobility Planning Division
<b>TRB</b>	Transportation Research Board
<b>UPWP</b>	Unified Planning and Work Program (also referred to as Work Program)
<b>UnJAM</b>	United Jefferson Area Mobility Plan
<b>UTS</b>	University Transit Service
<b>UVA</b>	University of Virginia
<b>SOV</b>	Single Occupant Vehicle
<b>V-C</b>	Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
<b>VCTIR</b>	Virginia Center for Transportation Innovation and Research
<b>VDOT</b>	Virginia Department of Transportation
<b>VDRPT</b>	Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
<b>VMT</b>	Vehicle Miles Traveled

# Executive Summary

The Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CA-MPO) is a regional planning commission housed within central Virginia's Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC). Composed of the City of Charlottesville and a portion of Albemarle County, the CA-MPO is the forum for continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning and decision-making among Charlottesville, Albemarle, state, and federal officials. The MPO collaborates with various agencies, facilitates public input, and conducts research and analysis to develop forward-thinking solutions for the region's transportation system.

One of the recurrent responsibilities of the CA-MPO is the creation of a Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). This federally-mandated plan outlines the region's priority transportation improvements over the coming decades. The Long-Range Transportation Plan is a fundamental document for our community. It states our region's collective vision for the future of our transportation system, and it identifies projects that we anticipate our region will implement in the foreseeable future. The LRTP considers all modes of transportation, including private vehicles, public transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and air, and covers other transportation issues such as bridge maintenance and safety improvements. The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO's LRTP must be updated every five years per federal mandate. The preceding version, approved by the MPO Policy Board in May 2019, was named the 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan (2045 LRTP). The updated plan presented in this document has been named **Moving Toward 2050**.

With the development of Moving Toward 2050, the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO continues and enhances a process for identifying and evaluating transportation projects that began with the 2045 LRTP. Public input was essential in all process aspects, especially identifying transportation deficiencies and potential projects. The evaluation process leverages the interconnectedness of our transportation system. Rather than assessing the benefits of individual projects in an isolated manner, proposed projects were combined into scenarios, tested as a system, and compared with other project groupings through a method of performance measure analysis. A set of performance measures, created using federal resources, public comment, and committee input, produced quantitative values for project scenarios. With these tools, the MPO could determine how various transportation improvements accomplished the region's vision, goals, and objectives and select the most optimal project combination for achieving them.

Moving Toward 2050 describes the region's characteristics, transportation deficiencies, vision, goals, objectives, and the analysis method's findings and conclusions. It is designed to improve the safety, efficiency, and interconnectedness of our facilities and services and strives to plan for and develop a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive regional transportation system. Detailed demographics of the MPO's population are available in Appendix A.

# Chapter 1: Introduction

## Overview

Moving Toward 2050 is the federally-mandated Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CA-MPO). It updates the 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan approved by the CA-MPO Policy Board in May 2019. The plan considers projected growth rates throughout the study area through the year 2050 and uses existing and future projected system conditions to identify priority projects for the region.

This chapter describes the federal requirements fulfilled by the LRTP and the regional goals identified as part of the LRTP.

## Purpose

Moving Toward 2050 is an essential document for improving the regional transportation system. The development of this plan is an opportunity for the region to determine its priorities for identifying the most critical transportation projects. While the plan provides a valuable framework to inform future planning initiatives based on the identified regional priorities, its ultimate purpose is to support the implementation of critical transportation improvements.

Moving Toward 2050 facilitates the implementation of these transportation improvements in the following ways:

1. To be eligible for federal funding, surface transportation projects must be identified in the MPO's adopted long-range transportation plan. This funding is critical for implementing necessary transportation solutions in the region.
2. Funding for transportation system improvements is limited. Therefore, the region must identify the highest priority projects that could be implemented based on the public and private resources that can be reasonably expected over the plan's lifetime. These projects are included on a "constrained list," referring to the consideration of the fiscal constraints that will limit the number of projects that could be implemented. The development of this plan allows the region to define what is important when considering transportation infrastructure investments.
3. Funding for transportation projects is based on competitive, performance-based application processes. To successfully implement projects that will improve the transportation system for our region, we need to identify not just the projects that will meet the highest priority needs, but also the projects that have the best overall opportunity to meet critical system needs compared to their costs. This plan facilitates a conversation about the best opportunities to leverage existing or potential funding sources to implement projects with the most value for the region.
4. Transportation planning is an ongoing process. The process of identifying transportation system projects for consideration occurs in two steps. The first step is to identify where existing system needs are. The second step is determining the most appropriate solutions to address that need.

Not every need identified in Moving Toward 2050 will have an identified solution. Those needs will indicate where additional planning studies are necessary to develop solutions, establishing an ongoing pipeline for developing implementable projects.

## Moving Toward 2050 Process

### 1. Establish goals and objectives for the regional transportation system.

- Goals were established by reviewing the goals in the 2045 Long-Range Plan, benchmarking against goals identified in other regions' plans, and getting feedback on draft goals and objectives through stakeholder discussion groups.

### 2. Assess system performance using data and public feedback.

- Public feedback was received through surveys, open houses, stakeholder meetings, and community outreach.

### 3. Identify areas of high-priority system needs.

- Staff identified the highest priority locations for system improvements based on safety, congestion, or lack of access.

### 4. Develop a comprehensive list of previously identified projects.

- These are the candidate projects considered when identifying the highest-priority projects for implementation. Candidate projects that resolve high-priority system needs were evaluated and prioritized.

### 5. Prioritize projects based on:

- The MPO's project prioritization process
- Previous statewide/regional initiatives
- Locality-developed project prioritization processes
- Public and stakeholder feedback

### 6. Identify gaps between high-priority needs and previously identified projects.

## Moving Toward 2050 Engagement Efforts

Throughout 2023, MPO staff undertook a robust public engagement campaign to collect stakeholder and public comments to help shape the Goals and Needs Identification phase of the Moving Toward 2050 planning effort. The objectives of this engagement process were to set and prioritize goals, identify travel needs, and inform the travel need and project selection prioritization process.

During this phase of the engagement process, MPO staff reached nearly 600 individuals, attended sixteen community events, and reviewed over 2,300 comments. Efforts included:

- Stakeholder Meetings (February 2023)
- Virtual Public Meeting (June 2023)
- Open House Events (June 2023)
- MetroQuest Community Survey (June 2023)
- Public Intercepts (July - August 2023)
- Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings (July - August 2023)
- Cville Plans Together Survey (past effort)
- Albemarle County 2044 Survey (past effort)
- Charlottesville Area Regional Transit Vision Plan Survey (past effort)



Overarching themes from this phase of the public engagement effort include a need for safer roadways and intersections, dedicated and protected bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and an enhanced public transit system. The community appears eager for solutions prioritizing safety and accessibility over traditional car-centric designs. More detailed information about these efforts can be found in the MPO's October 2023 Public Engagement Report, and a full list of comments can be found in Appendix F.

## Moving Toward 2050 Goals

At the beginning of the planning process, MPO staff established goals and objectives to identify regional transportation system priorities. Regionally identified goals were informed by national goals but based on regionally developed values.

Establishing goals and objectives for Moving Toward 2050 began with a review of goals identified in the 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan and a benchmarking exercise reviewing goals identified by other MPOs in Virginia. Related local and regional planning documents were further examined to identify emerging local priorities (refer to Appendix D). The final language for the goals was developed through an iterative process involving staff, the MPO committees, and identified stakeholder groups of organizations representing many community perspectives.

## Framework

MPO staff began establishing the plan's framework by considering the regional transportation system's goals and objectives. Goals are intended to be broad value statements, demonstrating the community's desired characteristics for its regional transportation system. Objectives are then developed that are more specific, identifying measurable outcomes that support achieving those stated goals. The final step was to establish metrics for evaluating the transportation system.

## Lenses

As goals were being discussed, themes emerged that were important enough to be integrated throughout the evaluation of individual goals and objectives. These themes have been identified in the system evaluation framework as lenses, indicating that the entire process needs to start with these considerations first and foremost:

- **Equity:** While the importance of addressing equity in the planning processes is not new, it is an area of emphasis that has continued to grow since the adoption of the previous LRTP. In January 2019, Albemarle County passed the Resolution in Support of an Equitable and Inclusive Community, reinforcing a public commitment to enhance all its residents' well-being and quality of life. Similarly, the City of Charlottesville formed an Advisory Committee on Organizational Equity in 2019. Planning, infrastructure, and neighborhood outreach & engagement were identified as focus areas for the City's racial equity and diversity & inclusion efforts. National priorities further bolster the identification of equity as an essential local priority. One of President Biden's early acts of his presidency was to sign Executive Order 14008, establishing the Justice40 Initiative. The initiative commits to direct 40 percent of new Federal program investments to disadvantaged communities. In late 2021, the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration provided a notice of updated Planning Emphasis Areas identifying joint agency priorities emphasizing the vital role of MPOs in supporting these federal investment goals.

- **Quality of Life:** Ultimately, the transportation system’s purpose is to facilitate the movement of people and goods for their benefit. It connects people to the people, places, and things they need, love, and care about. Therefore, any evaluation of the transportation system needs to focus on improving the quality of life for those who rely on it as a primary consideration.
- **Climate Action:** Climate action and environmental justice have become increasingly high priorities for the Charlottesville-Albemarle region. Since the 2019 Long-Range Transportation Plan was completed, Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville completed Climate Action Plans. Both plans independently identified a goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 45% from their identified base year by the year 2030 and achieving net zero emissions by 2050. Albemarle County used the base year of 2008 and determined that the transportation sector was responsible for 48% of the total GHG emissions within the county; the City of Charlottesville determined that the transportation sector was responsible for 39% of the GHG emissions in the city in 2019. As part of the MPO’s commitment to environmental justice, staff referred to the EPA’s most recent EJScreen community reports for Charlottesville and Albemarle County (included in Appendix C) when considering priority projects.

## Goals

The plan’s identified goals direct the process of evaluating the transportation system and developing infrastructure priorities. While the lenses indicate overarching community values that need to be considered, the goals address the transportation system directly. The goals define values necessary for the region to consider when determining how to improve the transportation system while incorporating and considering national goals, established performance targets, and state funding programs.

## Objectives

The plan’s objectives are specific and measurable, describing observable outcomes. They can determine whether the region is successfully achieving its established goals.

- **Goal 1: Safety** - Improve the safety of the transportation system for all users.
  - » **Objective 1:** Reduce the frequency of serious injury and fatal crashes.
  - » **Objective 2:** Improve comfort and safety for users of the multimodal system.
- **Goal 2: Multi-Modal Accessibility** - Improve access through greater availability of mode choices that are affordable and efficient.
  - » **Objective 1:** Increase mode choice for all users.
- **Goal 3: Land Use** - Connect community destinations in a manner that aligns with growth management priorities.
  - » **Objective 1:** Provide multimodal infrastructure in designated growth areas, mixed-use areas, and near community resources.
  - » **Objective 2:** Fill connectivity gaps in the multimodal network.
- **Goal 4: Environment** - Reduce the negative environmental impacts of the transportation system.
  - » **Objective 1:** Minimize impacts of the transportation system on the natural and built environment.
  - » **Objective 2:** Integrate sustainable infrastructure practices into project design.

- **Goal 5: Efficiency and Economic Development** - Efficiently and reliably move people and goods through the multimodal transportation system.
  - » **Objective 1:** Improve roadway and transit system efficiency through operational improvements.
  - » **Objective 2:** Increase system capacity at identified bottlenecks.
  - » **Objective 3:** Maintain the existing system in a state of good repair.

While objectives are grouped under the primary goal they are meant to support, many objectives support more than one goal. Figure 1 illustrates the complex interconnection between lenses, goals, and objectives. In developing this framework, MPO staff intentionally worked to minimize redundancy in objectives, meaning that specific desired outcomes will not be reflected directly in the goals and objectives language. For example, emissions reduction is not listed as a goal. Still, full consideration is given to other objectives contributing to decreased emissions, such as improving the multimodal network and system efficiency.

The language for the goals statements was carefully crafted to be inclusive of all modes of transportation, reflecting a desire to support reduced reliance on single occupancy vehicles while not excluding projects that will have important safety benefits for vehicular travel. Objectives reflected a commitment to a multi-modal transportation approach (an important aspect of improving equitable access to opportunities), meeting carbon reduction goals, and creating vibrant communities. To the extent possible, the prioritization process included metrics for each mode of transportation and metrics that tried to capture impacts for disadvantaged populations as identified through the statewide transportation plan, VTrans, reflecting the region’s commitment to equity. While these considerations are not necessarily explicitly discussed throughout the plan, they were built into the metrics used to evaluate the system’s performance.




Figure 1: Relationship of Lenses, Goals, and Objectives

# Chapter 2: Transportation Assessment

## Overview


This section overviews the regional transportation network, focusing on roadways, bridges, freight, public transit, passenger rail, bicycle & pedestrian facilities, and travel demand management. The MPO's physical infrastructure and transportation programming influence how the existing transportation system is used and inform opportunities for future improvements.




## MPO Location

The MPO area (MPA) is in the scenic shadow of the Blue Ridge Mountains to the West. CA-MPO is in Central Virginia, with Richmond approximately 75 miles Southeast of Charlottesville and Washington D.C. approximately 100 miles to the Northeast. The University of Virginia calls this area home and serves as a primary employer in the region.

The following maps highlight the location of the TJPDC (light blue) and the CA-MPO (dark blue).



Map 1: TJPDC/MPO Location (state)



Map 2: TJPDC/MPO Location (region)

## Roadways

The following section identifies primary roadways and bridges in the MPO region.


### Roadway Classification

Per the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), functional classification is the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of traffic service that they are intended to provide.




There are three functional classifications: arterial, collector, and local roads. Arterials provide the highest level of service at the greatest speed for the longest uninterrupted distance, with some degree of access control. These roads are typically classified as principal arterials (sub-grouped by Interstate, Freeway/Expressway, and other principal arterials) and minor arterials. Collectors provide a lower level of service at a slower speed and provide service for shorter distances by collecting traffic from local roads and connecting them with arterials. Collectors are typically classified as “major” or “minor.” Finally, local roads consist of all roads not defined as arterials or collectors and primarily provide access to land with little or no through traffic.

VDOT further classifies roadways as interstate, primary, or secondary roads. Interstates are limited-access highways that connect states and major cities. Primary roads connect cities, towns, and interstates. Secondary roads are generally connectors and county routes designated with Route numbers 600 and above.



Map 3: Roadway Classification (MPO). Source: VDOT



Map 4: Roadway Classification (Charlottesville). Source: VDOT

## MPO Roadways

The region’s road network consists of primary, secondary, and local roads. The MPO region contains only one interstate: Interstate 64. U.S. primary roads within the MPO region include Routes 29, 250, 22, 20, and 53. These are the most heavily used commuter and commercial routes.

A network of secondary roads provides residents with connections to local and regional centers. Charlottesville and the urban areas of Albemarle County function as hubs for commercial and economic development within the Planning District. Residents from the urban core and outlying rural areas commute to Charlottesville and Albemarle’s growth areas for work, shopping, and recreation. The following section describes higher-order roadways in the MPO region.

### Interstate 64

Interstate 64 is an east-west highway connecting the region to Interstate 95 (east) and Interstate 81 (west). The interstate carries through traffic but also serves local trips in Albemarle County, especially during rush hour, making it a critical roadway in the commuter network. Residents and visitors use Interstate 64 to access urban centers and other primary roads.

## **U.S. Route 29**

U.S. 29 is a north-south route linking the region to other metropolitan areas along the corridor, such as Washington, D.C. and northern Virginia, Lynchburg, Danville, and communities in North Carolina. Within the region, U.S. 29 passes through Greene, Nelson, and Albemarle Counties and the City of Charlottesville. It is also a major commuter and truck freight route through central Virginia. Increased development along U.S. 29 in the Places29 development area of Albemarle County has increased traffic in the corridor. U.S. 29 to the south of Charlottesville experiences less traffic and is a four-lane highway that connects with more rural areas of Albemarle County.

## **U.S. Route 250**

US 250 is an east-west corridor that roughly parallels Interstate 64 and connects the Pantops area, Charlottesville, Ivy, and Crozet. The US 250 Bypass provides an alternative route around downtown Charlottesville. Commuters in Fluvanna and Louisa Counties use this road to travel to job centers located in urban Albemarle and Charlottesville. The Pantops area continues to experience rapid development, which increases traffic volumes on the US 250 corridor, particularly at Free Bridge.

## **State Route 22**

Route 22 intersects US 250 at Shadwell and curves east-west through Louisa County. The road passes through the Town of Louisa and carries a moderate traffic volume. Route 22 experiences seasonal traffic variations due to tourist travel with the Green Springs National Historic Landmark District and Monticello.

## **State Route 20**

Another primary road in Albemarle County is Route 20, a rural highway with a north-south alignment that connects Charlottesville to the Town of Scottsville. VDOT designated this corridor as a Virginia Byway for its scenic and historic qualities because it is part of the historic “Journey Through Hallowed Ground” and carries a moderate amount of tourist traffic.

## **State Route 53**

Route 53 extends from Albemarle into Fluvanna County and intersects with U.S. 15 in Palmyra. Along with secondary Route 616, this road is heavily used by commuters from northwest Fluvanna County, particularly those from the Lake Monticello community. Tourists also use Route 53 when traveling to Monticello and Highland, the historic homes of Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe.

## **Secondary Roads**

The MPO also has a network of heavily used secondary roads that connect residents to local and regional centers. The City of Charlottesville has a dense roadway network with around 110 miles of secondary roads. Albemarle contains around 860 miles of secondary roads, roughly 220 miles of which are unpaved. Secondary roads connect developed areas with residential or commercial centers to larger-scale regional roads or primary routes. Secondary roads are typically more robust than local roads. Examples in the urban area are Rio and Hydraulic Road.

## **Bridges**

VDOT assesses the condition of over 100 bridges and over 100 additional culverts in Charlottesville and Albemarle County. Like roadways, the City of Charlottesville is responsible for bridges within its boundaries, while VDOT maintains bridges in Albemarle County. Additional information about bridges can be found in Chapters 5 and 7.



## Public Transit

Several public transit options exist within the MPO region, including commuter, local, regional, and intra-county bus service provided by Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT), Jaunt, and University Transit Service (UTS). Greyhound, Megabus, the DRPT's Virginia Breeze, and BRITE's Afton Express Route provide inter-regional bus service to the region, and Amtrak offers inter-city passenger rail service. In 2017, the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) was formed to increase communication and coordination between transit providers and identify regional transit goals and opportunities.

### Charlottesville Area Transit

CAT currently provides public bus service to the greater Charlottesville area with twelve routes and a trolley service. Service is currently fare-free via a 3-year TRIP grant. Per CAT's ridership data, the average daily ridership in FY 2019 was 5,129. That number dropped significantly in FY 2020 with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, which affected the four final months of the fiscal year (March through June). FY 2021's average daily ridership dwindled to 1,690 as the pandemic continued to impact the MPO but began to recover in FY 2022, serving an average of 3,157 riders daily. The routes with the highest ridership in FY 2022 were Route 7, running from Downtown to Fashion Square Mall (28% of trips); Route 5, running from Barracks Road to Wal-Mart (16% of trips); and the Free Trolley, running from Downtown to UVA (14% of trips).




Figure 2: CAT Average Daily Ridership by Route (FY 2022). Source: CAT

### Jaunt

Jaunt is a regional public transit agency serving Central Virginia. Jaunt provides demand response paratransit service for the Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) service area to meet ADA requirements for that system. The ADA service area is a ¾ mile buffer of CAT fixed routes. Like CAT, service is currently fare-free via a 3-year TRIP grant. Jaunt provides demand response for rural counties, linking them to Charlottesville and urbanized Albemarle County. Jaunt provides county-level rural demand response for Nelson, Fluvanna, Louisa, and Greene. Jaunt operates four CONNECT commuter bus fixed routes, linking Buckingham, Nelson, Crozet, and 29 North to downtown Charlottesville and UVA. Jaunt is governed

and funded by Charlottesville, Albemarle, and other local governments, and it uses federal, state, and local funding to provide service. In FY 2023, Jaunt’s combined demand response and commuter routes delivered 240,235 passenger trips, traveled over 1.6 million miles, and provided 99,000 service hours, enhancing mobility choices for the public, agency clients, senior citizens, and people with disabilities in Central Virginia. Figure 3 shows annual ridership from FY 2019 to FY 2022.




Figure 3: Jaunt Annual Ridership (FY 2019 - FY 2022). Source: Jaunt

## University Transit Service (UTS)

UTS is a fare-free transit service UVA provides to its students, faculty and staff, and the general public. UTS services the UVA Hospital and the university’s Central, West, and North Grounds. It also serves popular student housing areas, including Jefferson Park Avenue, Grady Avenue, Rugby Road, and 14th Street. UTS currently operates seven routes. Service hours vary by day, route, and time of year.

## Regional Transit Partnership (RTP)

The RTP serves as an official advisory board created by the City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, and Jaunt, in partnership with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, to provide recommendations to decision-makers on transit-related matters. The RTP is funded by the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County and is staffed by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. It has four main goals:

- 1. Establishing Strong Communication:** The Partnership will provide a long-needed venue to exchange information and resolve transit-related matters.
- 2. Ensuring Coordination between Transit Providers:** The Partnership will allow transit providers a venue to coordinate services, initiatives, and administrative duties of their systems.
- 3. Setting the Region’s Transit Goals and Vision:** The Partnership will allow local officials and transit staff to work with other stakeholders to craft regional transit goals. The RTP will also provide, through MPO staff updates of Transit Development Plans (TDPs), opportunities for regional transit planning.

**4. Identifying Opportunities:** The Partnership will assemble decision-makers and stakeholders to identify improved transit services and administration opportunities, including evaluating a Regional Transit Authority (RTA).

## Inter-Regional Bus Service

Greyhound offers inter-city bus service from a station on West Main Street in Charlottesville. Bus service is available throughout the day to destinations including Richmond, Lynchburg, Roanoke, Fredericksburg, and Washington, D.C., with connections to major metropolitan areas available. Megabus offers inter-city bus service from Charlottesville to Washington, D.C., where passengers can transfer to other bus or rail routes. The DRPT's Virginia Breeze bus line passes through the MPO in Charlottesville, offering bus service from Danville to Washington, D.C, and BRITE's Afton Express Route provides bus service to and from Charlottesville and the Shenandoah Valley.

## Inter-Regional Passenger Rail

Amtrak currently operates three service routes from Charlottesville Union Station:

- The *Crescent*, running daily from New York City to New Orleans;
- The *Cardinal*, operating three days per week between New York City and Chicago; and
- The *Northeast Regional*, offering daily service from Roanoke to New York City.

Amtrak's Northeast Regional line has become a reliable transportation alternative for commuters and travelers along the eastern seaboard. Although Virginia is not strictly part of the Northeast Corridor, some Northeast Regional trains continue into Virginia. Northeast Regional service south to Alexandria, Richmond, Williamsburg, and Newport News formally began in 1976. In 2009, Amtrak extended the Northeast Regional with daily service from Alexandria, VA, via Burke, Manassas, Culpeper, and Charlottesville to Lynchburg. Since 2017, this service has been extended to provide same-seat trips to and from Roanoke, VA, and in 2022, a second daily train between Roanoke and Washington, D.C., was introduced.

As shown in Figure 4, Charlottesville Union Station is one of the state's busiest in terms of total ridership. Ridership was severely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 but increased steadily through 2022, as shown in Figure 5.






Figure 4: Total Amtrak Station Arrivals & Departures for Top Stations in Virginia (2020-2022). Source: Rail Passengers Association





Figure 5: Charlottesville Amtrak Station Arrivals & Departures (2016-2022). Source: Rail Passengers Association

# Bicycle and Pedestrian


Charlottesville has been honored as a silver-level Bicycle Friendly Community by the League of American Bicyclists since 2008. The University of Virginia received a silver-level Bicycle Friendly University award from the League of American Bicyclists in 2013. Additionally, the city has been designated a gold-level Pedestrian Community by Walk Friendly Communities since 2011 due to its high walking rates, innovative planning practices, and a centralized, successful Downtown Pedestrian Mall. Nonetheless, the region must continue to increase efforts to improve conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians. Improving safety is a crucial aspect of this plan.

The MPO Policy Board approved an update to the Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan in March 2019. The updated plan encouraged implementation by providing a focused list of regionally significant bicycle and pedestrian projects that enhance connectivity and provide routes to important residential and economic centers.

The following maps show existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the MPO.



Map 5: Existing and Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (MPO). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County



Map 6: Existing and Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Charlottesville). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County

## Freight

Identifying freight corridors and preserving freight mobility is a Long-Range Transportation Plan component. The MPO is primarily served by truck freight and supplemented by rail service.


### Truck

Interstate 64 is the primary east-west truck route in the MPO region, transporting goods statewide and connecting neighboring industrial centers. In 2022, the portion of Interstate 64, which runs through the MPO area, carried a daily truck traffic volume of approximately 11.8% of total daily traffic in the region. Truck freight also utilizes U.S. 29. U.S. 29 is the primary truck route in the north-south direction and facilitates freight routing changes. One of those routing changes, U.S. 250, also carries significant freight traffic and has become a major shipping corridor in recent years. Maintaining and improving the roadways for freight movement is critical to the region's economic development and sustainability.

Three roadways provide primary access to the major commercial areas and business centers at the center of the MPO region: Interstate 64, U.S. 29, and US 250. Due to traffic volume, hilly terrain, a reduced speed limit, and the number of signalized intersections, U.S. 29 experiences frequent congestion, creating difficult driving conditions for freight trucks. Continued implementation of Route 29

improvement projects is necessary to alleviate freight bottlenecks in Charlottesville.

As evident from the Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) data shown in the map below, the highest densities of truck activity are along the I-81 corridor and at Virginia's major population hubs: Northern Virginia, Richmond, and Hampton Roads, with concentrations also visible at Roanoke, Lynchburg, and Charlottesville.



Map 7: Virginia's Inbound/Outbound/Internal Truck Tons (2017). Source: FHWA

## Rail

Freight rail is provided via two railroads that cross at grade in downtown Charlottesville: CSX Transportation and Norfolk Southern Corporation, two of the largest railroad conglomerates in the U.S. The Norfolk Southern line travels north-south through Albemarle County, Charlottesville, and Nelson County. The CSX line, carrying primarily empty coal cars, follows a roughly east-west route through Albemarle County, the City of Charlottesville, and Louisa County.

In 2023, two rail projects in the MPO were awarded \$500,000 each in federal funding to study improvements to passenger rail service. The Commonwealth Corridor project, proposed by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), aims to connect Newport News with Richmond, Charlottesville, and the New River Valley. It plans to utilize existing rail lines and complement current

Northeast Regional services connecting Washington, D.C., Newport News, and Roanoke. The proposal includes filling a gap in passenger rail service along the Buckingham Branch Railroad freight line, with plans to offer east-west service across Virginia. A study estimates the corridor’s annual ridership to be around 177,200 passengers.

Amtrak’s project aims to enhance the Cardinal Service, which operates three days a week, to daily service. The route passes through Charlottesville and connects Alexandria, Manassas, Culpeper, and Clifton Forge to destinations such as New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C. Increasing the frequency of the service will improve accessibility and connectivity for passengers along the route.

Figure 6 shows that Virginia’s truck and rail freight volumes are expected to double their 2004 tonnage by 2035, an upward trend expected to continue through 2050.




Figure 6: Projected Growth in VA Freight Tonnage through 2035. Source: Virginia Statewide Multimodal Freight Study, Phase I

## Airport

Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport (CHO) is the only commercial service airport in the region. The airport is eight miles north of Charlottesville and one mile west of U.S. 29 on Airport Road. It is a general aviation and commercial service airport, offering more than 50 daily non-stop flights to and from Charlotte, New York, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, and Chicago. Delta, United, and American Airlines serve the airport. The number of enplaned passengers has been steadily increasing since 2013. In FY 2018, enplaned passengers reached 315,099, an 8% increase from FY 2017, the highest total in the last ten fiscal years. The number of enplaned passengers in FY 2021 dwindled to 76,709 due to the COVID-19 pandemic but steadily increased to 275,002 in FY 2023. General aviation facilities include an executive terminal offering a full-service fixed-base operation, a flight school, and aircraft charter firms.

Daily and hourly parking is available at the airport. Car rentals are available in the terminal facility, and many area hotels provide shuttle service from the airport for guests. Taxi and rideshare services are also available.



# Travel Demand Management

Two programs currently implemented for regional Travel Demand Management (TDM) in the MPO region include RideShare and Park & Ride Lots.


## RideShare

RideShare is a program housed within the TJPDC, in cooperation with the Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission (CSPDC), working to reduce traffic congestion and increase mobility throughout Central Virginia and the Central Shenandoah Valley. Services include free carpool matching, vanpool coordination, and a Guaranteed Ride Home program to provide free rides home in an emergency. RideShare also works with employers to develop and implement traffic reduction programs and advertises the region's Park and Ride lots. The RideShare database has 1,682 registered members in the ConnectingVA system and 257 registered users in the Guaranteed Ride Home program database as of April 2024.

## Park & Ride Lots

There are thirty Park and Ride lots within the RideShare service area. Twenty-one are located within the TJPDC, and nine are within the MPO area, as listed in the map below. Some of these lots are formal facilities managed by VDOT, while others are informal lots made available to commuters by businesses or organizations that own the property.

RideShare conducts quarterly inventories of each park & ride lot. The most active lot is in Waynesboro (AUG2), averaging 75 cars each weekday from FY 2021 to FY 2023. Based on interviews conducted at the lot and data collected from RideShare, most travelers parking at this lot commute to Charlottesville. The second most active lot is at Zion Crossroads (LOU1), with an average of 27 cars each weekday from FY 2021 to FY 2023.



Map 8: MPO Park & Ride Lots. Source: RideShare

## National Goals and Performance Measures

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) established a requirement for states and MPOs to participate in performance-based planning and programming processes. Performance-based planning and programming practices are intended to identify system performance goals and support transportation investment decisions based on meeting the established goals.

### National Goals

Goal Area	National Goal
Safety	To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
Infrastructure Condition	To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.
Congestion Reduction	To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.
System Reliability	To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.
Freight Movement and Economic Vitality	To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
Environmental Sustainability	To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
Reduce Project Delivery Delays	To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.

Table 1: MAP-21 National Goals. Source: Federal Highway Administration

### National Performance Measures

To measure progress in achieving these national goals, the following performance measures were established in 2017:

#### Highway Safety (crashes)

- Number and rate of fatalities (per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled)
- Number and rate of serious injuries (per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled)
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries

#### Highway Infrastructure Condition

- Percent of pavement on the interstate system in good condition
- Percent of pavement on the interstate system in poor condition
- Percent of pavement on the non-interstate national highway system in good condition
- Percent of pavement on the non-interstate national highway system in poor condition
- Percent of national highway system bridges classified in good condition
- Percent of national highway system bridges classified in poor condition

## Highway System Performance

- Percent of person miles traveled on the interstate system that is reliable
- Percent of person miles traveled on the non-interstate national highway system that is reliable (Vehicle Reliability Index)
- Percent of interstate system mileage providing for reliable truck travel times (Truck Travel Time Reliability Index)
- Annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay per capita (not applicable to the MPO)

## Transit Asset Management

- Percent of revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark
- Percent of non-revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark
- Percentage of track segments with performance restrictions
- Percentage of facilities rated in poor condition

## Public Transportation Agency Safety

- Fatalities, total
- Fatalities per total vehicle revenue miles
- Injuries, total
- Injuries per total vehicle revenue miles
- Safety events, total
- Safety events per total vehicle revenue miles
- Distance between major failures
- Distance between minor failures

## Performance Targets

States, MPOs, and public transportation providers are required to establish performance targets for each performance measure to support the achievement of the national goals. States will set their performance targets, and then MPOs set performance targets to support the achievement of the state's targets. With the establishment of performance targets, states, MPOs, and transit providers are committing to pursuing projects and activities that support the achievement of those targets.

Once the state has adopted its targets, MPOs can either adopt the state's targets or establish their own targets. Overall progress towards achieving the performance targets is evaluated at the state level, not the MPO level. There are no penalties if an MPO does not achieve its performance targets. MPOs must identify and report these performance targets to the state agencies at specified intervals.

## Highway Safety (Crashes)

Virginia uses a data-driven predictive model to establish statewide safety targets. This model is based on developing a baseline for the safety data using a statistical analysis and then determining the expected safety benefits from implementing planned infrastructure improvement projects.

Virginia's 2022-2026 Strategic Highway Safety Plan, *Arrive Alive*, aimed to reduce fatalities and serious injuries by 50 percent over the next 25 years, equating to a two percent yearly reduction. The modeled predictions did not indicate that this annual target reduction would be met when the Commonwealth Transportation Board adopted its safety targets in 2022, so they adopted predicted safety targets while

committing to pursue an aspirational safety target that meets the two percent annual reduction goal. State agencies were directed to identify actionable strategies to improve safety performance to support these aspirational goals.

Figures 7 and 8 were provided by VDOT to aid in developing highway safety performance targets and show regionally specific trends. As the graphs show, the general trendline points downward for the injury rate five-year average but upward for the fatality five-year average. However, both graphs indicate a recent increase in fatalities and serious injuries. If this trend continues, projections will likely demonstrate an increasing number of fatalities and serious injuries.




Figure 7: Fatality Five-Year Averages. Source: VDOT




Figure 8: Serious Injury Five-Year Averages. Source: VDOT

The MPO's 2024 safety performance targets are based on goals established as part of the development of a multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Safety Action Plan funded through a U.S. Department of Transportation Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant. Approval of more aspirational targets to reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries by an average annual percentage change of 2% is consistent with the goals established in the statewide Strategic Highway Safety Plan. It supports reaching a 50% reduction in deaths and serious injuries by 2050.


### CA-MPO 2024 Safety Performance Targets:

- Five-year average annual percentage change in fatalities: 2% reduction or more
- Number of fatalities: 11 or fewer
- Fatality rate per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT): 0.962 or lower
- Five-year average annual percentage change in serious injuries: 2% reduction or more
- Number of serious injuries: 137 or fewer
- Serious injury rate per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT): 12.106 or lower
- Five-year average annual percentage change in non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries: 2.00% reduction or more
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries: 15 or fewer

Adopting these more aggressive safety goals reflects a commitment from the CA-MPO region to pursue projects and initiatives that will improve the safety of the regional transportation system.

### Highway Infrastructure Condition

VDOT operates and maintains nearly 58,000 miles of road network throughout the state, the country's third highest state-maintained roadway systems. Highway infrastructure condition performance targets are based on pavement conditions on Interstate and National Highway System (NHS) facilities. In contrast, bridge conditions are based on bridges in the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) on the NHS, which are predominately part of a state-maintained system, as shown in the map below.



Map 9: National Highway System (NHS) Maintenance. Source: VDOT

The state established performance targets for the condition of pavement and bridges in 2022, which the CA-MPO also adopted, as indicated in Table 2.

Highway Infrastructure Condition	CA-MPO 2017 Baseline	2018 Adopted Targets	CA-MPO 2021 Baseline	2023 Adopted Targets
Percentage of deck area of bridges in good condition (NBI on NHS)	12.8	23.0	10.8	25.1*
Percentage of deck area of bridges in poor condition (NBI on NHS)	12.1	2.0	7.8	3.6*
Percentage of pavement in good condition (Interstate)	Data Not Available	45*	73.5	45*
Percentage of pavement in poor condition (Interstate)	Data Not Available	3*	0	3*
Percentage of pavement in good condition (NHS)	Data Not Available	25*	28.7	25*
Percentage of pavement in poor condition (NHS)	Data Not Available	5*	0.1	5*
*CA-MPO adopted state-wide target.				

Table 2: Highway Infrastructure Performance Targets. Source: CA-MPO

When the CA-MPO adopted the first set of highway infrastructure conditions performance targets in 2018, regionally-specific data for pavement conditions was unavailable, so the MPO adopted the state’s targets. Regionally-specific data was provided to CA-MPO by the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) for consideration in adopting its targets in early 2023. The existing pavement conditions of the CA-MPO system already exceed the statewide performance targets.

Regarding the percentage of deck area of bridges in good condition, the actual condition for the CA-MPO region is below state-adopted targets. The data also shows that the percentage of deck area of bridges in good condition has decreased between 2017 and 2021. The percentage of deck area of bridges in poor condition is higher than the state-adopted goal. Still, the percentage of deck area of bridges in poor condition decreased between 2017 and 2021, demonstrating that the CA-MPO region is progressing in prioritizing improvements of the bridge infrastructure most in need of maintenance and repair.

## Highway System Performance

Highway system performance is intended to assess how predictably the transportation system can move vehicles by measuring the variability in travel times between peak and free-flow traffic conditions. For example, a truck travel time reliability index value close to 1 indicates little variation in travel time between peak and free-flow conditions, meaning the system is very reliable.

For all highway system performance measures, existing conditions for the CA-MPO region exceed state-identified system performance targets, as indicated in Table 3.

Highway System Performance	CA-MPO 2017 Baseline	2018 CA-MPO Targets	CA-MPO 2021 Baseline	2023 CA-MPO Targets
Percentage of person-miles traveled that are reliable (Interstate)	99	82*	100	85*
Percentage of person-miles traveled that are reliable (Non-Interstate NHS)	86.21	82.5*	90.7	88*
Truck travel time reliability index (Interstate)	1.13	1.56*	1.15	1.64*
*CA-MPO adopted state-wide target.				

Table 3: Highway System Performance Targets. Source: CA-MPO

## Transit Asset Management

Transit agencies that receive federal financial assistance and own, operate, or manage capital assets used to provide public transportation are required to create a Transit Asset Management (TAM) plan. DRPT maintains a Tier II group plan for qualifying transit providers in Virginia. CAT and Jaunt participate in the state's Tier II group plan, and the CA-MPO adopted targets identified by DRPT as indicated in Table 4.

Asset Category - Performance Measure	Asset Class	FFY2022
<b>Revenue Vehicles</b>		
Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	AB - Articulated Bus	5%
	BU - Bus	15%
	CU - Cutaway	10%
	MV-Minivan	20%
	BR - Over-the-Road Bus	15%
	VN - Van	20%
<b>Equipment</b>		
Age - % of vehicles that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	Non-Revenue/Service Automobile	30%
	Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles	30%
<b>Facilities</b>		
Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA TERM Scale	Administrative Facilities	10%
	Maintenance Facility	10%
	Passenger Facilities	15%
	Parking Facilities	10%

Table 4: Transit Asset Management Targets. Source: CA-MPO

## Public Transportation Safety

In 2018, the Federal Transit Administration published 49 CFR Part 673, which requires transit agencies receiving Urbanized Area Formula Grants per 49 USC Section 5307 to develop a Public Transportation Safety Action Plan (PTASP). The federal code further requires that states establish a PTASP for small transit agencies. Jaunt and Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) are both included in the state's PTASP.

The performance measures identified in the PTSAP are reported separately for fixed routes and paratransit/demand response services. The transit agencies developed these performance measures and provided them to DRPT for inclusion in the PTSAP adopted in July 2020.

Performance Measure	Fixed Route	Paratransit/Demand Response*
Fatalities (total number of reportable fatalities per year)	0	0
Fatalities (rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode)	0	0
Injuries (total number of reportable injuries per year)	5	0
Injuries (rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode)	Less than 0.5 injuries per 100,000 vehicle revenue miles	Less than 0.5 injuries per 100,000 vehicle revenue miles
Safety events (total number of safety events per year)	10	1
Safety events (rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode)	Less than 1 reportable event per 100,000 vehicle revenue miles	Less than 1 reportable event per 100,000 vehicle revenue miles
Distance between Major Failures	10,000 miles	10,000 miles
Distance between Minor Failures	3,200 miles	3,200 miles
*Jaunt is under contract to provide paratransit service operations for CAT in urbanized areas.		

Table 5: Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) PTSAP Performance Measures

Performance Measure	Fixed Route
Fatalities (total number of reportable fatalities per year)	0
Fatalities (rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode)	0
Injuries (total number of reportable injuries per year)	9
Injuries (rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode)	Less than 0.5 injuries per 100,000 vehicle revenue miles
Safety events (total number of safety events per year)	17
Safety events (rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode)	Less than 1 reportable event per 100,000 vehicle revenue miles
Distance between Major Failures	10,000 miles
Distance between Minor Failures	3,200 miles

Table 6: Jaunt PTSAP Performance Measures



# Chapter 3: Transportation Deficiencies Overview

## Overview

Developing a plan for improving any aspect of the community must start with identifying what elements of the community's system are deficient. For this plan, MPO staff examined how the region's future transportation system would function if no future improvements were planned beyond projects included in the State's Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) or proffered from local developers. Through this process, MPO staff, working with MPO Committees, identified infrastructure expected to be incomplete or insufficient by 2050. Analysis for each mode considers the population total and distribution as projected for 2050, the employment total and distribution as projected for 2050, and road network conditions as projected for 2050.



## Roads, Freight, Bridges, and Intersections

### Roads

Most traffic in the MPO travels via the region's roadway system. As the Charlottesville-Albemarle region grows, more people are expected to use this system, which will constrain its capacity and result in congestion and delays. To ascertain how congested the road system would likely be in 2050, the MPO used its travel demand model to forecast where demand on the system is expected to exceed system capacity.

The travel demand model identifies these congested areas by calculating a volume-to-capacity ratio. The ratio

indicates the volume of traffic expected on the road compared with the capacity the roadway can accommodate. Roadways approaching or over capacity are considered deficient. The maps on the following pages show roads expected to be classified under the "Minor Congestion" or "Congested" categories. The MPO used VDOT's volume-to-capacity ratio standards to define minor congestion and congestion. The capacity identified for each roadway varies based on multiple factors, including whether it is leading to an intersection. While this helps estimate the congestion caused by intersections, it is not a detailed analysis of any specific roadway or intersection.

## Minor Congestion


Roads approaching capacity are those with a Level of Service (LOS) E, which indicates that between 85% and 100% of the road's capacity is being used. These roads are expected to experience minor congestion, which means they are likely to be congested during rush hour travel but operate at free-flow conditions during other times.


## Congested

Roads over capacity are those with a LOS F, which indicates that the roadway is expected to carry more volume than it was engineered to handle. These roads are expected to be congested throughout the day.

## Significance

The transportation system's congestion level in 2050 was identified for two purposes. First, it was used to determine which areas would likely need improvements to reduce congestion and function more efficiently. Second, it served as a base against which each scenario could be compared.





Map 11: 2050 Congestion Levels (Charlottesville). Source: VDOT


## Freight

While important, the issue of freight movement throughout the region is not an overriding concern for regional mobility. The region’s key freight corridors are Interstate 64 and U.S. 29. Both routes are susceptible to congestion issues affecting general traffic mobility concurrent with freight movements. Freight movement along rail corridors is also not a prevalent regional traffic concern. Currently, rail freight movement in the region travels to destinations outside the MPO’s boundaries. While facilitating the movement of goods throughout the region is a priority, it is not as prominent in the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO as it is for other MPOs.

## Bridges

Safe and adequate bridges are vital components of a fully functional transportation system. Using VDOT bridge condition reports, the entire region of Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville was reviewed to identify the condition of each bridge and assess the need for improvements. For the federal performance measure, bridges are categorized as “good,” “fair,” or “poor” and determined by the worst condition of the deck, superstructure, and substructure.

Bridges identified as being in poor condition are shown in the map below. VDOT structure ID numbers are included on the map.




Map 12: Bridges in Poor Condition. Source: VDOT


## Intersections

Intersections are a central concern in the MPO, as they are primary areas of congestion, locations where many crashes occur, and barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel. VDOT evaluates intersections to identify potential for safety improvement (PSI) locations. This evaluation is based on the number of crashes at each intersection from 2016 to 2020 for the City of Charlottesville and 2017 to 2021 for parts of the MPO outside Charlottesville. The region's intersections with the highest PSI scores are shown in the following maps, indicating those with the most potential benefit from improvements.





Map 13: High PSI Intersections (MPO). Source: VDOT



Map 14: High PSI Intersections (Charlottesville). Source: VDOT

## Transit and Rail

Three transit entities serve the MPO: Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT), run by the City of Charlottesville with additional contributions coming from Albemarle County; University Transit Service (UTS), run by the University of Virginia; and Jaunt, which provides transit and para-transit service for several contiguous counties in the region including the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County. To determine regional transit deficiencies, MPO staff considered regional transit services that have identified stops. Shuttle-style services, like the Micro-CAT pilot program and Jaunt's 29 Express and Park Connect services, are not included but could potentially provide solutions to these deficiencies.


### *Transit Accessibility to Population and Employment Maps*


The travel demand model's 2050 population and employment data was used to map each zone's population and employment densities forecast. In Maps 15 and 16, dark shades of blue indicate densely populated zones, while light shades of blue indicate sparse populations. Similarly, in Maps 17 and 18, dark shades of red indicate zones with considerable employment opportunities, while light shades indicate fewer opportunities.

Because future bus stop locations for 2050 cannot be anticipated, existing bus stop locations for UTS and CAT routes were used in our analysis. Projected population and employment within a one-quarter-mile buffer of transit stops were calculated to determine access to transit in 2050. This analysis considers all stops equally, although some routes have a frequency as low as one bus per hour. Map 19 shows current CAT transit routes.


Within the MPO, approximately 49% of the projected population and 73% of projected employment opportunities will be within a one-quarter-mile radius of a bus stop in 2050, indicating an opportunity to expand service to a more significant proportion of residents and increase transit use by residents who live close to existing transit services. These maps help identify general areas that would benefit from additional transit service.

Darker shaded areas without bus stops indicate areas where expanded service is expected to perform well due to the high concentration of residents or employment opportunities in these areas.







Map 15: 2050 Population Access to Transit (MPO). Sources: CAT, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 16: 2050 Population Access to Transit (Charlottesville). Sources: CAT, U.S. Census Bureau . Source: VDOT




Map 17: 2050 Employment Access to Transit (MPO). Sources: CAT, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 18: 2050 Employment Access to Transit (Charlottesville). Sources: CAT, U.S. Census Bureau.





Map 19: CAT Transit Routes. Source: CAT

## Bicycle and Pedestrian

The MPO's bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is relatively robust for recreational purposes. Still, the current network is not extensive or connected enough to be a viable transportation option for most of the 2050 MPO's population and employment base. Public outreach efforts for the 2019 Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan indicated that the community strongly desires additional infrastructure. Creating a more connected network would increase the desirability of bicycling and walking for transportation and recreation in the region.

### Bicycle


The MPO's bicycle network includes bike lanes, shared-use paths, and shared roadway facilities. This plan's analysis focuses on existing designated bicycling facilities. It does not focus on areas that do not have these facilities but are, in fact, bikeable due to the nature of the roadway. It includes all existing bicycle infrastructure identified, although the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan identified the need for improved infrastructure in many corridors. Many bike lanes and shared roadways in the region are on roads with speed limits of 35 or 45 mph. In these places, protected bike lanes and shared-use paths could dramatically increase safety and comfort for people riding bicycles.

### *Bicycle Accessibility to Population and Employment Maps*


For Maps 20 through 23, existing and proposed bicycle facilities were mapped with a 500-foot buffer. Population and employment within 500 feet were calculated to determine what percentage of the population or employment in 2050 would have relatively easy access to bicycle facilities.

Within the MPO, approximately 31% of the projected population and 49% of projected employment opportunities will be within 500 feet of a bicycle facility in 2050. However, regional biking tends to be limited to smaller zones due to barriers that prohibit bicycling beyond these areas. These maps help identify general areas that would benefit from improved connectivity.







Map 20: 2050 Population Access to Bicycle Facilities (MPO). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 21: 2050 Population Access to Bicycle Facilities (Charlottesville). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 22: 2050 Employment Access to Bicycle Facilities (MPO). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 23: 2050 Employment Access to Bicycle Facilities (Charlottesville). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau




## Pedestrian

The MPO's pedestrian network includes sidewalks and walkable areas such as Charlottesville's Downtown Pedestrian Mall. This plan's analysis focused on access to this walkable network.


### *Pedestrian Accessibility to Population and Employment Maps*

For Maps 24 through 27, existing and proposed pedestrian facilities were added to each map and buffered using a distance of 200 feet. The population or employment within 200 feet of pedestrian facilities was calculated to determine what percentage of the population or employment opportunities in 2050 would have access to a sidewalk or walkable area.


Within the MPO, approximately 48% of the projected population and 63% of projected employment opportunities will be within 200 feet of a pedestrian facility in 2050. The regional pedestrian network, while extensive, is missing links or extensions that would make the network more effective for the region. These maps help identify the general areas that would benefit from improved pedestrian connectivity. Efforts are also necessary to improve conditions on existing sidewalks, as many sidewalks are narrow or difficult to use due to impediments such as utility poles.




Map 24: 2050 Population Access to Pedestrian Facilities (MPO). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 25: 2050 Population Access to Pedestrian Facilities (Charlottesville). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 26: 2050 Employment Access to Pedestrian Facilities (MPO). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau



Map 27: 2050 Employment Access to Pedestrian Facilities (Charlottesville). Sources: City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, U.S. Census Bureau

## Conclusion

Transportation deficiency analysis provided MPO staff insights on transportation improvements to consider for Moving Toward 2050. Staff concluded that roadway improvements must be targeted at critical regional locations such as the U.S. 29/U.S. 250 Bypass or U.S. 250 at Pantops. Regarding transit improvements, the ongoing work of the Regional Transit Partnership will be valuable in identifying priorities for the transit system. As part of the Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, staff determined that access via bike facilities is limited by significant barriers prohibiting connectivity despite reasonable access to facilities within the urban core. Likewise, staff established that the pedestrian network lacks key links that could provide greater accessibility. Additionally, the needs prioritization process development included evaluating how access to employment could be improved for each mode.



Staff used this information and recommendations from other plans to develop an initial list of proposed roadway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects targeted at improving these areas. Bicycle and pedestrian projects were taken from the 2019 Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Intersection and bridge projects were identified based on VDOT and locality evaluations. These projects are discussed further in Chapter 7.

# Chapter 4: Needs Evaluation, Project Identification, and Project Prioritization

## Overview

This section describes the evaluation process undertaken by MPO staff to evaluate transportation needs, identify candidate projects, and prioritize those projects. The MPO's examination of transportation deficiencies, outlined in Chapter 3, helped inform this process.

## Needs Evaluation Process

To prepare for long-range transportation plan development, the MPO successfully applied for and was awarded a technical assistance grant through the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) to develop a system needs and project prioritization process. This technical assistance aimed to create a process for the MPO to use a data-driven framework to support prioritizing transportation system needs. The process was developed based on MPO-defined goals, and MPO staff worked closely with consultants to identify appropriate evaluation metrics to assess the overall system operations.

*The needs prioritization process was developed using the following framework:*

- 1. The process would use publicly accessible data specific to the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO area.**
- 2. The process itself would be developed based on existing staff and technical capacity.**
- 3. The process is replicable and can be used in future planning efforts.**

With the consultant team's support, the MPO identified thirteen metrics to evaluate transportation system needs. The consultants developed two thresholds for each metric, and MPO staff worked with the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Policy Board to identify the preferred threshold for each metric. The thresholds determined whether a need was indicated at particular segments.

The final aspect of the needs prioritization process was determining how much weight each metric should carry to prioritize the transportation system's needs. The consultant team developed three potential approaches to the weighting scenarios:

- 1. Accessibility-Focused:** Prioritizes needs that will improve access to jobs, non-work destinations, and multimodal choices for bicycling, walking, and transit.
- 2. Balanced:** Prioritizes all categories equally, with an increased focus on limiting environmental impacts.
- 3. Mobility-Focused:** Prioritizes highway and roadway projects that reduce vehicular delay.

The accessibility-focused weighting scenario was determined to be the most appropriate for needs prioritization based on feedback received through the engagement process. This scenario gave the highest weighting to Multi-modal Accessibility and Safety, which also reflected a desire to prioritize needs most closely related to concerns regarding Quality of Life, Equity, and Climate Action.



The following table summarizes the data used for the need prioritization process. An in-depth explanation of each evaluation metric can be reviewed in the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO Performance-Based Planning Process document, which is included in Appendix G.

Weighting Scenarios					
Prioritization Category	Evaluation Metric	Threshold	Accessibility-Focused	Balanced	Mobility-Focused
Safety	Roadway Safety (PSI <sup>1</sup> )	All PSI locations	15%	12%	15%
	Bike/Ped Safety (PSAP <sup>2</sup> Corridors)	Top 5% District Corridors	15%	13%	15%
Multimodal Accessibility	PAI <sup>3</sup> - Bike/Ped	All segments PAI greater than 0	8%	7%	7%
	PAI - Transit	All segments PAI greater than 0	8%	7%	7%
	PAI - Vehicle	All segments PAI greater than 0	6%	4%	9%
	PAI - Disadvantaged Populations	All segments PAI greater than 0	8%	7%	7%
Efficiency & Economic Development	Travel Time Index (TTI)	Avg weeklong TTI > 1.5 for three hours; > 1.7 for one hour	3%	7%	10%
	Travel Time Reliability (PTI <sup>4</sup> )	Avg weeklong PTI > 1.5 for three hours; > 1.7 for one hour	3%	7%	10%
	Transit On-Time Performance <sup>5</sup>	On-time performance less than the systemwide average performance from the previous year	4%	11%	10%
Land Use Coordination	Walk Access - General	All segments in "somewhat walkable" census tracts	10%	13%	5%
	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Populations	All segments in transit viable EEA <sup>6</sup> that are also in "somewhat walkable" census tracts	20%	12%	5%
Environment	Flooding Exposure	Segments Exposed to Historical Flooding	Applied to aggregate score in other factor areas		
		Additional Adjustment for economically distressed communities	Applied to aggregate score in other factor areas		

Table 7: Needs Prioritization Metrics

<sup>1</sup> PSI – Potential for Safety Improvement

<sup>2</sup> PSAP – Pedestrian Safety Action Plan

<sup>3</sup> While the MPO committees had supported using the top 5% of the statewide corridors for this evaluation metric, the information contained in that data layer was incompatible with the processing steps to utilize the information. The information glitch in the mapping layer that prevented us from viewing the correct information when the MPO committees were discussing the information had been resolved. While the top 5% of regional corridors contain additional segments on smaller road networks than what is considered in the Top 5% of statewide corridors, the use of the top 1% of regional corridors did not include all of the segments that were captured by the top 5% statewide corridors. Therefore, MPO staff used the top 5% of regional corridors data layer to complete the first step of the data processing.

<sup>4</sup> PAI – Potential for Accessibility Improvement

<sup>5</sup> PTI – Planning Time Index

<sup>6</sup> EEA – Equity Emphasis Areas; defined in VTrans

After metrics were standardized, they were combined into a needs score for the need category they supported. All standardized values were then summed into a weighted average score, assigning different weights to each metric in the scoring process for each factor. Finally, all need category scores were combined into an aggregate needs score that reflected total need based on all five categories, and staff created a map showing the need score for each road segment. Note that while the needs prioritization methodology used a 7-point scale, the MPO simplified the scale into three categories: High (scores from 6 to 7), Medium (scores from 4 to 5), and Low (scores from 1 to 3).






Figure 9: Needs Prioritization Process





Map 29: Road Segments by Aggregate Need Score (Charlottesville)

### Limitations of Needs Analysis

The following limitations were considered as part of the needs evaluation process:

- Staff used 2016-2020 PSI data for analysis. While 2017-2021 PSI data was available, it did not include needs indicated in the City of Charlottesville.
- Needs were coded to existing roadway segments and did not necessarily capture those that could be addressed through off-road shared-use paths or new road alignments.
- Congestion mitigation was incorporated into the need prioritization process using present-day conditions and high thresholds, limiting future operational conditions' impact in determining priority segments. While mitigating vehicular congestion was not a high priority based on public feedback, this also limits needs indicated where multimodal congestion solutions could be identified.
- The Potential for Accessibility Improvement (PAI) measure determines where a high population of people could access more jobs with an accessibility improvement, not necessarily where the improvement needs to occur.
- The aggregation process de-emphasized individual evaluation metrics. A need could be very high in a single category, but it may not be indicated as a high need overall if it does not demonstrate additional needs in other categories.


- The use of statewide data for congestion and flooding impacts limited the influence of those factors in the prioritization process. Statewide data did not necessarily reflect locations with known issues that could be captured using locally developed data.




## Public Feedback

MPO staff used public feedback to supplement the data analysis process and review locations with high concentrations of indicated needs. First, staff created a heat map of public comments indicating specific transportation improvements. Then, staff compared the public feedback heat map to the needs analysis output maps to determine where there was overlap and divergence (refer to Maps 30 and 31).

For the most part, public feedback confirmed the needs identified through the data analysis process. However, some exceptions were noted where public feedback indicated strong support for improvements, whereas the data analysis indicated low or no need. Public feedback was also reviewed to determine whether projects under consideration would garner support from the community.



Map 30: Public Engagement Heat Map (MPO)




Map 31: Public Engagement Heat Map (Charlottesville)


## Additional Data Reviewed

To address limitations of the data analysis process, MPO staff also considered future Levels of Service to determine where there may be future capacity concerns based on regional growth projections (refer to Maps 32 and 33). This ensured the plan accounted for future travel needs based on projected population and employment growth.






Map 32: 2050 Levels of Service (MPO). Source: VDOT




Map 33: 2050 Levels of Service (Charlottesville). Source: VDOT

MPO staff also mapped PSI needs to review potential projects' proximity to locations with an indicated need for safety improvements (refer to Maps 34 and 35). This additional consideration for projects identifying operational and safety needs aligns with previous efforts to identify priority improvements. It provides some continuity between past efforts and current plan development.



Map 34: PSI Intersections and Segments (2016-2020, 2017-2021) (MPO). Source: VDOT



Map 35: PSI Intersections and Segments (2016-2020, 2017-2021) (Charlottesville). Source: VDOT

## Project Identification Process

Staff compiled a list of candidate projects based on improvements identified through previous planning efforts or studies, including the following. Refer to Appendix D for a full list of related plans.

- Small Area Plans
- Corridor Studies
- Transit Strategic Plans
- Regional Plans
- Hazard Mitigation Plans
- High Water Roads (TJPDC 2023 Hazard Mitigation Plan) - refer to Appendix E
- VDOT Project Pipeline & STARS Studies

## Project Prioritization Process

After compiling a list of candidate projects, staff worked to prioritize them. Priority projects were identified based on the following:

- Locally identified priority improvements
- Candidate projects that addressed needs identified through the Moving Toward 2050 prioritization process

Indicated needs not addressed by a committed or recently implemented project or a priority project were flagged as planning priorities, which will inform the efforts the region undertakes over the next several years to identify solutions to address these identified needs.

## Conclusion

The evaluation process has helped identify transportation needs, select candidate projects, and prioritize them effectively. By employing a data-driven framework and engaging stakeholders and the public, the MPO has developed a comprehensive system for prioritizing transportation projects, considering safety, accessibility, efficiency, and environmental impact. Chapter 7 describes how the evaluation process will inform decisions regarding transportation infrastructure investments, ensuring alignment with community priorities and future growth projections.





# Chapter 5: Additional Transportation System Elements

## Overview

Moving Toward 2050 is a comprehensive process that identifies the needs of many transportation system elements. This chapter will provide information about intersections, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and bridge needs. These aspects were separated from the roadway and transit analysis for multiple reasons, including that some funding is dedicated to one type of project. Challenges are associated with measuring the impact of various kinds of improvements. For example, the travel demand model used to estimate the congestion impact of roadway and transit projects cannot calculate the effect of intersection or bike/ped improvements. Nonetheless, the transportation network is one system, and any decision should consider all aspects of the network to ensure maximum system performance and a good quality of life for residents of the region.

## Intersections

Intersections are a central concern in the MPO, as they are primary areas of congestion, locations where many crashes occur, and barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel. Given this, VDOT and the localities continuously evaluate conditions at intersections and work to identify improvements that increase safety and multimodal flow through intersections. Intersections identified as essential locations for improvements are listed in Chapter 7.

## Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Network

In 2019, the MPO adopted the Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to provide a regional vision for implementing regional bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. While the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan identified many corridors and projects, it was not an attempt to compile all potential projects. As such, local efforts will identify additional bicycle and pedestrian needs within and between neighborhoods.

## Bridges

Like intersections, bridges are continuously evaluated by VDOT and the localities to ensure safe travel now and in the future. This LRTP includes information that VDOT has collected regarding bridge conditions, and the MPO will continue to monitor these conditions as part of the national performance measures. A list of bridges currently identified as being in poor or fair condition or otherwise needing improvement is provided in Chapter 7. Chapter 7 also contains a list of bridge improvement projects that have already been funded.



# Chapter 6: Planning for Uncertainty

## Overview

This chapter discusses some uncertainties related to long-range transportation planning and provides an overview of technologies and trends essential to transportation planning. While there is constant debate about how innovations will change how we move people, goods, and services, this plan acknowledges the uncertainties of 20-year plans.

## Changing Technologies

The transportation sector is entering a period of rapid change and technological disruption. New services such as bike-sharing and Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) coupled with a move towards autonomous vehicles and connected infrastructure are reshaping how people and goods move. These new technologies and new travel modes have the potential to reshape the transportation landscape radically. With some technologies being relatively new and evolving, there is very little consensus around planning for them and making assumptions for the future. Long-range plans require a two-decade planning horizon, and many planning assumptions used for that 20-year vision are based on historical trends. These trends are changing rapidly and may not represent future transportation systems. Therefore, it is important to monitor trends and new developments and adapt the plan to meet the needs of this changing landscape. It is also crucial that local, regional, and state decision-makers are aware of these trends and are prepared to embrace or regulate them as necessary. Currently, the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County are taking action to encourage appropriate use of some of the new technologies described in this chapter.

This plan continues the process of understanding the new modes and technologies. Future iterations will have to adapt continuously to the changing nature of transportation. Many of the projects included in this plan are designed to fix current capacity constraints and improve operational efficiency, safety, and mode choice. Therefore, the projects are expected to help meet the transportation needs in both the short- and long-term.

## Transportation Network Companies

The Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) is serviced by two Transportation Network Companies (TNCs), also known as Mobility Service Providers (MSPs). Uber and Lyft rely on online-enabled platforms to connect users and drivers. One of the hallmarks of these systems is the use of noncommercial vehicles. This differs from local taxi services, which have provided similar on-demand transportation services to the region for many decades.

The arrival of TNCs has already begun to change some travel behaviors, especially with Charlottesville's large university population lacking personal cars. As these services continue to grow in popularity, planners may need to rethink the design of downtown streets better to facilitate drop-off and pickup activities at the curb. TNC services will likely play a small but growing role in the Moving Toward 2050 planning horizon.

## Shared Mobility Programs

Shared mobility programs are one form of innovation reshaping active transportation by addressing the demand for quick and affordable transportation in urban areas. Since the 2045 LRTP was adopted, many companies have taken on the role of bike-share providers and have introduced dockless electric scooters. In 2018, the City of Charlottesville approved a temporary Dockless Scooter and Bicycle Policy Pilot Program to evaluate their impacts in Charlottesville. The City provided permits to two providers (Lime and Bird), and the first dockless scooters were introduced in December of 2018. Veo, a competitor to Lime and Bird, now provides dockless scooters and electric bikes, which have become a regular fixture on local streets.

While shared mobility provides convenient travel options, these programs have also caused many concerns. Ensuring their appropriate and safe use is essential if scooters are to remain as a mode of travel. Appropriate scooter parking is necessary to avoid obstructing sidewalks or otherwise endangering or limiting pedestrian access. Despite bike-share and other shared mobility programs aiming to provide affordable mobility options, the cost and dependence on smartphones and credit cards can still make them inaccessible to some vulnerable populations. To make bikes and scooters accessible to everyone, many programs have introduced discounts or subsidized passes for riders based on income thresholds and have options for text-to-unlock features. Given these concerns locally and in cities nationwide, it is unclear if electric scooters will continue to serve as a valid transportation option or disappear in the coming years.

## Electric Bikes and Scooters

Electric bicycles (e-bikes) continue to grow in popularity as technological advancements allow for lower costs and longer battery life. Additionally, some e-bikes can match travel speeds with city speed limits, allowing riders to keep pace with automobile traffic. The Department of Energy reports that e-bike sales skyrocketed by about 30 percent, from 325 thousand bikes sold in 2018 to 1.1 million in 2022. These improvements are especially influential in hilly communities like Charlottesville, where more robust motors and batteries make biking available to more riders.

The region may expect more trips to transition from single-use occupancy vehicles as electric bikes and scooters become more popular. Additional bike facilities can accommodate this shift. The region may also want to consider more bike storage and racks. The MPO may need to reevaluate the modal split in the model for future updates of the LRTP.

## Connected and Autonomous Vehicles

Connected Vehicles (CVs) and Autonomous Vehicles (AVs) are two technologies likely to impact transportation significantly within the 2050 planning horizon. CVs refer to vehicles that can communicate with one another to achieve goals such as reducing traffic congestion and improving safety. Autonomous vehicles refer to vehicles that can travel independently of a human operator. The precise timeframe for the widespread implementation of these technologies is uncertain.

There is disagreement on the costs and benefits the technologies will have on the transportation network. Some research indicates a potential upside for the capacity of roadways, while other predictions indicate a scenario with roads clogged with roving AVs. The technology has several potential benefits, such as reduced traffic congestion, increased safety, reduced fuel consumption and travel time, lower insurance and healthcare costs, better city planning due to less need for parking, increased productivity, and improved personal mobility and public transit.

The impact of CVs and AVs on future commuting patterns is not clear. Some research suggests that they could increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by encouraging workers to live farther away from employment and take advantage of their commute time to increase productivity. The impact of CVs and AVs on vehicle ownership is another significant factor. Some research suggests that they will reduce personal vehicle ownership, and consumers will use on-demand driverless transportation services for most of their travel. CVs and AVs also have the potential to change transit, freight movement, and other travel significantly. Since autonomous vehicles would not have drivers, transit and freight costs would dramatically decrease. The decrease in other limitations, such as required breaks and rest stops, may lead to these vehicles being operational continuously or for more hours of the day.

There are barriers to the widespread adoption of CVs and AVs, such as public safety and privacy concerns from possible equipment failures and cyber security. There is also uncertainty regarding the impact of the partial implementation of CVs and AVs, which would result in a mixed fleet of driverless and non-autonomous vehicles. Estimates for how long it would take for the vehicle fleet to transition from non-autonomous to driverless vehicles are generally more than ten years. Fully automated safety features, such as highway autopilot, are not expected to be used across a large portion of the vehicle fleet for many years. VDOT has developed a Connected and Automated Vehicle Program Plan, and the MPO will continue to monitor systems as they evolve over the next five years.

## Transit

New technologies and their applications continue to influence transit services across the country. Strategies like bus-only lanes and bus priority at traffic signals make routes more efficient and reliable. Technology also has the potential to make paying transit fares quicker and easier than in the past. Autonomous transit vehicles, including those tested in Albemarle County, could dramatically decrease transit service costs. On-demand mobility is also an opportunity for transit agencies, as they may determine that they can provide improved service and efficiency by replacing low ridership routes with flexible, on-demand services.

Access to real-time transit data, often on cell phones, has made transit more desirable for riders. However, the increase in other transportation options, such as the on-demand mobility services provided by TNCs, may decrease the number of people using transit. CAT is currently implementing a micro-transit pilot called “Micro-CAT,” and Jaunt is undergoing a micro-transit study. It is also possible that the transportation changes discussed in this chapter will lead to fewer households owning cars and an increase in transit use in combination with other modes.

## Telecommuting and Remote Work

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, a growing proportion of the workforce worked from home. Before 2020, the U.S. Census Bureau showed that approximately 7% (5,402) of residents in the MPO area worked from home — a 22% increase since 2010. Nationally, the number of Americans working from home increased from 2.2 million in 1980 to 11 million in 2020. During the pandemic, the 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) showed that 27.6 million people (17.9% of the workforce) primarily worked from home. In 2023, 12.7% of full-time employees worked from home. While many employers ask their workers to return to the office, Forbes reports that teleworking will continue to increase, following a forty-year trend.

As these trends continue, the region should incorporate communications and internet access as transportation assets, satisfying the commuting needs of a growing proportion of the workforce.

## Uncrewed Aerial Vehicles (UAVs)

Debates and research continue into the application of Uncrewed Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), commonly called drones. Several industries are researching ways to use UAVs to deliver goods for commercial purposes and even medical services.

There are too many technological, business, and legal uncertainties to predict how UAVs may influence the transportation network in the next two decades. However, the MPO should continue to track this topic and adjust plans as drone applications evolve.

## Sustainable and Resilient Transportation Systems

The region's transportation system is a notable source of greenhouse gas emissions and is vulnerable to climate change impacts in the short and long term. Using gasoline to power vehicles contributes significantly to greenhouse gas emissions in this region and nationwide. Albemarle's climate action data suggests that in 2000, the transportation sector was responsible for 52% of greenhouse gas emissions in the County, the largest share of emissions by sector, followed by residential (27%) and commercial (11.5%). The 2016 Greenhouse Gas Inventory in Charlottesville indicated that transportation sector emissions were approximately 28% of total emissions in the City. A similar proportion came from residential uses (30%) and commercial uses (27%). Appendix C refers to the EPA's most recent EJScreen community reports for Charlottesville and Albemarle County for environmental and socioeconomic indicator data.

Coordinating transportation and land use planning is essential to reducing transportation emissions. Land use decisions significantly influence the number and length of trips made in the region and the mode used for each trip. These land use factors include the density of development and how it is connected to the transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian networks.

Strategies that could reduce regional transportation greenhouse gas emissions include increasing public transit frequency and routes, building more bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, encouraging ridesharing, installing charging stations for electric vehicles, and increasing the number of people who work from home. Many of these strategies involve changing resident behavior to reduce the number of vehicle trips. Strategies should substantively involve residents to reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions successfully.



Climate change raises important questions about community resilience and adapting infrastructure for an environment that may have different precipitation or temperature patterns than we experience today. For example, communities in our region and nationally have recently been confronted with increases in flooding. Transportation planning in the 21st century will require increased attention to resiliency and environmental protection. Roads and parking lots are generally impervious surfaces, which increase runoff, pollution of waterways, and potential for flooding. For these reasons, transportation planning must continue to avoid flood-prone areas, maintain wetlands, and include flood mitigation strategies.

# Chapter 7: Transportation Projects Identified

## Overview

As explained in Chapter 4, a primary requirement for the LRTP is the creation of constrained lists of projects based on estimates of future funding. Estimating future funding has become more challenging in recent years, particularly since Virginia has moved to a competitive method of distributing major funding called SMART SCALE. Including a project in the constrained list of this LRTP has less impact than in the past, as each project needs to compete for state and federal funding regardless of whether it is in the constrained list or the vision list. Nonetheless, the constrained and vision lists are an essential component of this LRTP, and they identify projects that the region desires to receive state and federal funds to construct.

Transportation projects in the region were split into four categories, based on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) groupings, for evaluation and inclusion in the constrained and vision lists. These categories are:

- **Safety and Operational Improvements** that improve safety and flow for those using vehicles, as well as improving bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure;
- **Transportation Enhancements** that create safe and desirable infrastructure for bicycling and walking;
- **Transit Projects** that increase transit service in the region; and
- **Bridge Projects** that rehabilitate or replace bridges to ensure the region's bridges remain safe and in good condition.

## Funding Estimates

MPO staff worked with VDOT staff to create estimates for the state and federal transportation funds the region will receive before 2050. The amount of money currently programmed for each type of project in the TIP was used to estimate funding.

## New Construction Projects

Steps taken to determine the constrained amount for new construction projects are outlined below.

First, staff reviewed the following funding sources from VDOT's budget forecast spreadsheet for 2024 – 2050.

Budget Forecast 2024 - 2050	
District Grant Program Funding	\$220,735,991
High-Priority Projects Program Funding	\$196,303,710
Interstate Corridor Fund	\$536,563
Other Federal Funding	\$16,201,840
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$433,778,105</b>

Next, the total from the above funding sources was divided proportionally among three TIP groupings:

Groupings	TIP	% of Total	L RTP Constrained Budget Amount
Safety and Operational Improvements	\$243,333,199.00	92.90%	\$402,970,535
Transportation Enhancements	\$10,365,594.00	3.96%	\$17,165,882
Traffic and Safety Operations	\$ 8,237,514.00	3.14%	\$13,641,687
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$261,936,307.00</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$433,778,105</b>

Then, staff combined the Safety and Operational Improvements and Traffic and Safety Operations into a single category:

Groupings	L RTP Constrained Budget Amount
Safety and Operational Improvements (combined)	\$416,612,223
Transportation Enhancements	\$17,165,882
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 433,778,105</b>

Note: Budget projections do not include Revenue Sharing allocations or funding through US DOT discretionary grant programs. Revenue Sharing is available every two years with an allocation of up to \$10 million per locality (the maximum amount a locality can receive per funding cycle and the entirety of an individual project; the match for revenue sharing is 50%).

## Non-Construction Bridge Projects

Non-construction bridge projects will be funded through a combination of maintenance and State of Good Repair (SGR) funding sources. Steps taken to determine the constrained amount for new bridge projects are outlined below.

First, staff referred to the following funding sources from VDOT's budget forecast spreadsheet for 2040 – 2050.

Budget Forecast 2024 - 2050	
Maintenance - Localities	\$100,483,900
Maintenance - VDOT	\$1,004,271,230
State of Good Repair	\$177,315,823
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,282,070,953</b>

Next, the total from these funding categories was divided proportionally among the following TIP groupings:

Groupings	TIP	% of Total	L RTP Constrained Budget Amount
Bridge Projects	\$ 9,624,826.00	12.38%	\$158,678,934
Preventative Maintenance	\$ 49,752,817.00	63.98%	\$ 820,245,891
Bridge Maintenance	\$ 18,387,625.00	23.65%	\$ 303,146,128
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 77,765,268.00</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$1,282,070,953</b>

Note: Preventative Maintenance projects do not need to be included in the L RTP. They are referenced to determine how much funding can be allocated for bridge maintenance and repair.

Then, the Bridge Projects and Bridge Maintenance categories were grouped into one category:

Grouping	L RTP Constrained Budget Amount
Bridge Projects	\$ 461,825,062.49

## Funded Projects

Each year, the Virginia Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) creates a funding plan for projects for the next six years called the Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP). The complete list of projects can be viewed on VDOT’s Six-Year Improvement Program website.



## Constrained and Vision Lists by Category

Following the evaluation process described in Chapter 4, MPO staff created final project lists. The MPO Technical Committee, Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee, and Policy Board reviewed the lists at multiple meetings in 2023 and 2024. Given the uncertainty of funding sources and the likelihood that different projects will be eligible and competitive for various funding sources, all projects listed here should be considered equally eligible for federal, state, or local funding.

Federal requirements dictate that MPOs adopt a Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) so project recommendations are grounded in budgetary constraints. VDOT provides the MPO with a figure of how much transportation funding the area can anticipate for the planning horizon, and regional planners develop a list of projects that generally fit into that estimated

budget. In recent years, Virginia adopted changes in their funding processes and created SMART SCALE, a data-driven approach to prioritizing and selecting funding requests. Under this new system, the CLRP’s roles shifted but still served to highlight the region’s high-priority projects. Generally, the vision list consists of recommendations that are not yet ready for funding applications and lower-priority projects. The Vision list can also function to document all potential transportation projects in the region, regardless of readiness.

Projects are listed in no particular order and have been assigned numbers so they can be referenced more easily. These numbers do not indicate priority levels. Projects identified as planning priorities are noted with an asterisk. Detailed project review pages can be found in Appendix B



Safety and Operational Improvements
<i>Constrained Projects</i>
1. I-64 and 5th Street Interchange Improvement
2. Rio Road Peanut-Shaped Roundabout and Shared Use Path
3. Airport Road and US 29 Intersection Improvements
4. Ivy Road Corridor Improvements, including Multimodal Improvements on Old Ivy Road
5. US 250 Corridor Improvements from Old Trail Drive to Cory Farms Road
6. Avon Street Multimodal Improvements – Avon Court to Route 20
7. Eastern Avenue Connection between Westhall and US 250
8. Barracks Road Corridor Improvements between Georgetown Road and Emmet Street
9. Ridge/McIntire/W. Main/South/Water Street Intersection Improvement
10. Rio Road Corridor Improvements between Huntington Road and Greenbrier Terrace
11. Hillsdale South Extension, including 250 Interchange and Multi-Modal Improvements
12. Peter Jefferson Parkway & Rolkin Road Access Management/Pedestrian Improvements
13. U.S. 250 and Route 29 Interchange near Hydraulic Road
<i>Vision Projects</i>
14. U.S. 29 between Exit 118 and Ivy Road*
15. E. High Street from US 250 to Locust Avenue*
16. 5th Street Station/5th Street Intersection Improvements
17. Louisa/Milton Road Pipeline Bundle
18. Greenbrier and Commonwealth Drive Intersection Improvements
19. Greenbrier and Route 29 Intersection Improvements
20. Earlysville Road Corridor Improvements between Ivy Creek and Hydraulic Road
21. Intersection Improvements at 29/Boulders and 29/Briarwood

Table 8: Safety and Operational Improvement Projects

Transportation Enhancement
<i>Constrained Projects</i>
22. Old Lynchburg Road Shared Use Path between Ambrose Commons and 5th Street
23. Berkmar Drive Shared Use Path between Rio Road and Hilton Heights Road
24. 5th Street Multimodal Improvements from Harris Road to City/County Line, including Moores Creek Crossing
25. Preston Avenue Multi-Modal Improvements from 10th Street NW to Ridge/McIntire
26. Rivanna River Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge between Pantops and Woolen Mills
<i>Vision Projects</i>
27. Three Notched Trail Section Improvements (as identified by the Albemarle County RAISE Grant) and Shared Use Path*
28. 10th and Page Multimodal Improvements, including improvements along 10th Street between Preston and Cherry Avenue*
29. North side of Jefferson Park Avenue from W. Main Street to McCormick Road*
30. 29 North/West Main/UVA Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis*
31. Route 20 Shared Use Path
32. Greenbrier Drive/John Warner Parkway Multimodal Connection
33. Shared Use Path connection between the 10th & Page neighborhood and Schenk's Greenway (Rail to Trail Project)
34. Hydraulic Road from Earlysville Road to Georgetown Road (including Lambs Lane Campus) Multimodal Improvement
35. Emmet Street between Barracks Road and US 250 Bypass Multimodal Improvements
36. Biscuit Run Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections

37. 14th Street NW from Grady Avenue to W. Main Street Multimodal Improvements
38. Amtrak Station Improvements
39. Hydraulic Corridor Improvements from Georgetown to Lambs Road
40. Moore's Creek Shared Use Path – 5th Street to Fontaine Ave to Seig Development
41. Route 240 Shared Use Path – Highlands Drive to Music Today
42. Route 250 Commuter Trail

Table 9: Transportation Enhancement Projects

Transit Projects
43. Microtransit in Pantops
44. Microtransit along Northern 29 Corridor
45. Free Trolley Service Improvements
46. Route 7 Service Improvements
47. Route 8 Service Improvements
48. Expanded Bus Stop Amenities
49. Expanded Microtransit Service in Charlottesville and Albemarle Growth Areas
50. CAT Existing Facility Expansion

Table 10: Transit Projects

Bridge Projects
51. Keswick Road over Carroll Creek (VDOT Structure #6224, Poor Condition)
52. Arrowhead Valley Road over Branch Moores Creek (VDOT Structure #6229, Poor Condition)
53. Arrowhead Valley Road over Branch Moores Creek (VDOT Structure #6230, Poor Condition)

Table 11: Bridge Projects

Other Ongoing Initiatives to Identify Priorities
Multimodal Connectivity Studies*
Implementation of improvements identified through the development of the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan*
Route 29 Corridor Improvements - Study parameters to be set once resources are determined (STARS, Pipeline, County Small Area Plan, etc.)*
U.S. 29 between US 250 and Hilton Heights Road (including Greenbrier Drive)*

Table 12: Other Ongoing Initiatives to Identify Priorities


## Conclusion

As FHWA and FTA require, the MPO has created constrained project lists and identified additional projects included in vision lists. These lists will ensure coordinated decision-making by federal, state, and local officials regarding important regional projects in the MPO in the coming years.


# Appendix A: Demographics

## Population

The MPO's population is concentrated most densely in the City of Charlottesville and its immediate surroundings, with moderate densities also located along US Route 29 and Crozet. The following maps provide a clearer picture of the area's overall population and densities by US Census block groups according to 2022 ACS 5-year data.



Map 36: Total Population. Source: U.S. Census Bureau



Map 37: Population Density. Source: U.S. Census Bureau


## Race & Ethnicity

The City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County contain diverse populations. The table below summarizes some basic demographics for the area using the latest ACS estimates.


Racial Identity/Ethnicity	Percent of Total Population (Charlottesville)	Percent of Total Population (Albemarle County)
Non-Hispanic White	68.5%	74.7%
Black or African American	17.2%	8.0%
Asian	7.0%	5.4%
Hispanic	5.8%	5.8%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.2%	0.2%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%
Other Race	1.2%	3.4%

Table 13: Race & Ethnicity. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)


The following maps provide a more detailed breakdown of the region's racial/ethnic identity.



Map 38: Race/Ethnicity - Asian. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)




Map 39: Race/Ethnicity - Black or African American. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)



Map 40: Race/Ethnicity - Hispanic or Latino. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)





Map 41: Race/Ethnicity - White. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

## Age

According to 2022 ACS estimates, the median age of Charlottesville residents is 32.4 years, which is likely influenced by the university population. The median age of Albemarle residents is notably older, at 38.6 years. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the national and statewide median age for comparison is 39 years. The age pyramid below highlights the relatively large number of those aged 20-24, which likely reflects the sizeable undergraduate student body at the University of Virginia.





Figure 10: Age Pyramid (City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County). Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

# Education

The region is comparatively highly educated. Across the United States, 35.7% of the “25 or older” population has at least a bachelor’s degree. In Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville, this figure is 59.8% and 58.9%, respectively (ACS 2022 5-Year Estimates, Table S1501). This comparatively high proportion of college-educated residents is a significant advantage for attracting certain industries, such as Northrop Grumman’s presence in the Charlottesville area and the development of Rivanna Station.


The following map presents the percentage of the total population with a bachelor’s degree by Census Block Group according to ACS 2022 5-year estimates.



Map 42: Percent of Population with a Bachelor's Degree or Higher. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

## Income

Median household incomes in the United States and Virginia are \$74,755 and \$85,873, respectively. Median household income in Charlottesville and Albemarle County is \$67,177 and \$93,691, respectively (ACS 2022 5-year Estimates Table S1901). Despite Charlottesville's high educational attainment, its median household income lags somewhat behind that of the United States and Virginia. Albemarle County, however, out-earns most of the country and Virginia by this metric. In addition, significant geographic disparities in median household income are highlighted on the following map.



Map 43: Median Household Income. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

## Housing

Like much of the United States, the region is in need of more affordable housing. Median rents in Albemarle County and Charlottesville were \$1,550 and \$1,357, respectively, compared to a nationwide median rent of \$1,300. Home values are also higher in Charlottesville and Albemarle County than across the United States.

The graph below shows gross rent as a percentage of household income in Albemarle County and Charlottesville.




Figure 11: Gross Rent as a Percentage of Monthly Income. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

Type	Albemarle County	City of Charlottesville
Owner-occupied housing units	27,692	8,262
Renter-occupied housing units	17,486	11,249

Table 14: Housing Tenure. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

## Vehicle Ownership

The number of vehicles households own varies across Albemarle County and Charlottesville. Notably, 5.2% of Albemarle County households and 11.8% of Charlottesville households do not have access to a vehicle. These residents are those most reliant on multimodal alternatives to cars. The graph below shows vehicle access by housing tenure for Albemarle County and Charlottesville, highlighting the disparity in vehicle access between owners and renters.




Figure 12: Vehicle Access by Housing Tenure. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

## Economy and Employment

According to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average unemployment rate for the combined area of the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County remained at 2.65% between 2018 and 2022. During that time, the area's unemployment rate was lower than that of Virginia, which had an unemployment rate of 2.8%. The size of the labor force and the number of employees increased during this period.

The relative strength of the Charlottesville area is due in large part to its central Virginia location and the nature of the local economy. As the seat of the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County governments, Charlottesville serves as Central Virginia's economic, cultural, and educational center. As the home of the University of Virginia, one of the country's most prestigious and highly-regarded universities, the City derives benefits to the economy and quality of life associated with this area. The predominant economic sectors are healthcare, education, service-related industries, tourism and hospitality. Some emerging sectors include technology and renewable energy.

## Specialized Communities

The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO's Title VI Plan outlines how the MPO achieves Title VI and Environmental Justice compliance. The plan discusses the MPO's efforts to include specialized populations in the regional planning process, including minorities, the elderly, the disabled, low-income populations, and limited English-speaking populations. The plan also discusses the demographic breakdown of the MPO region. It outlines a procedure for filing complaints should any MPO stakeholders feel they were subject to discrimination under Title VI guidelines and accompanying policies, including negative impacts on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations.

### Racial Minorities

American cities have historically left minority voices out of planning processes that affect their communities. The legacy of marginalization and segregation is seen in the fact that African American, Asian, and other racial minorities are primarily clustered in central areas of Charlottesville and Albemarle, like in many cities in the United States. Map 26, which represents the percentage of residents that identify as White only, shows the higher concentration of minority residents near the downtown area of Charlottesville. Given the region's history, it is essential to target outreach and engagement to reach minority populations. In addition to being racially diverse, the MPO area is ethnically diverse, with a large Spanish-speaking population and schools with students speaking more than 30 different first languages. Outreach to this community and other more recent immigrants may require accessible materials for limited English-speaking populations.

### Older Adults

As shown in Figure 12, 18.37% (29,538) of the population in the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO area is 65 years or older. Older adults may face various barriers that prohibit them from engaging in planning processes. Involving older adults may mean targeted strategies like sending letters, making phone calls, or making neighborhood visits.

### Persons with Disabilities

According to the ACS, disability is the product of interactions among individuals' bodies, their physical, emotional, and mental health, and the physical and social environment in which they live, work, or play. Disability exists where this interaction restricts full participation at school, work, home, or in the community.

Figure 15 shows estimates of these characteristics for Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville. The total share of the population with disabilities increases with age, and estimates skew toward residents living with an Independent Living Difficulty.




Figure 13: Disability Characteristics. Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2022)

## Low-Income

According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s ACS 2022 estimates, 9% of Albemarle County residents and 23.6% of Charlottesville residents lived below the poverty level. Poverty thresholds are the dollar amounts the U.S. Census Bureau uses to determine poverty status. Each person or family is assigned one out of 48 possible poverty thresholds, which vary according to the family size and the members’ ages. Persons living in poverty frequently live in low-resource communities where the outcome of a planning project can be a higher risk for residents. Additionally, low-income residents are often not active in planning due to limited leisure time and energy outside work and family responsibilities. Engaging low-income communities affected by planning processes is essential because appropriate planning projects can significantly improve a community’s quality of life.

Due to the large population of unemployed full-time students at UVA, the survey results are skewed. Census block groups on and adjacent to the UVA campus have a median household income of less than \$20,000, likely because a majority of the residents in these areas are students. There are a few block groups (e.g., east of the UVA campus in the 10th & Page neighborhood, in the southeast Belmont neighborhood, and the westernmost area of the TJPDC) where the median household income is also less than \$20,000, even though there are fewer students that live in these areas. The median household income in Albemarle County is significantly greater than the national average, and due to the student-populated block groups adjacent to the UVA campus, the median household income in Charlottesville is lower than national and Virginia state averages.

## Limited English-Speaking Population

As of 2019, Limited English-speaking populations comprised approximately 4.7% of the Charlottesville-Albemarle total population. These populations require targeted outreach in an appropriate language.



## Responsibilities and Strategies

The MPO makes efforts to include stakeholders in developing and approving regionally significant transportation plans to ensure that its planning efforts are holistic and include all populations that are part of the regional community. The MPO hosted several public input events before the approval of this plan. There have also been a variety of ways to comment on the plan. Residents could provide comments via in-person events, MPO committee meetings, online surveys, the MPO’s website comment box, or directly to MPO staff. Also, as a federally-funded agency, the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO has developed a method for receiving and handling complaints should they be made.

## Growth Projections

The University of Virginia’s Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service produces population estimates and forecasts for Virginia and its jurisdictions. According to the Weldon Cooper Center’s most recent estimates, Albemarle County had a population of 115,495 in 2022 and is forecast to grow to 155,102 in 2050. Charlottesville had a population of 51,278 in 2022 and is forecast to reach 49,691 by 2050.

Jurisdiction	2022	2030	2040	2050
Albemarle County	115,495	124,016	138,523	155,102
Charlottesville	51,278	48,920	48,939	49,691

Table 15: Growth Projections. Source: Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service

These projections indicate population growth of 34.3% in Albemarle County from 2022 to 2050 and population decline of 3.2% in Charlottesville from 2022 to 2050. Combining Charlottesville and Albemarle yields a 22.8% population increase over the same period, rising from 166,773 to 204,793. Comparatively, the population of Virginia is expected to grow 21.1% over the same period, with the population increasing from 8,696,955 to 10,535,810.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Appendix B: Project Review Pages

## I-64 and 5th Street Interchange Improvement



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index*
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index*
Transit PAI	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	D/E
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>This project is being developed for a Round 6 SMART SCALE application submission. It will include bike/ped accommodations through the interchange. The project will improve operational efficiency and address safety concerns at the interchange, as well as improve multimodal connectivity at the existing bridge over I-64.</p>

## Rio Road Peanut-Shaped Roundabout and Shared Use Path




<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	High/Medium
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index*
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population*
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	D/E
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>This project would construct a peanut-shaped roundabout at the intersections between Rio Road, Northfield Road, Old Brook Road, and Hillsdale Drive. This project would improve safety at these intersections and provide more comfortable bicycle and pedestrian accommodations through this section of the Rio Road corridor.</p>

## Airport Road and US 29 Intersection Improvements




<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index*
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index*
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	E/F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>Intersection improvements at the intersection of Airport Road and Route 29 to address operational and safety concerns. Several alternatives were identified in the U.S. 29 Corridor Study completed in 2023 that would be further evaluated.</p>

# Ivy Road Corridor Improvements, including Multimodal Improvements on Old Ivy Road



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population*
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	E
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>This is a project pipeline study conducted by VDOT, and project recommendations are expected to be developed in the spring of 2024. The purpose of the study is to identify project recommendations for the U.S. 250 (Ivy Road) corridor, including the interchange with U.S. 29. The study focuses on improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving access, and enhancing multimodal accessibility and connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users, including how these needs might be satisfied by facilities within the Old Ivy Road corridor.</p>

## US 250 Corridor Improvements from Old Trail Drive to Cory Farms Road



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
------------------------------------	-----


### Prioritization Process Identified Needs

Roadway Safety	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	E

### Additional Information

PSI needs are indicated at the intersection between US 250 and Crozet Avenue/ Miller School Road and along the segment of U.S. 250 west of and up to Old Trail Drive. Public feedback also indicated concern for the intersection between Crozet Avenue and Old Trail Drive related to school traffic. This project includes three roundabouts along U.S. 250 at the intersection with Old Trail Drive, at the entrance into Henley Middle School, and the intersection with Crozet Avenue/Miller School Road, as well as a shared-use path along this segment.


## Avon Street Multimodal Improvements – Avon Court to Route 20



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	E/F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>Intersection improvements (potentially a roundabout) at Avon Street Extended and Mill Creek Road would improve operations and safety and potentially provide some traffic calming measures, addressing concerns about traffic speeds along Avon Street received through the MPO's public engagement process.</p>




## Eastern Avenue Connection between Westhall and US 250




<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	N/A
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	N/A
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>The intersection of Rio Road and Berkmar Drive is a PSI location. Public feedback indicated a desire for additional bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along Berkmar, which would provide an alternative multimodal connection to travel through the local area. The parallel segment of U.S. 29 from Rio Road to Hilton Heights Road shows future LOS of D/E/F indicating significant future congestion concerns. This SUP would support multimodal travel options increasing overall mobility through this segment of U.S. 29.</p>

## Barracks Road Corridor Improvements between Georgetown Road and Emmet Street




<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index*
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population*
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	D/E/F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>There are operational concerns at the intersection between Barracks Road and Georgetown Road, as well as at the interchange between Barracks Road and 250. The interchange is also indicated as a PSI need. This corridor is currently being studied as a VDOT project pipeline study. The focus of the study is to improve roadway safety and enhance multimodal accessibility and connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. Project recommendations are anticipated to be identified by Spring 2024 in time to be submitted as applications for SMART SCALE Round 6.</p>

## Ridge/McIntire/W. Main/South/Water Street Intersection Improvement




<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Medium
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index*
Transit PAI	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population*
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	E/F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>Five roads intersect at this intersection. It was identified as a medium-priority need in the MPO's need prioritization process and was a hot spot for public feedback. Public comments received primarily indicated a desire to improve the safety of multi-modal travel through the intersection. Specific improvements have not been identified.</p>

## Rio Road Corridor Improvements between Huntington Road and Greenbrier Terrace




<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Medium
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	D/E
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>There is a PSI need identified along this segment, and future LOS is indicated as D/E, demonstrating both safety and operational concerns. Specific improvements are not currently identified for this segment, including at the intersection with Greenbrier Drive, but improving this segment is a priority for Albemarle County. There are a number of service stations located in close proximity along this segment, so improvements may include access management strategies.</p>

## Hillsdale South Extension, including 250 Interchange and Multi-Modal Improvements



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	High
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population*
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>The parallel segment of U.S. 29 is indicated as a high need through the MPO's prioritization process and was a hot spot for public comment. The Travel Demand Model shows the interchange operating at LOS F in the future year scenario. This project would extend Hillsdale Drive south to provide a complete connection from Hydraulic Road to the 250 bypass. The interchanges between 29 and 250 would be removed and traffic would be directed through the local road network. The project would also include multimodal improvements.</p>

# Peter Jefferson Parkway & Rolkin Road Access Management/Pedestrian Improvements



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Medium
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	D/E/F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>This bundle of projects was identified through a project pipeline study in preparation for SMART SCALE Round 5. The project includes access management measures along U.S. 250 between Peter Jefferson Parkway and Pantops Mountain Road, a park and ride lot that will accommodate 50 vehicles, and pedestrian improvements at the intersection of U.S. 250 and Rolkin Road supporting pedestrian movement across U.S. 250 and extending the sidewalk on the southern side of U.S. 250 from the intersection with Rolkin Road to State Farm Boulevard.</p>

## Old Lynchburg Road Shared Use Path between Ambrose Commons and 5th Street



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	A/B
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>The intersection between Old Lynchburg Road and 5th Street is a PSI location and a hot spot for public comment. Public feedback indicated concerns about safety at the intersection, as well as a desire for improved multimodal accessibility along this segment of Old Lynchburg Road. Connectivity for desired multimodal connections along 5th Street should be coordinated.</p>


## Berkmar Drive Shared Use Path between Rio Road and Hilton Heights Road



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population*
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	C/D/E/F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>The intersection of Rio Road and Berkmar Drive is a PSI location. Public feedback indicated a desire for additional bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along Berkmar, which would provide an alternative multimodal connection to travel through the local area. The parallel segment of U.S. 29 from Rio Road to Hilton Heights Road shows a future LOS of D/E/F, indicating significant future congestion concerns. This SUP would support multimodal travel options, increasing overall mobility through this segment of U.S. 29.</p>




## 5th Street Multimodal Improvements from Harris Road to City/County Line, including Moores Creek Crossing



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	High/Medium/Low
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI*	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	E
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>This project would provide a continuous multimodal connection along 5th Street from the intersection of Harris Road south to 5th Street Landing, facilitating access across Moores Creek. Future operations along 5th Street show segments operating at LOS E. This project would improve the safety of multimodal travel along the corridor and support multimodal travel as an alternative in response to increased future congestion.</p>

## Preston Avenue Multi-Modal Improvements from 10th Street NW to Ridge/McIntire



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	High/Medium
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index
Transit PAI	Walk Access - General*
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population*
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	E/F
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>In addition to being a high/medium need indicated throughout the MPO's prioritization process, this segment was a hot spot for public feedback. Public feedback indicated a desire for additional transit access and improved bicycle and pedestrian access. Bicycle and pedestrian safety was specifically an expressed concern. Congestion is expected to worsen in the future horizon year, and improved multimodal infrastructure can provide an alternative travel mode to reduce roadway demand. Specific improvements have not been identified.</p>

## Rivanna River Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge between Pantops and Woolen Mills



<b>Prioritization Overall Need</b>	Medium (at Free Bridge)
<b>Prioritization Process Identified Needs</b>	
Roadway Safety*	Disadvantaged Population PAI*
Bike/Ped Safety*	Travel Time Index
Bike/Ped PAI*	Planning Time Index*
Transit PAI	Walk Access - General
Vehicle PAI*	Walk Access - Disadvantaged Population
<b>2050 Level of Service</b>	F (at Free Bridge)
<b>Additional Information</b>	<p>This project would construct a bicycle and pedestrian bridge to aid multimodal access across the Rivanna River and provide an alternative multimodal crossing from Free Bridge. The TJPDC is submitting a RAISE application for the project to complete the preliminary engineering phase to better estimate right-of-way and construction costs. There was a large concentration of public feedback in the area of Free Bridge, with respondents commenting on the desire for another bridge across the Rivanna River and frustration with congestion along U.S. 250 coming into Charlottesville. The proposed bike/ped bridge would provide that alternative multimodal connection and support stronger efforts to promote mode shift as a way of addressing increased congestion.</p>

## Appendix C: EPA EJScreen Community Reports

EPA EJScreen Community Reports for Charlottesville and Albemarle County are included on the following pages. They provided MPO staff with environmental and socioeconomic data to help inform this plan's environmental justice efforts.




# EJScreen Community Report

This report provides environmental and socioeconomic information for user-defined areas, and combines that data into environmental justice and supplemental indexes.

## Albemarle County, VA

County: Albemarle  
Population: 111,438  
Area in square miles: 725.96


A3 Landscape




April 16, 2024  
Albemarle  
Traffic Proximity (National Percentiles)  
Less than 50 percentile  
50 - 60 percentile  
60 - 70 percentile  
70 - 80 percentile  
80 - 90 percentile  
90 - 95 percentile  
95 - 100 percentile  
Data not available

1:577,791  
0 5 10 20 mi  
0 5 10 20 km  
©2024 Esri, DeLorme, Garmin, TetraGeo, FDO, NITN, NOAA, USGS, Esri, HERE, DeLorme


### COMMUNITY INFORMATION



### BREAKDOWN BY RACE



### BREAKDOWN BY AGE



### LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING BREAKDOWN



### LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT HOME

LANGUAGE	PERCENT
English	87%
Spanish	5%
French, Haitian, or Cajun	1%
German or other West Germanic	1%
Russian, Polish, or Other Slavic	1%
Other Indo-European	2%
Chinese (including Mandarin, Cantonese)	1%
Other Asian and Pacific Island	1%
Total Non-English	13%

Notes: Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2017-2021. Life expectancy data comes from the Centers for Disease Control.


# Environmental Justice & Supplemental Indexes

The environmental justice and supplemental indexes are a combination of environmental and socioeconomic information. There are thirteen EJ indexes and supplemental indexes in EJScreen reflecting the 13 environmental indicators. The indexes for a selected area are compared to those for all other locations in the state or nation. For more information and calculation details on the EJ and supplemental indexes, please visit the [EJScreen website](#).

## EJ INDEXES

The EJ indexes help users screen for potential EJ concerns. To do this, the EJ index combines data on low income and people of color populations with a single environmental indicator.


### EJ INDEXES FOR THE SELECTED LOCATION



## SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES

The supplemental indexes offer a different perspective on community-level vulnerability. They combine data on percent low-income, percent linguistically isolated, percent less than high school education, percent unemployed, and low life expectancy with a single environmental indicator.

### SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES FOR THE SELECTED LOCATION



These percentiles provide perspective on how the selected block group or buffer area compares to the entire state or nation.

Report for County: Albemarle

# EJScreen Environmental and Socioeconomic Indicators Data

SELECTED VARIABLES	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	PERCENTILE IN STATE	USA AVERAGE	PERCENTILE IN USA
<b>POLLUTION AND SOURCES</b>					
Particulate Matter (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	7.09	7.53	25	8.08	22
Ozone (ppb)	55.8	59.1	8	61.6	12
Diesel Particulate Matter (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.137	0.209	28	0.261	27
Air Toxics Cancer Risk* (lifetime risk per million)	28	29	0	25	5
Air Toxics Respiratory HI*	0.3	0.33	0	0.31	4
Toxic Releases to Air	6.6	4,300	6	4,600	7
Traffic Proximity (daily traffic count/distance to road)	56	150	48	210	42
Lead Paint (% Pre-1960 Housing)	0.11	0.22	46	0.3	37
Superfund Proximity (site count/km distance)	0.052	0.11	44	0.13	44
RMP Facility Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.054	0.21	17	0.43	12
Hazardous Waste Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.43	0.61	67	1.9	47
Underground Storage Tanks (count/km <sup>2</sup> )	1.7	1.9	61	3.9	56
Wastewater Discharge (toxicity-weighted concentration/m distance)	5.5E-05	7.2	45	22	26
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS</b>					
Demographic Index	21%	31%	34	35%	34
Supplemental Demographic Index	10%	12%	41	14%	32
People of Color	24%	38%	36	39%	42
Low Income	17%	25%	42	31%	32
Unemployment Rate	3%	5%	52	6%	45
Limited English Speaking Households	2%	2%	69	5%	61
Less Than High School Education	7%	10%	48	12%	44
Under Age 5	5%	6%	55	6%	54
Over Age 64	19%	17%	63	17%	62
Low Life Expectancy	16%	20%	14	20%	15

\*Diesel particulate matter, air toxics cancer risk, and air toxics respiratory hazard index are from the EPA's Air Toxics Data Update, which is the Agency's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. This effort aims to prioritize air toxics, emission sources, and locations of interest for further study. It is important to remember that the air toxics data presented here provide broad estimates of health risks over geographic areas of the country, not definitive risks to specific individuals or locations. Cancer risks and hazard indices from the Air Toxics Data Update are reported to one significant figure and any additional significant figures here are due to rounding. More information on the Air Toxics Data Update can be found at: <https://www.epa.gov/haps/air-toxics-data-update>.

**Sites reporting to EPA within defined area:**

Superfund .....	1
Hazardous Waste, Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities .....	2
Water Dischargers .....	77
Air Pollution .....	94
Brownfields .....	0
Toxic Release Inventory .....	13

**Other community features within defined area:**

Schools .....	26
Hospitals .....	5
Places of Worship .....	118

**Other environmental data:**

Air Non-attainment .....	No
Impaired Waters .....	Yes

Selected location contains American Indian Reservation Lands* .....	No
Selected location contains a "Justice40 (CEJST)" disadvantaged community .....	Yes
Selected location contains an EPA IRA disadvantaged community .....	Yes

Report for County: Albemarle

## EJScreen Environmental and Socioeconomic Indicators Data

HEALTH INDICATORS					
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE
Low Life Expectancy	16%	20%	14	20%	15
Heart Disease	5.1	5.5	45	6.1	31
Asthma	9.2	9.6	35	10	27
Cancer	6.6	6.1	55	6.1	57
Persons with Disabilities	9.3%	12.6%	34	13.4%	27

CLIMATE INDICATORS					
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE
Flood Risk	5%	9%	49	12%	43
Wildfire Risk	2%	2%	93	14%	79

CRITICAL SERVICE GAPS					
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE
Broadband Internet	11%	13%	53	14%	49
Lack of Health Insurance	6%	8%	41	9%	42
Housing Burden	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Transportation Access	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Food Desert	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Report for County: Albemarle






# EJScreen Community Report

This report provides environmental and socioeconomic information for user-defined areas, and combines that data into environmental justice and supplemental indexes.

## Charlottesville, VA

City: Charlottesville  
 Population: 46,597  
 Area in square miles: 10.26

A3 Landscape




April 16, 2024  
 Charlottesville City  
 Traffic Proximity (National Percentiles)  
 50 - 60 percentile  
 60 - 70 percentile  
 70 - 80 percentile  
 80 - 90 percentile  
 90 - 95 percentile  
 Less than 50 percentile  
 172,224  
 0 0.5 1 2 4 km  
 NOAA, Facebook, VGI, Esri, Swire, Garmin, CalTopo, GeoNames, OpenStreetMap, Esri, Bing, Google, EPA, APFC, USGS, USFWS


### LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT HOME

LANGUAGE	PERCENT
English	86%
Spanish	4%
French, Haitian, or Cajun	1%
Other Indo-European	3%
Chinese (including Mandarin, Cantonese)	2%
Other Asian and Pacific Island	1%
Arabic	1%
Other and Unspecified	1%
Total Non-English	14%

### COMMUNITY INFORMATION



### BREAKDOWN BY RACE



### BREAKDOWN BY AGE



### LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING BREAKDOWN



Notes: Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2017-2021. Life expectancy data comes from the Centers for Disease Control.


# Environmental Justice & Supplemental Indexes

The environmental justice and supplemental indexes are a combination of environmental and socioeconomic information. There are thirteen EJ indexes and supplemental indexes in EJScreen reflecting the 13 environmental indicators. The indexes for a selected area are compared to those for all other locations in the state or nation. For more information and calculation details on the EJ and supplemental indexes, please visit the [EJScreen website](#).

## EJ INDEXES

The EJ indexes help users screen for potential EJ concerns. To do this, the EJ index combines data on low income and people of color populations with a single environmental indicator.


### EJ INDEXES FOR THE SELECTED LOCATION



## SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES

The supplemental indexes offer a different perspective on community-level vulnerability. They combine data on percent low-income, percent linguistically isolated, percent less than high school education, percent unemployed, and low life expectancy with a single environmental indicator.

### SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES FOR THE SELECTED LOCATION



These percentiles provide perspective on how the selected block group or buffer area compares to the entire state or nation.

Report for City: Charlottesville

# EJScreen Environmental and Socioeconomic Indicators Data

SELECTED VARIABLES	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	PERCENTILE IN STATE	USA AVERAGE	PERCENTILE IN USA
<b>POLLUTION AND SOURCES</b>					
Particulate Matter (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	7.21	7.53	37	8.08	25
Ozone (ppb)	55.9	59.1	9	61.6	12
Diesel Particulate Matter (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.21	0.209	55	0.261	48
Air Toxics Cancer Risk* (lifetime risk per million)	30	29	26	25	52
Air Toxics Respiratory HI*	0.31	0.33	9	0.31	31
Toxic Releases to Air	2	4,300	3	4,600	5
Traffic Proximity (daily traffic count/distance to road)	200	150	79	210	74
Lead Paint (% Pre-1960 Housing)	0.39	0.22	79	0.3	65
Superfund Proximity (site count/km distance)	0.038	0.11	32	0.13	35
RMP Facility Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.049	0.21	13	0.43	10
Hazardous Waste Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.65	0.61	75	1.9	54
Underground Storage Tanks (count/km <sup>2</sup> )	4.6	1.9	87	3.9	76
Wastewater Discharge (toxicity-weighted concentration/m distance)	5.6E-05	7.2	45	22	27
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS</b>					
Demographic Index	37%	31%	68	35%	61
Supplemental Demographic Index	15%	12%	69	14%	60
People of Color	35%	38%	51	39%	54
Low Income	38%	25%	76	31%	67
Unemployment Rate	4%	5%	60	6%	53
Limited English Speaking Households	2%	2%	71	5%	63
Less Than High School Education	8%	10%	52	12%	48
Under Age 5	5%	6%	55	6%	54
Over Age 64	12%	17%	37	17%	35
Low Life Expectancy	15%	20%	13	20%	14

\*Diesel particulate matter, air toxics cancer risk, and air toxics respiratory hazard index are from the EPA's Air Toxics Data Update, which is the Agency's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. This effort aims to prioritize air toxics, emission sources, and locations of interest for further study. It is important to remember that the air toxics data presented here provide broad estimates of health risks over geographic areas of the country, not definitive risks to specific individuals or locations. Cancer risks and hazard indices from the Air Toxics Data Update are reported to one significant figure and any additional significant figures here are due to rounding. More information on the Air Toxics Data Update can be found at: <https://www.epa.gov/haps/air-toxics-data-update>.

**Sites reporting to EPA within defined area:**

Superfund .....	0
Hazardous Waste, Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities .....	0
Water Dischargers .....	8
Air Pollution .....	39
Brownfields .....	0
Toxic Release Inventory .....	4

**Other community features within defined area:**

Schools .....	13
Hospitals .....	6
Places of Worship .....	45

**Other environmental data:**

Air Non-attainment .....	No
Impaired Waters .....	Yes

Selected location contains American Indian Reservation Lands* .....	No
Selected location contains a "Justice40 (CEJST)" disadvantaged community .....	Yes
Selected location contains an EPA IRA disadvantaged community .....	Yes

Report for City: Charlottesville

## EJScreen Environmental and Socioeconomic Indicators Data

HEALTH INDICATORS					
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE
Low Life Expectancy	15%	20%	13	20%	14
Heart Disease	4.1	5.5	24	6.1	12
Asthma	10.3	9.6	72	10	61
Cancer	4.5	6.1	21	6.1	18
Persons with Disabilities	8.6%	12.6%	30	13.4%	22

CLIMATE INDICATORS					
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE
Flood Risk	9%	9%	72	12%	64
Wildfire Risk	0%	2%	0	14%	0

CRITICAL SERVICE GAPS					
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE
Broadband Internet	12%	13%	57	14%	54
Lack of Health Insurance	7%	8%	51	9%	52
Housing Burden	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Transportation Access	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Food Desert	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Report for City: Charlottesville

# Appendix D: Relationship to Other Plans

## Federal Priorities

### Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a prioritized listing of transportation projects developed by a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) in cooperation with the State, localities, and affected public transportation operators as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process. The TIP lists transportation projects where federal funding has been committed for implementation. Projects included in the TIP must also be included in the MPO's long-range transportation plan.

The TIP covers a four-year period and is updated every three years. The MPO is responsible for preparing the TIP in coordination with the Virginia Department of Transportation and regional transit providers receiving federal funding.

## Statewide Plans

### Virginia Six-Year Improvement Program

The Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) is the approved plan allocating public spending for transportation projects. The SYIP is approved by the Commonwealth Transportation Board annually and includes funding allocations for transportation system studies and construction. The SYIP comprises all projects selected to receive funding through the programs administered by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

### VTrans

VTrans is Virginia's statewide multimodal transportation plan. VTrans establishes the overall vision and goals of the state's transportation system at the direction of the Commonwealth Transportation Board. VTrans uses a ten-year planning horizon to identify mid-term needs. These mid-term needs are used to identify projects that may be eligible for funding through state funding programs such as SMART SCALE and are intended to inform the prioritization of funding requests.

VTrans also maintains an extensive database known as InteractVTrans to identify, analyze, and monitor longer-range trends as part of its long-term planning process. Moving Toward 2050 uses data available through the InteractVTrans dataset to evaluate its regional need priorities, and the statewide goals and objectives were considered in developing the regional priorities.

### Arrive Alive: Virginia 2022-2026 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

Arrive Alive is the required five-year plan for road safety efforts in the state. As a state agency, the Virginia Department of Transportation has adopted a Towards Zero Deaths initiative that supports initiatives identified by multiple federal agencies and national organizations. Arrive Alive provides specific goals and strategies the state is undertaking to achieve the established vision of zero deaths or serious injuries from motor vehicle crashes. The plan aims to reduce motor vehicle-related fatalities and serious injuries by 50 percent by 2045. It outlines several strategies the state is undertaking using a

safe system approach, as identified by the FHWA. The safe system approach involves anticipating that humans will make mistakes and considering those mistakes in the design and management of roadway infrastructure to mitigate risk and minimize harm to the human body.

Arrive Alive strategies will inform state priorities and safety performance targets. These strategies could potentially lead to adjustments to state funding priorities, so the MPO must remain aware of the plan and opportunities to align local initiatives with statewide priorities.

## Pedestrian Safety Action Plan

Virginia's statewide Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (PSAP) was initially adopted in 2018. The PSAP was developed in response to rising pedestrian fatalities throughout the state and identified statewide and regional priority corridors for pedestrian safety improvements and countermeasures that should be considered to address major factor areas contributing to pedestrian crashes.

The PSAP is intended to complement other statewide safety planning initiatives such as Arrive Alive, and a companion Map Viewer developed in conjunction with the PSAP report is updated biennially. MPO staff used data from the most recent PSAP Map Viewer as part of the transportation system evaluation stage of needs and project prioritization.

## Statewide Rail Plan

The Statewide Rail Plan was most recently updated in 2022. The Federal Railroad Administration encourages the plan to identify priorities and strategies to enhance rail within each state that benefits the public and guide federal and state rail investments. The Statewide Rail Plan addresses both freight and passenger rail services. Of note, Virginia recently established a new Virginia Passenger Rail Authority (VPRA) that has assumed all responsibility for state-sponsored passenger rail services and has a stated mission to promote, sustain, and expand the availability of passenger and commuter rail services throughout the state.

An east-west passenger rail connection that would provide a direct connection between Charlottesville and Clifton Forge to the west and Doswell to the east has been identified by VPRA as a priority, and the Statewide Rail Plan reflects the right-of-way acquisition for this rail corridor as a needed infrastructure project. VPRA applied for a grant through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL)'s Corridor Identification and Development Program to develop and scope passenger rail corridor improvements for this Commonwealth Corridor. State efforts to improve this east-west service could be further bolstered by local initiatives to enhance and improve the capacity and accessibility of the Charlottesville Amtrak Station.

## Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment Plan

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) signed in 2021 allocated \$5 billion for the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) program. With additional funding allocated to the discretionary Charging and Fueling Infrastructure grant program, the law aims to establish a comprehensive network of 500,000 EV chargers nationwide by 2030. The NEVI program requires each state to develop an EV Infrastructure Deployment Plan that prioritizes the installation of EV charging infrastructure along Alternative Fuel Corridors (AFCs). Virginia's NEVI plan was completed in September of 2022 and identified the section of I-64 that passes through Charlottesville as an existing gap in the network of publicly accessible fast-charging EV infrastructure, which means that this section of I-64 is identified

among the statewide priorities for deployment of new EV charging infrastructure. As the MPO identified priority projects in this plan, appropriate inclusion of EV charging infrastructure during project identification and scoping was considered to support the achievement of this goal.

## Transit Plans

### Jaunt's Transit Development Plan

The state requires transit agencies that do not serve a census-designated urbanized area and have a bus fleet of fewer than 20 vehicles to adopt a Transit Development Plan (TDP) every ten years. Jaunt's service primarily intends to provide transit service for rural localities outside the urbanized area. Still, much of their service transports riders to the urbanized areas to access jobs, goods, and services. Jaunt has also historically contracted with Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) to provide para-transit services.

TDPs are intended to identify transit service needs and support their planning, execution, funding, and implementation. They guide funding requests for service improvements, support financial planning for ongoing capital and operational expenses, and facilitate the inclusion of transit service needs in statewide and regional planning initiatives.

### Charlottesville Area Transit's Transit Strategic Plan

Transit agencies serving census-designated urbanized areas and with a bus fleet of at least 20 vehicles must complete a Transit Strategic Plan (TSP). The TSP is intended to ensure that transit services are being planned effectively to meet the public transportation needs of the communities where they operate based on existing funding structures.

While both the TDP and TSP primarily focus on operating and capital improvements, there may be opportunities to identify infrastructure improvements that could better support the effective delivery of public transportation. These infrastructure improvements were considered when developing the list of candidate projects and assessing the transportation system's needs in this plan.

## Regional Plans

### Regional Transit Vision Plan

The Regional Transit Vision for the Charlottesville Area is a collaborative effort to evaluate transit service in Charlottesville and the surrounding region and establish a clear long-term vision for efficient, equitable, and effective transit service. The goal of the Regional Transit Vision Project is to establish a single unified, long-term vision for transit service in the Charlottesville area that can be shared and supported by all the members of the RTP and its constituents. Recommendations from this plan were considered when assessing transportation needs for this plan.

### Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

The Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is regionally focused and intended to help build and implement bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. The Plan seeks to encourage implementation by providing a focused list of regionally significant bicycle and pedestrian projects that enhance connectivity and provide routes to important residential and economic centers. This plan provides an update to the 2004 Jefferson Area Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Plan and recommendations for inclusion in long-range transportation plans such as Moving Toward 2050.

## Planning for Affordability

Planning for Affordability is the TJPDC's regional housing plan. It is intended to assist local decision-makers on the need for affordable housing and provide a roadmap of decision points. The plan discusses the importance of a regional approach to affordable housing so that one locality does not shoulder the burden alone. It provides a detailed look at each locality, with the chapters intending to supplement the respective locality's Comprehensive Plans with recommendations across the housing spectrum. During affordability evaluations, transportation and housing costs were considered in tandem because many employees live considerable distances from their places of employment to find affordable housing.

## Environmental Plans

### Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan

The Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan systematically identifies potential hazards and sets long-term implementation goals to reduce risk. Unlike emergency operations plans or disaster preparedness, the plan seeks to develop ways to lessen the impact of natural disasters on the region's resources, including its transportation network, through strategic, long-range planning. The overall goal of hazard mitigation is to save lives and reduce property damage. The plan's evaluation of high-water roads was reviewed as part of the Moving Toward 2050 planning process.

### Albemarle County Climate Action Plan

This Climate Action Plan is consistent with and supports Albemarle County's overall vision for the community. The plan aims to reduce the community's contributions to global climate change while advancing the County's vision of a thriving, vibrant community for every resident. In particular, the Climate Action Plan seeks to benefit the health of all residents, protect the local natural environment, stimulate the creation of green jobs to support a thriving local economy, promote education on climate action for youth and adults, and contribute to a more equitable community, with the benefits of climate action programs easily accessible and affordable for every resident regardless of socio-economic status. The plan's recommendations were reviewed as part of the Moving Toward 2050 planning process.

### Charlottesville Climate Action Plan

Charlottesville's Climate Action Plan is a strategic framework for how the City can reach its goal of carbon neutrality by 2050. It was prepared by the Climate Protection Program within the Department of Public Works' Environmental Sustainability Division, in conjunction with other City departments and with input from the public. The plan's recommendations were reviewed as part of the Moving Toward 2050 planning process.

## Comprehensive Plans

### Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan is a guiding document for growth, development, and investment in Albemarle County. It recommends how and where the County should grow, support local businesses and industry, protect and enhance natural resources, provide transportation options for walking, biking, taking transit, and driving, and allow and encourage various housing types. The Comprehensive Plan guides decisions on public infrastructure and funding, plans and programs, and the review of some development applications. Transportation recommendations from this plan were considered when developing the list



of potential transportation projects.

## Cville Plans Together

Cville Plans Together is an opportunity for the community to actively participate in updating the city's Comprehensive Plan, with a focus on equity and affordability. The document guides the City as it identifies and addresses future changes in ways that will meet the needs of all of Charlottesville's citizens. The Plan will identify future actions regarding the City's growth, its priorities, its development and redevelopment, its health and well-being, and the services that it provides. It reflects the voices of thousands of residents and is the guiding document for shaping the city's future. Transportation recommendations from this plan were considered when developing the list of potential transportation projects.

## Small Area Plans

Small Area Plans are intended to provide a long-range vision for the future of a specific community. While similar to Comprehensive Plans in planning for future growth and development, Small Area Plans focus on a much smaller geographic area, allowing for specific needs and recommendations to be developed. Albemarle County has developed a Small Area Plan for each of its growth areas, and the City of Charlottesville has identified priority communities to work with to develop Small Area Plans in the near future.

Listed below are the Small Area Plans reviewed as part of the Moving Toward 2050 plan development. These plans' recommendations were considered transportation priorities when developing the list of potential transportation projects.

- Crozet Master Plan
- Pantops Master Plan
- Places 29 Master Plan
- Urban Rivanna River Corridor Plan
- Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan
- Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan

## Transportation Studies

Once a transportation need is identified, stakeholders undertake a more technical study to better understand specific issues along a corridor and identify potential solutions. Since the previous long-range transportation plan was developed in 2019, Albemarle County and VDOT have completed several corridor studies to identify recommended improvements to improve safety and operations along priority corridors. A list of transportation studies that were reviewed are listed below.

- North 29 Corridor Study
- Albemarle Transit Expansion Feasibility Study
- Avon Street (Re)Vision
- Rio Road Corridor Study
- 5th Street Corridor Study
- VDOT Project Pipeline Studies

## Appendix E: List of High Water Roads in Charlottesville-Albemarle (from 2023 TJPDC Hazard Mitigation Plan)

- 21 Curves Road (Old Garth Road)
- 21 Curves Road at the pond
- Airport Road at the new post office
- Albemarle Lake Road at Garth Road
- Alderman Road at Twyman
- Avon Street at the ridge
- Ballards Mill Road ¼ mile to 4024
- Route 680 - Browns Gap Road at 240
- Carters Bridge Route 20 South
- Cherry Avenue 500-700 block
- Cherry Avenue at Johnson School to Cleveland Clark Road, just off 810
- Earlysville 700
- East High Street, 1500 block
- East Market Street, 1100 block
- Esmont Road (old railroad trestle)
- Faulconer Drive at Railroad Bridge
- Free Union Road (4933-4920)
- Gilbert Station Road at 640 at the bridge
- Ivy Depot Road / Route 786 at 250
- Route 726 - James River Road at Totier Creek
- Jarmans Gap / Carter Street
- Jefferson Park 1700 at Woodrow
- Kingston Drive at West Leigh Drive
- Meade Avenue 200
- Meade at Fairway over the bridge Milton Road
- 2100 at Milton Hills North Berkshire 2300
- Old Ballard Road
- Old Ivy Road at Garth Road
- Old Ivy Road at the underpass and exit ramp
- Old Lynchburg Road 1200
- Polo Grounds Road east of Route 29 North
- Proffit Road at North Fork Rivanna
- Stony Point Road at Key West
- University Avenue, east of Emmet
- Route 795 past Route 622
- Route 20 South at 708
- Route 240 at 680
- Route 240 Browns Gap Turnpike
- Route 250 West at UPD
- Route 250 bypass at Locust
- Route 29 North At Camelot
- Route 29 ¼ mile south of Red Hil
- Route 53 ¼ mile past the Monticello exit
- Route 53 at Jefferson Vineyard
- Route 53 at Monticello
- Route 6 at Scotland Farm
- Route 600 ¼ mile from Route 22
- Route 600 at Route 20
- Route 600 Watts Passage Railroad bridge
- Route 601 at 810
- Route 601 at Barracks Road Route 602 and 722
- Route 614 1st low spot from Whitehall to Sugar Hollow
- Route 620 1/8 mile south of County Line
- Route 620 at Buck Island Creek Route 622 1 ½ mile from 795
- Route 622
- Route 773
- Route 761
- Route 622 at Hardware River
- Route 626 Loan Oak Farm      Route 627 at Albemarle Farm
- Route 627 at View Mount Farm
- Route 631 and 706 at the bridge
- Route 631 at Dudley Mountain Road
- Route 631 at Gentry Lane
- Route 640 at Route 20
- Route 641 Advance Mills Road
- Route 667
- Route 672
- Route 674 - Slam Gate/Break Heart Road
- Route 680 – Brown’s Gap from 240 to 802
- Route 683 – Shelton’s Mill
- Route 687
- Route 704 between Route 715 and dead-end
- Route 706 ½ mile off 631
- Route 708 at KOA
- Route 708 at Nutmeg Farm
- Route 708 between 627 and 795
- Route 712 at 713
- Route 712 between 627 and 717
- Route 712 between 719 and 631
- Route 712 between Route 713 and 795
- Route 713 from 20 to dead end

- Route 715 between 20 South and 627
- Route 715 between 719 and Route 6
- Route 723 south of Route 6
- Route 726 – James River Road - at Totier Creek
- Route 729 near Route 53
- Route 736 between 635 and 636
- Route 737 between 726 and Route 6
- Route 747 Route 723 south of Route 6
- Route 761 between 622 and 620
- Route 776 off Route 667
- Route 786 at 250 Ivy Depot Road
- Route 795 at 638
- Route 795 at Ash Lawn
- Route 795 between 713 and 708
- Route 795 between Route 620 and Route 708
- Route 795 north of Ash Lawn
- Route 810 Mont Fair
- Route 810 North 601
- Route 810 near Crozet Rescue Squad
- Route 810 North
- Route 687
- Route 810 Nortonsville Route 628
- Route 810 1st bridge north
- Garrisons Sharon Road 1/10 mile to 6 (Route 622)
- Sharon Road at the bridge
- Totier Road North of Route 626
- Watts Passage Road between the bridge and railroad track West Leigh Drive/ Leigh Way
- West Leigh Drive at 250

# Appendix F: Public Participation Record of Input

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
7/26/2023	Every apartment should have a VEO scooter.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Children should have a bus to school (6 agreed).		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Comment that people here don't have money to buy EVs. Some debate over this comment. Another noted we all may have EVs in the future.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	The bus stops so regularly that it's easier to walk or scooter.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	If bike is stolen, you need to report it to police before getting reimbursed.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Fashion square mall is easier to get to by scooter than by bus one person said.	Fashion Square	CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	More scooters and bikes are desired.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Gas is expensive but gas vouchers are only good if you have a car.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Bus is convenient once you know the routes.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Buses aren't always on time.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	You have to wait 45 minutes if you miss the bus, which is a long time.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	The bus does not take you very far.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Buses out of Cville take a while and sometimes have to be scheduled. Commenter mentioned Afton Express and Green County transit.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Route 29 is missing good sidewalk infrastructure (3 agreed).	Route 29	CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Construction on 6th street has removed the sidewalk from the area.	6th Street	CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Stonefield and everything around hydraulic is unsafe.	Hydraulic, Stonefield	CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	One person said a lady in a wheelchair was injured on a bus due to a bad driver. Did not specify what bus.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	6th and Monticello intersection is dangerous, especially for kids (6 agreed).	6th Street & Monticello intersection	CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Need for safe transportation for kids to from schools.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Concern about shortage of bus drivers.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Not everyone can drive their kids to school due to work or lack of cars.		CRHA - Sixth Street	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
7/26/2023	I have to be at work at 6:45 AM but my kids have to be at school at 7:30 so I can't take them.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	More buses. Period.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	If kids can't get to school, they just get a computer to work from home, which isn't helpful when I have to work and can't make sure they're actually paying attention.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Biking to school isn't safe for kids here.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Complaints about not getting responses from bike share (2 agreed).		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	I can't walk too far due to health conditions. Bus is better for me.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
7/26/2023	Getting a car via "network to work" has too long of a waitlist.		CRHA - Sixth Street	
8/9/2023	Shared use paths, specifically along 240 from the east to Park Ridge Drive	240; Park Ridge Drive	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	A lot of families would like to get around Crozet by walking, and using gravel trails is not sufficient – network is inconsistent	Crozet	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Shared use path on 250 from Old Trail to Foxdale Lane – maybe the Three Notched Trail would cover this section	250 from Old Trail to Foxdale Lane	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Eastern Avenue connector – Extend Eastern Avenue south to connect to 250 & north to connect to 240 to provide alternative access in and out of residential area	Eastern Avenue South; 250; 240	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Additional railroad crossings between Park Ridge Drive and existing rail bridge – see stub-out on Crozet Master Plan completed by Frank Stoner as a potential location	Between Park Ridge Drive and Railroad bridge in Crozet	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Centralized sidewalks in downtown Crozet to connect businesses, park, and schools – want families with children to be able to walk safely to school and park on built out sidewalk systems	Downtown Crozet	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Traffic calming on Park Road – safety concerns with families/children walking to park from neighborhood	Park Road	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Sections of Bike Route 76 through Crozet are incredibly dangerous – example is Route 810 from Crozet to White Hall. Traffic backs up behind bikes and drivers get impatient and try to go around them	Bike Route 76; Route 810	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Section of Bike Route 76 on Garth Road is also very dangerous – refer to B.R. 76 study that the TJPDC completed for more info	Bike Route 76; Garth Road	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Bike Route 76 should be marked better for driver awareness of bicyclists	Bike Route 76	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/9/2023	The Crozet trail system is nice, but it's not paved and there are gaps in the network where the paths just end when they run into environmental features like creeks or other obstacles. Would be nice to have those gaps filled and add trailheads and publicly accessible access points. Potential locations could be at Crozet Avenue near the bridge at 240 or coming up on 240 near the constructed wetlands site	Crozet Avenue, 240	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	240 between 250 and Jarmans Gap Road needs the sidewalk gap filled to accommodate young kids walking to school	240 between 250 and Jarmans Gap Road	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Jarmans Gap Road towards Chiles Orchard needs general maintenance/repainting and add shoulders. Would improve safety	Jarmans Gap Road	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	In general, there needs to be investments in established neighborhoods that are consistently overlooked. There needs to be a streetscape initiative on Crozet Avenue from the former Dairy Queen site to Crozet Elementary School	Crozet Avenue from former Dairy Queen to Crozet Elementary School	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Albemarle County needs to hire professionals to comprehensively plan out a trail and participate in the State Trails Advisory Committee		CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	The community should be able to walk to the park safely – very high priority		CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	"•	Safety improvements needed along 250 at these intersections: o o	Miller School Road o	Harris Teeter shopping center o
8/9/2023	Lane capacity issues on 250 for people that are dropping off/picking up children at Henley Middle School and Western Albemarle High School. Right turn lane into Henley is not long enough and needs additional capacity. People are backing up off the shoulder of the road because the holding lane is not sufficient	250 by Henley Middle School; 250 by Western Albemarle High School	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Increase the capacity of I-64 (add third lane) to get more vehicle traffic off of 250 and local roads. Will also help when there are back-ups and delays to maintain the operations of the interstate so that traffic doesn't get diverted to 250 and overload its system capacity	64; 250	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Add a third lane on 250 between the stop light at Miller School Road and Old Trail Road/Western Albemarle High School – Traffic gets backed up during school drop-off and pick-up hours	250 between Miller School Road and Old Trail Road (Western Albemarle High School)	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Need lights at 64/250 – Coming off 64 to get to 250 and crossing 250 is dangerous. Need wider median landing – it is too narrow now (Not sure if this was referring to Exit 107 or Exit 99)	64; 250	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/9/2023	One of the problems is that there is no comprehensive level planning going on for these improvements. Instead of focusing on individual problem areas, need to take corridor perspective		CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	90 degree turn at Park Road is very dangerous – vehicles are regularly crossing the center line coming around that turn	Park Road	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	In general, many of the roads in Crozet are too narrow and lack shoulders	Crozet	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Intersection at Jarmans Gap Road and Lanetown Road/Half-Mile Branch Road is dangerous – the intersection is off-center, so takes a lot of coordination with other drivers at intersection to move through safely	Intersection of Jarmans Gap Road and Lanetown Road/ Half-Mile Branch Road	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Railroad Avenue needs sidewalks or to be widened to accommodate walking	Railroad Avenue	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	In general, need to consider the future plans for the growth of Crozet and make sure transportation improvements are supporting the planned development	Crozet	CAC - Crozet	What are your transportation priorities?
8/9/2023	Get people out of cars whenever possible		CAC - Crozet	In a sentence, how would you describe what the transportation system should do
8/9/2023	Increase system capacity and improve efficiency for commuter traffic (bus, rail, roadway improvements)		CAC - Crozet	In a sentence, how would you describe what the transportation system should do
8/9/2023	Convert people to using active transportation, especially as active transportation technology continues to make it a more efficient and viable transportation option (ie e-bikes)		CAC - Crozet	In a sentence, how would you describe what the transportation system should do
8/9/2023	Light rail between Staunton-Crozet-Charlottesville-farther east	Staunton; Crozet; Charlottesville	CAC - Crozet	In a sentence, how would you describe what the transportation system should do

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/9/2023	Connect community destinations		CAC - Crozet	In a sentence, how would you describe what the transportation system should do
6/21/2023	When planning the bike network, most of the existing infrastructure is inadequate and should be removed from the map - a new map should be created with just safe (i.e., continuous, protected) facilities		CAMPO Open House	
6/21/2023	I am a 21 year old who si car free + intends to stay. That's why I am interested in participating as a transit user in any advisory capacity to any vville administration - Peter Felcity peter.felcity@gmail.com * Need a central clearinghouse for Cville / Alb Cty transit organizaitons - Thx		CAMPO Open House	
7/25/2023	Trains are free and it takes you place to place. It's great. Add wifi to buses		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Route 2 is best. Likes the bus pass being free. Continue keeping them free. Having a route map by bus stops would be helpful		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Transit center should be at Amtrak station instead		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Run the buses all night		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Not enough bike lanes. Some of the bike lanes feel unsafe. Need more protected bike lanes.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Time between buses too long. The bus stop is from where you want. Route 5 CAT has a bus that won't let family member on. They don't put the ramp down for the stroller onto bus. CAT route 5 only has 2 buses. The bus does not run late enough. The bus does not go to Aldi, center shopping, bank. The space between bus stops is too long. Bus smells like marijuana.	Aldi	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	New bridge (Belmont Bridge) does not have enough lights atdark. Wheelchair access on the bridge is not good. Ramps were too steep. Need ramp grade low enough. Carlton Ave and Carlton Rd - No railing on sidewalk and there's a blind guty that walks across there. Buses should run till 11pm and run on Sunday. We like the free bus rides. More public bathrooms available on downtown mall open at more times.	Belmont Bridge; Carlton Ave and Carlton Rd	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Buses between over 1 hour. Need more frequent service. CAT #6, #2 especially bad in bad weather. Need more of a break for bus drivers. Smoking on bus is bad. Too much violence on bus, especially #3 going to Belmont.		Transit Center	



Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
7/25/2023	Change the cloth seat padding to something cleaner. Likes cushioning on seats, asked for better cushioning. Intersection of 10th and preston: Turning right vs bearing hard right drivers get confused and get in wrong lane.	Intersection of 10th and Preston	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	The wait for buses is too long. An hour wait is long enough.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	A while to board or disboard. Need more bus drivers. Want a full schedule on Saturday and need servcie on Sunday, even limited. And people do work on Sunday. The Lofts Apartments: They havea nice bustop. At bustop at social security administration by OMNI Hotel, there's no bench. Need some lighting and benches at bus stops. Empty bottle of liquor on bus, but silly they don't allow food/drink. The AC is too strong on busses even in summer.	Social Security Administration Bus Stop	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Downtown/Tensler park. Buses get everywhere you want to go. E-scooters one good option. Sidewalks everywhere need them to be.	Downtown/Tesler Park.	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Need to make your buses run until they get to the downtown transit station and not go out of service before they get to the downtown transit station.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Shopping centers on N29 hard to get to from downtown. Ivy Rd orthopedic to Barracks Rd hard to access. Public safety concern when walking downtown. Buses are dirty now that they're free. Hard to get to work on Ivy Rd. Have to get uber to work, but bus back is not efficient. Would like efficient, clean trip on bus both ways.	29N; Ivy Rd orthopedic; Barracks Rd	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	More buses + more stops along exisitng routes. Keep buses free. Bus transfers take too long.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Maintenace of roads terrible (Main Street). CAT network is good. Covid impacts network. Transit service 29N challenge. Jaunt helps, but only limited by time of day (Connect). Downtown to 29N hard to access with transit. Transit to airport would be helpful	Main Street; 29N; Airport	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Spread out the buses?		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Sunday bus service to downtown	downtown	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Support CAT + UTS. Dosctor's appt. Sunday CAT service reinstated.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	All buses Sunday route + night route (not 7 + not 5). Different hours + different routes, but some beginning + end stations on Sundays. Add bus stops back at KFC. Add sidewalks at all bus stops + bus stops permanent.	KFC	Transit Center	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
7/25/2023	Increase benefits/wages for employees to help with service delivery to meet demand. Need to focus on operation now before env focus. Improve circulation around city. Any road improvements are good. People trouble getting to Target on CAT is hard. Stay fare free. Lack of reliability is barrier to bus use. Market schedule improvements. Need resources from city. Lack of bus drivers for schools -> more kids walking to school. No waether events, but that could cause issues.	Target	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Sunday service. Late at night service		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	More Veo scooters. Visibility at bus stops. More resting spots at bus stops.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Transit needs to better serve homeless community/shelter. Likes Charlottesville services to help social conditions.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Route 10 doesn't come frequently enough. Lack of Sunday service limits opportunities to get out + do things. End up staying at home.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Destinations: Walmart, Marshalls, Midsommer. Normal to catch bus here @ transit center	Walmart; Marshalls; Midsommer	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Transit stops are too far apart in section of Locus Ave, has disability. Appreciates transit system, drivers.Considers less than quarter mile ideal distance		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Sunday - Barracks Rd + Pantops from downtown. W/out Sunday CAT Service, hard to run errands, shopping, restaurants. After church afternoon leisure like to strolling at shopping center at Barracks Rd. Also no bus at 5th street station on Saturdays - have to take taxi from downtown if unable to walk	Barracks Rd; Pantops from Downtown; 5th Street Station	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Lack of bus service on Sundays. Can't get to work on Sundays. Trying to get from Downtown to Pantops. Have to cross Free Bridge (work at Lazy Parrot in shopping center)	Pantops from Downtown; Free Bridge	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Access to Mcdonald's for job interview. Missed bus and have to wait an hour for next one to come.	McDonald's	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Road maintenance issues throughout city. Biggest complaint drivers hear is that buses aren't on time.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Sunday transit service to Fashion Square mall. Public safety on buses is major concern (don't want people bringing guns on buses)	Fashion Square Mall	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	E Main street by homeless shelter - public safety concerns (safety rooms). Need bike improvements on 29N -> not safe. Need to phsyically separate bikes from car traffic to protect against drunk drivers	E Main Street; 29N	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	More bus drivers. More buses. More service. Hollymead shopping center by bus desired.	Hollymead Shopping Center	Transit Center	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
7/25/2023	Put the time of bus arrival at bus stops		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Buses need to come on time. Run the buses till 12am (midnight) please		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Bus not on time. Hollymead add a stop.		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Bench at stop & protection. Alta vista ave first stop. Issue that when it rains	Hollymead	Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Speeders make roads unsafe		Transit Center	
7/25/2023	Ealier service on buses. Bus #3 should start at 5:30. Ridge and Cherry - there's a turn lane, a ign to yield to bikes. On other side bike lane is in middle. Bus driver won't let you bring fold-up scooter on bus. Pretty happy generally with service	Intersection of Ridge and Cherry	Transit Center	
8/1/2023	Hydraulic is a problem. There seems to be too much traffic for a city this size. Typography limits what you can do. Better use of commercial space	Hydraulic	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	More frequency in bus service		National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Rio Road at Belvedere intersection is dangerous. People speed on Rio. Bike lanes are crowded + dump you into the traffic. Create a transit authority. Put all transit under one system. Need more coordination between all localities and agencies.	Rio Road at Belvedere intersection	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Lochlyn Hill to Greenbrier Elementary -> We want to ride our bikes to school. The sidewalk just ends.	Lochlyn Hill to Greenbrier Elementary	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Bus stop not safe. No sidewalk or bike lane on side of road Harris/Willard intersection. Crosswalk not well marked. No sidewalk across Willard at intersection. Snow plows push snow into sidewalk + intersections. Nothing is ADA Accessible. Disconnected bike lanes. Interference between parking + bike lane. Lack of safety devices at crosswalks once outside of UVA campus -> Fontaine + JPA 1/2 block toward 64 @ Silk Thai / Atlas Coffee. Rear end crashes stopping for pedestrians. Need to repair crosswalks where ADA ramps are installed.	Intersection of Harris/Willard; Fontained + JPA 1/2 block toward 64 @ Silk Thai / Atlas Coffee	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Roundabout at 250/240 in Crozet. Roundabout turning onto Beaver Creek unsafe, so roundabout will help with that. Stanley Martin Development -> Need more connections serving that community (connection road to Jarmans Gap). Instead building connections to Cling(?) Lane - public safety access concern.	250/240 turning onto Beacer Creek in Crozet; Stanley Martin Development	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Narrow sidewalks to Fry Springs pool. Narrow 2-way street -> only 1/2 width sidewalk (Where Harris turns into Jefferson Park Ave + turns into Old Lynvhburg Rd.	Where Harris turns into Jefferson Park Ave + Old Lynchburg Rd	National Night Out - IX Park	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/1/2023	Briarwood neighborhood. It's hard to walk home. There's a lot of traffic. My neighborhood is very safe.	Briarwood neighborhood	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Road outside of King Family Vineyards need to be maintained. 250/240 intersection dangerous - support the roundabout. More bus routes to access Crozet + get to UVA. Park out Emmett / Ivy + take UVA bus to work. Parking for employees of hospital closer to hospital.	250/240 intersection; King Family Vineyards; Crozet to UVA; Emmet + Ivy to UVA; hospital	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Bus routes need to be faster. Otherwise it's not feasible for commuting.		National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Help address climate change.		National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Make people feel safe to ride public transportation. Lighting. Sheltered bus stops. Improve access to schools for kids. Focus on access/equity.		National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Expand transit service outside of urban areas. Congestion in downtown cville is challenge. Walkability is good. Nervous to drive on UVA campus because of pedestrians + safety concerns.		National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Old fashion taxi cabs - I feel more comfortable than with uber. I avoid town whenever I can. Provide safe options (multi-modal) to get around.		National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Main + 5th street area (next to Nickel store) -> heavy traffic disruptive to quality of life. Hard to see pedestrians. All of traffic cut through street accessing UVA. Cherry Ave unsafe due to traffic speed -> Dangerous to cross street coming down hill. Speed limit should be lowered. Seperate scooters from sidewalks. Trash cans left in streets create safety hazards.	Main and 5th street; Cherry Ave	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Construction in UVA area. UVA by corner under bridge unsafe to both drive + walk.	The Corner	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Don't like DDf in Pantops - traffic backups more. Eliminated lane at Kohrs ice cream which impacts traffic going towards Richmond. Add third lane back. Navigation through that area is confusing coming from Shadwell. Makes a little more sense coming from MJ hospital side. Both safety + roadway design. Getting on Rolkin from 250 challenging. Cars stop when they could go ahead + move through intersection. Hydraulic + Rio intersections dangerous for pedestrians to cross.	250 to Rolkin; Hydraulic / Rio intersection	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Access to the food bank and equity accessibility.		National Night Out - IX Park	
8/1/2023	Pedestrian environment on Emmett. Better transit service awareness outside of Cville -> Make people more aware of existing transit service.	Emmett	National Night Out - IX Park	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/1/2023	Falencies corner is dangerous for pedestrians.	Falencies Corner	National Night Out - IX Park	
8/2/2023	Steps are hard for me with my leg. 29 is dangerous. Where the underpass is with Rio Rd and 29 is dangerous too. Interchange at Rio / 29 is bad. Don't like the bag tax.	Rio / 29 interchange	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Pantops and 64 has a lot of congestion when they work on the roads on 250, the traffic gets even more backed up. Unless there's construction, traffic is not too bad. They should not do road construction during rush hour.	64; Pantops	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Roundabouts working well. Do we have enough water and school space for all the new development? Grows then -> concern over gentrification. Concern over Dairy Market gentrification.		Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	What are they gonna do from Pantops to "Black Cat"? Desire for widening to 4 lanes from Pantops to Black Cat. Water is major concern. Interest in the bypass for 29. Wants to build the 29 bypass.	Pantops to Black Cat; 29 bypass	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Park street - There's no bike lane / shoulder, after Melbourne - there's no bike. Even if I'm wearing a yellow vest, cars cut me off.	Park Street, especially after Melbourne	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Recommend taking the money game into the high schools.		Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Light cycles are really long (especially on 29, but more generally). Lights not synchronized along 29.	29	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Bus service to areas outside of region that accommodates day trips (Richmond for example). Light rail in region. West / East to Staunton, S from Culpeper to Lynchburg / Danville.	Richmond; Staunton; Culpeper; Lynchburg; Danville	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Buses should come more often. Scooters and ability to walk to a corner bar		Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Need more transit to Belvedere Center. Increase service area of buses. Some people don't want to take Jaunt, they want to take the bus.	The Center at Belvedere	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Driving will be more and more difficult. There's not good public transit. Wants transit up 64 to Ferncrest. Better in-town transit in Cville. You should force me to park where there's better transit. Avoids 29 cause its crowded. I cannot drive at night, but limited other options.	Ferncrest; 29	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	In the near future, as they build out Polo Grounds Rd, the apts there will use our light at Asheville Blvd and Route 29 intersection -> we've already had some accidents there, but more people will be using it in the future, and the light isn't enough as is.	Polo Grounds Rd; Intersection of Asheville Blvd/Route 29	Center at Belvedere	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/2/2023	Hydraulic is insane, so may lights and crowded. Near Stony Point in Keswick - I have to take Stony Point Pass, but they have to pave that road still - When it rains, there are bad divits on this road. Forest Lakes or Hollymead to the Center at Belvedere by bus would be great. Why don't school bus systems have an inclement weather central where parents can drop their kids off during inclement weather and buses stop there to pick up kids.	Hydraulic Rd; Stony Point Pass	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Potential for more transit in Forest Woods area. Bus stop in front of Holiday Inn (unsure on hotel name) on 29S has issues, because bus stop has to stop in middle of 29 and has no where to pull off. VDOT responsive to complaint to fix pipe protruding out of road. Bus should operate a coffee stand at bus stops so bus drivers can meet clientele and to provide a revenue stream for buses. San Francisco had hooks on back of bus for storing buses, we should try that here. Information on bus network no communicated / advertised well. We could not figure out where to park to take the bus.	29 South in front of Holiday Inn bus stop	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Worried about roads keeping pace with the population growth. The roads are still the same size but the population is growing. Garth Road, specifically, sees a lot of traffic. 21 curves hasn't been changed since I was born. Will it keep up with population? Concern about cut-through 21 curves. People using it to save time. Concern about septic flowing downhill on new development. Keep streams reasonably healthy please.	21 Curves	Center at Belvedere	
8/2/2023	Help the bus system VDOT. Rideshare opt. Bus to Hollymeade, shopping Alb square Rio Hall. Earlysville bus system. - Reys @ Earlysville, Forest bus stop / Old book mobile setup (sic)	Hollymead, Albemarle Square, Earlysville	Center at Belvedere	
8/1/2023	At the county office building on 5th street, pedestrians crossing there. People turning left, put in traffic light or roundabout.	5th Street & Stagecoach Rd intersection	Spark Apts	
8/1/2023	Bad bus - doesn't run late enough. 40 min to 1 hour wait is too long, then it's transferring to get to another bus. Uber is expensive. Long wait times.		Spark Apts	
8/1/2023	Add more sidewalks on 5th street by the county office building - maybe people walking to Wegmans.	5th Street & Stagecoach Rd intersection	Spark Apts	
8/1/2023	Roads are terrible - Hydraulic road has lots of potholes. Roads have a lot of potholes generally.	Hydraulic Rd	Mallside Forest Apartments	
8/1/2023	Work at research park, but there's no bus there - Main Campus to research park.		Northwoods	
8/1/2023	Passes every 2 hours, more drivers. Not enough buses to Barracks. More buses up by Target. The bus drivers see you and keep going. #5 bus line runs here	Barracks Rd; Target	Northwoods	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/1/2023	Need new paint on crosswalks. No specific location. Just generally.		Northwoods	
8/1/2023	Roads for people. Not for cars		Northwoods	
8/1/2023	More sidewalks from these apartments (Northwoods). Oriental market, no good sidewalks there		Northwoods	
8/1/2023	More cameras. Lady's car was stolen, so wants more cameras.		Northwoods	
8/1/2023	Waiting for bus is very long		Mallside Forest Apartments	
8/1/2023	Preferred when it was 1 lane on the road - Rio Rd W	Rio Rd W	Townwood Mobile Homes	
8/1/2023	Hydraulic Rd has a lot of potholes	Hydraulic Rd	Townwood Mobile Homes	
8/1/2023	Adt'l busline on corner of Lambs Road / Hydraulic so people can get to food bank?"Livsandbisherds"	Lambs Rd / Hydraulic Rd	Spark Apts	
8/1/2023	Less bikes on country roads, cause there's no shoulder. Bicycles should have to register and pay tax to use road. Public transit is adequate - it's not that bad. The buses aren't even full. Hydraulic and 29 intersection. Problems with people running red light. 29 and Taylors Gap - speed limit is 60 and there's no sightline cause there if turning its a problem. East Rio Road at put-put. When the mall was more vibrant, the issue is there's no light there	Hydraulic and 29 intersection; 29 and Taylor's Gap; East Rio Rd at put-put	Townwood Mobile Homes	
8/10/2023	Bus to target: Some reach target now b borrowing a car or getting a ride. Wish to get there b bus within 45 minutes	Target	CRHA - Westhaven	What is the absolute first thing you would change about transportation in the region?
8/10/2023	Survey each neighborhood		CRHA - Westhaven	What is the absolute first thing you would change about transportation in the region?
8/10/2023	Ride the bus, experience the isseus with the buses		CRHA - Westhaven	What is the absolute first thing you would change about transportation in the region?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/10/2023	Shelters and benches not equitable: Some bus stops have them, others do not. No bench at Fashion Square Mall or Food Lion stops.	Fashion Square Mall; Food Lion	CRHA - Westhaven	What is the absolute first thing you would change about transportation in the region?
8/10/2023	Have buses running every 15 minutes. Some buses have to wait an hour or more		CRHA - Westhaven	What is the absolute first thing you would change about transportation in the region?
8/10/2023	Fix ADA issues		CRHA - Westhaven	What is the absolute first thing you would change about transportation in the region?
8/10/2023	Walking on Pantops between Giant and Bojangles within the shopping center	Pantops between Giant and Bojangles	CRHA - Westhaven	Where are areas you feel unsafe?
8/10/2023	Bus stops at Hillsdale and Hydraulic (High impact area): No shelter or bench; People take the bus to the grocery stores and have their groceries but have to sit on the sidewalk. Not safe for people in wheel chairs. People come from Michie Drive and Hillsdale and use different routes to get to the bus stop. Not enough pedestrian safe crossing at Michie and Hillsdale.	Hillsdale bus stop; Hydraulic bus stop; Intersection of Michie and Hillsdale	CRHA - Westhaven	Where are areas you feel unsafe?
8/10/2023	1st Street South: Bus stop on Elliot Street. Fast cars, not a safe street to cross. Often walk through Crescent Hills neighborhood to get to bus stop because of safety issues.	Intersection of Elliot and 1st St S	CRHA - Westhaven	Where are areas you feel unsafe?
8/10/2023	One person said transit		CRHA - Westhaven	What would you want to fund first: Transit or sidewalks?
8/10/2023	One person said both are needed to get places and it is not fair to ask that question. Need transportation in the neighborhood and access to other neighborhoods.		CRHA - Westhaven	What would you want to fund first: Transit or sidewalks?
8/10/2023	Sidewalks on Route 29: Some development has sidewalks and some do not creating gaps and unsafe walking journeys. Hard to walk around areas after getting off the bus. Walking between stores and shopping centers is hard to do.	rte 29	CRHA - Westhaven	Where are there sidewalk gaps?
8/10/2023	Whole Westhaven Neighborhood and surrounding community	Westhaven	CRHA - Westhaven	Where are there sidewalk gaps?



Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/10/2023	Unable to go anywhere on Sundays: No buses. Cannot get to stores and run errands		CRHA - Westhaven	Issues with buses
8/10/2023	Bus no longer comes to the neighborhood, have to walk somewhere else to get the bus		CRHA - Westhaven	Issues with buses
8/10/2023	Often late to appointments		CRHA - Westhaven	Issues with buses
8/10/2023	7 CAT bus reaching a lot of necessary stops, most accesible and accommodating		CRHA - Westhaven	Good things about buses
8/17/2023	Connections from the 5th Street Trail Hub and Biscuit Run Trail connection into the City (bike/ped)	5th street trail hub; Biscuit Run Trail	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Improving operations at 5th Street and 5th Street Station Parkway intersection	intersection of 5th street and 5th street station parkway	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Facilitating bike/ped movement on Avon and 5th Street at bridges that cross 64. People currently walking there and the lack of accommodations leads to safety concerns (+2)	Avon and 64; 5th and 64	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	In general, support implementing roundabouts where feasible		CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Want to prepare for electrification and autonomous vehicles. What will the infrastructure needs look like?		CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	What do we imagine our infrastructure needs will be 100 years from now? What do we need to do to incrementally prepare for that (autonomous vehicles, ROW acquisition). Let's not just look 25 years out, but 100 years out.		CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Getting out onto Avon from Southern (?) is a problem.	Avon	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Support investments into passenger rail to provide access outside of our region		CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Plank Road from North Garden to Scottsville is windy and unsafe. There are nice country roads in other parts of the region	Plank Road from North Garden to Scottsville	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	29 Northbound tractor trailers turning onto 64 – truck back up at that location. Needs a capacity improvement	29 North onto 64	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Pedestrian and bike safety from the County into the City is a priority		CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Capacity/operational improvements at Hydraulic and 29. One lane was closed at Hydraulic during some routine maintenance and it shut down traffic on 29 during lunch hour	Hydraulic and 29 intersection	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Traffic circles also support traffic calming		CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/17/2023	Congestion at Free Bridge is a problem	Free Bridge	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Lack of capacity on 250 in Crozet. Residents in Crozet didn't want 250 widened to add additional lanes, but also complain that development is being added without the transportation infrastructure to support it	250 in Crozet	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	Need the 29/Fontaine interchange improvements – would like to see UVA be more active partners in implementing improvements	29/Fontaine	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Eastern Avenue connector in Crozet is important	Eastern Avenue connector in Crozet	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Intersection at Old Trail and 250 gets backed up	Intersection of Old Trail and 250	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Ivy Intersection, coming out at Dick Woods Road – the business keeps growing towards the road and blocks visibility	Ivy and Dick Woods Road intersection	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Owensville onto 250 gets backed up	Owensville onto 250	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Thinking 50 years from now, every intersection will need to be widened. Should reconsider western bypass. Maybe consider an eastern bypass as an alternative. Or at a minimum, improvements to Proffit Road.	29 Bypass; Proffit Road	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Need parallel roadways along northern portion of 29 corridor	29 Corridor	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Getting people that work in development areas up 29 north is a priority. Give them alternatives to 29 as an access option.	29 North	CAC - 5th and Avon	What are your transportation priorities?
8/17/2023	· Move people safely, efficiently, and conveniently between homes and jobs		CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/17/2023	· Provide an alternative to cars – need transit throughout the region to function well		CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/17/2023	· Provide local transportation options to get around within urban areas (like on-demand buses or microtransit)		CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/17/2023	· Support the use of e-bikes with appropriate infrastructure that accommodates different types of users.		CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/17/2023	· Develop off-road shared use paths to provide multi-modal transportation options		CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/17/2023	· Transit will be a good choice is the alternative is so bad		CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/17/2023	· Need to accommodate pedestrians crossing 29 along section between Hydraulic Road and Lowe's	Hydraulic Road and Lowe's	CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/17/2023	· Get people to major employers with multi-modal paths		CAC - 5th and Avon	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/17/2023	· Long distance passenger rail seems to have low priority in regional transportation discussions; it's coming up more at the state level. What can the County do to push for increased trains, better reliability, priority over freight, electrification, raised platforms; connecting between local transit and regional transit is important for a robust network.		CAC - 5th and Avon	Written comments
8/17/2023	· Pie in the sky – light monorail connecting areas at UVA – Hospital, Scott Stadium, JPI, Fontaine. Would remove bus and car traffic, but know it's cost prohibitive.		CAC - 5th and Avon	Written comments
8/17/2023	· I'm not sure what to do about Crozet. 250 will remain a rural road unless the BOS acts to change that. Not sure what to do about Pantops since the 250 bypass is only two lanes each way.	250	CAC - 5th and Avon	Written comments
8/10/2023	· Major concerns about safety on Belvedere, especially near The Center	The Center at Belvedere	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traveling SB on 29 and making right turn onto Rio Road – Other traffic is coming through the intersection it's hard to see. VDOT recently added a stop sign for people making the right turn to stop prior to merging onto Rio Road. Stop sign doesn't do anything, though.</li> </ul>	Southbound 29 at Rio intersection	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need better pedestrian accommodations across 29 in Hydraulic area.</li> </ul>	29; Hydraulic	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to add protected pedestrian refuge areas in medians along 29 where there are lights that can support safe pedestrian crossings. One potential location where this could be accommodated is near the Belk at Fashion Square Mall.</li> </ul>	29 near Belk at Fashion Square Mall	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand 29 to three lanes near North Fork to add capacity</li> </ul>	29 near North Fork	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to complete Berkmar Extension as a parallel local road option to reduce need for local traffic to use 29</li> </ul>	29; Berkmar Extension	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need bus service to extend farther north than Forest Lakes</li> </ul>		CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connecting the dense residential areas on both sides of 29 is a priority between Seminole Square/Stonefield area and up to Rio Roads. 29 bifurcates the community, and more pedestrian walkways, at-grade pedestrian crossing options with protected refuge lanes, and other options to improve safe, comfortable multi-modal travel across 29 is needed to tie the community together</li> </ul>	29; Seminole Square; Stonefield; Rio Road	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maybe need to push back on the idea that the primary purpose of 29 is to move large volumes of vehicles through the area efficiently and instead prioritize multi-modal safety. Take advantage of opportunities to improve safe pedestrian crossing opportunities where there are existing lights, and commit to developing pedestrian overpasses to accommodate safe options for people that need to cross 29</li> </ul>	29	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One attendee discussed not observing a large number of bicyclists traveling along W. Main near the UVA campus and questioning whether there was a need to continue to invest significant resources in bicycle accommodations – others responded that a single day of observations isn't enough to make that assessment and that one reason we may not see a lot of bike riders is that it's not very safe to bike in downtown Charlottesville</li> </ul>	W Main	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/10/2023	· Develop a circulator shuttle system that could move people around between the Hydraulic and Rio Road areas	Hydraulic; Rio Road	CAC - Places 29 North	What are your biggest transportation priorities?
8/10/2023	· Get me out of my car		CAC - Places 29 North	In one sentence, how would you answer the question, "What should the transportation system do?"
8/10/2023	· Focus on multi-modal transportation		CAC - Places 29 North	In one sentence, how would you answer the question, "What should the transportation system do?"
8/10/2023	· Move people safely		CAC - Places 29 North	In one sentence, how would you answer the question, "What should the transportation system do?"
8/10/2023	· Unite the community where there is density		CAC - Places 29 North	In one sentence, how would you answer the question, "What should the transportation system do?"
8/10/2023	· Better safety for bikes (need separated bike lines, sharrows are not sufficient)		CAC - Places 29 North	In one sentence, how would you answer the question, "What should the transportation system do?"
8/17/2023	Old Lynchburg Road as a pain point -- cars flying well over the posted speed limit on a narrow and winding road particularly south of Hickory. With the expansion of Southwood and the additional development of homes in Whittington and the like, this road will only become more dangerous.	Old Lynchburg Rd	CAC - 5th and Avon	Written comment

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/24/2023	A sidewalk is needed to connect from Out-of-bounds to the Colonnades - along Barracks Road on the West Side. Critical for pedestrians to safely cross @ the Georgetown / Barracks intersection	Out-of-bounds; The Colonnades; Georgetown Rd/Barracks Rd intersection	RTP meeting	Written comment
8/24/2023	· Crosswalks are needed across Berkmar coming from Woodbrook Drive to get to Kroger. There is pedestrian infrastructure along Berkmar, but not across Berkmar. Would like to be able to safely walk from Agnor Hurt Elementary School to Kroger, for example. This would also help facilitate pedestrian access to the bus stop located near the Credit Union on Berkmar	Berkmar; Kroger; Woodbrook dr; Agnor Hurt Elementary	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Rio Road is used as a main Road providing access from development areas along 29 to Charlottesville and Pantops. Would like to see a stronger local road network so that there are many alternative routes people could take, as well as more comprehensively supporting pedestrian travel.	Rio Rd	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Rio Road traffic is a nightmare. While there are crosswalks on the road, people don't use the crosswalks to cross, and it's very dangerous. Try to avoid 29 whenever possible and use Hillsdale and Greenbrier as alternate routes. In general, would like to see more alternative routes to 29 implemented.	Rio Rd; 29	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· See lots of people walking and riding bikes along Carrsbrook. Would like to see expanded network of shared use paths throughout the neighborhoods.	Carrsbrook	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Would like to build out a comprehensive multi-use path network. Start by filling connectivity gaps in the existing infrastructure.		CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Connect Commonwealth to Berkmar. Implement physical barriers to separate bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure from vehicular infrastructure.	Commonwealth; Berkmar	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Invest in public and active transportation infrastructure at the same level that we invest in vehicular/roadway infrastructure.		CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Better enforcement of speeding along Rio Road	Rio Rd	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· While there are identified development areas, the development occurs in isolated segments and aren't necessarily connected together well. 29 is a physical barrier that separates communities. Would like communities across 29 to be better integrated with each other.	29	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· SUBWAY		CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/24/2023	· Would like to think more critically about where it is appropriate for bikes to be. Sharrows along smaller roads (Earlsville, for example) may create more conflict for bikes/vehicles. Feeling that bike infrastructure may be over-emphasized compared to pedestrian infrastructure, and would like to see more attention paid to pedestrian infrastructure needs		CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Excited about the micro-transit demonstration project		CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· There is a transportation desert at Woodbrook. Can't easily get to a bus stop. No close, direct access. Have to go to the back of the shopping areas or across Rio Road to get to a bus stop. This limits access to errands and shopping. Almost considering selling home and moving just to have better access to places of interest. Aging in place is limited by lack of transportation options.	Woodbrook	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Reconfigure lights at Rio and Hillsdale	Rio and Hillsdale	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Restore pre-COVID bus service		CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Downgrade the functional classification of Route 29	Route 29	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Slow down traffic on 29 to facilitate safety and improve access along/across it	Route 29	CAC - Rio 29	What are your transportation priorities?
8/24/2023	· Implement existing plans		CAC - Rio 29	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/24/2023	· Maintain what we have already; don't continue to build more		CAC - Rio 29	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/24/2023	· Improve safety and slow traffic down		CAC - Rio 29	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
8/24/2023	· Implement recommendations identified in small area/master plans to improve connectivity		CAC - Rio 29	What is the most important thing the transportation system should do?
8/24/2023	· Abolish VDOT		CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
8/24/2023	· More pedestrian improvements		CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
8/24/2023	· More biking infrastructure		CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
8/24/2023	· Recreational trails		CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
8/24/2023	· More shaded/physical barriers between pedestrians/bicycles and cars		CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
8/24/2023	· I live in Woodbrook. Access to public transportation has gotten worse since the 615 (619? – not sure) was built. I live in a public transportation desert. Without using a car, I cannot access a grocery store, library, department store (Walmart) or hardware store (Lowe's), or my bank (UVA Credit Union). A nearby bus station near ACAC was eliminated when the Route 29 615 was built. A phone call to Jaunt was suggested. I do not qualify because I do not have a disability despite my age (79 years) and long distances I must walk to reach a bus stop (Belk or Library). I tried taking buses from Woodbrook to Northridge for a medical appointment. It took 2 hours 1 way. That included the UVA shuttle from the Main Hospital to Northridge. My mortgage is nearly paid for. I do not want to rent on a bus line and incur a large monthly rent. I am tired of providing feedback to the MPO about this!	615/29	CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
8/24/2023	· Very concerned about Rio Road East traffic growth and use as the primary access to Charlottesville and Pantops	Riod Road East	CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
8/24/2023	· Too much reliance on existing road structure to handle traffic growth. More connecting roads needed to allow more options for travel; ex. Hillsdale Drive to Berkmar	Hillsdale Dr to Berkmar	CAC - Rio 29	Written comment
2/28/2024	More bike and ped infrastructure. Simple, connected, protected bike and pedestrian infrastructure connecting neighborhoods to urban(ish) areas, and connecting City & County to each other.		Project Website	



Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
2/28/2024	<p>The shared use path along Route 20 between the City line and VA-53 is a longstanding, very high priority yet it is absent from the list. This is not some aspirational nice-to-have concept. It is actually one of the most thoroughly vetted connections, Albemarle has a very feasible, buildable plan. But for the change recent changes to SmartScale, it would likely be included in *this* round of SmartScale submissions. Route 20 (City line to 53) should be on the list of "Infrastructure Priorities."</p>		Project Website	
3/6/2024	<p>The top priority - by a long way - should be a GSI at Hyrdaulic/29. Unfortunately, we know that costs about \$100M and it scored low in recent funding exercise. I note with profound regret and anger that MPO was against this GSI in 2014 when the money was sitting right in front of us. I remember the discussion involving MPO members and Lynchburg representatives when they argued this matter in May 2014. This mistake will cost thousands of wasted hours, injuries and a few lives. I hope that sits well with you.</p>		Project Website	
3/8/2024	<p>"The Draft Priority Projects list lacks detail on the ""Planning Priorities,"" a list that wasn't fully presented at the Open House. I am interested in knowing more about several of these, including ""North side of JPA from W. Main to McCormick,"" ""29 North/West Main/UVA Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis,"" and ""E. High Street from 250 to Locust Avenue."" If they are what I think they are, I'd like to see them studied very soon.</p> <p>Also, I noticed that 2050 LOS seems to be one of the key ways of identifying needs. Is that automobile LOS, and if so, why is it used? It is not such a great way of representing conditions in urban areas. VDOT and OIPI are not using it much."</p>		Project Website	
3/11/2024	<p>I appreciate this public forum offering that involves needed education as well as the inclusion of interested community members' with our relevant input for safer healthier car-free transportation planning. This is especially important as we now must to take action to address our climate crisis.</p>		Project Website	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
4/3/2024	<p>A bus rapid transit project along Main, Emmett and Seminole Trail is identified. With all the development that is underway at Hydraulic and Seminole, and the likely increase in development at Fashion Square and Seminole and Rio, a bus rapid transit line connecting at least these three nodes and UVA makes a great deal of sense. With proper screening the rightmost lanes on Seminole could also become a bike lane, providing not only access to the shopping on Seminole for bicycles but also enhancing the use of bicycles to commute to work and school.</p>		Project Website	
4/19/2024	<p>"Thank you for sharing and opening up for comment.</p> <p>This is a very long document, but when rubber meets the road (ha), the actual actionable outcomes are described in just two pages (middle 72-middle 74). There is no table of results from the scoring, or even a sentence description of what all of the projects are. The result is this reads like an elaborate justification to give the illusion of a process, and then presents arbitrary outcomes without evidence. Appendix F seems to have substantial procedural documentation, but again without explaining what the projects do it's not clear how they were assigned scores.</p> <p>One comment on the needs prioritization (Table 7): The "Efficiency &amp; Economic Development" categories seem woefully unambitious. Allowing an entire hour where travel times are more than 70% longer than the best case? That seems absurd. I suggest the threshold should be weeklong TTI &gt; 1.05 for one hour. We should aim for reliable travel times all the time. This is a 26 year horizon planning document after all. If car-based infrastructure can't achieve that, well, too bad. We should prioritize modes that actually can. And the "Accessibility-Focused" weighting should value efficiency much more highly. Why should non-driving options be slow? They should not be.</p> <p>Bugs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 58, the reference to Map 18 should be Map 17.</li> <li>- Most of the map pictures are too low resolution to be useful." </li></ul>		Project Website	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
5/1/2024	<p>"Preserving the rural character of much of the County is crucial, as is conserving the healthy of the envirpoment (waterways, animal habitat and crossings, etc). Part of rural living is, unfortunately, driving places. We cannot walk or run along the roads here without endangering ourselves and drivers, but that is not going to change without massive detriment to the envi-ronment, which we do not want. I would suggest more hubs where people can park and ride/car-pool, coupled with increased public transporta-tion stops at those hubs. Advertising heavily for informal carpooling, as is done in northern VA, would be good, too (people connect at these lots at """"rush hour"""" times and ride in together to make use of HOV lanes).</p> <p>Also, we have to have animal crossings on 29. The amount of roadkill is just staggering, and we all know deer crashes can be fatal to both the deer and human. We have also seen bear, fox, coyote, and more along 29. It is too much.</p> <p>Access on and off 29 is also a very large concern (see, especially, Red Hill Road and 29 right near the Red Hill Quarry-trucks on and off there are a constant danger, as are people going 75-80 mph around that curve in both directions).</p> <p>Finally, invest in the trails and pathways where we have them and where we can connect them to get bicylists and runners/walkers off the roads. We make heavy use of the system, but it needs to be beefed up. Thank you."</p>		Project Website	
5/8/2024	<p>"1. Provide Bicycle/Pedestrian access to the Rivanna River along Polo Grounds Road.</p> <p>2. Utilize the Rail Road corridor for a Commuter Train Possibility"</p>		Project Website	

Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
5/8/2024	<p>""Multi-modal transport planning should include the need for comfortable areas for travelers to wait while awaiting onward modes of travel</p> <p>*Make sure you proactively seek representative community involvement before publishing engagement surveys.</p> <p>*Report the demographic information of residents reached through engagement opportunities to ensure that marginalized communities' self-reported needs are identified and prioritized.</p> <p>*Equitable transit should allow disabled people access to the same flexibility and convenience that is sought for the rest of the population.</p> <p>*Environmental and climate justice should be more boldly embedded into all parts of the document.</p> <p>*References to third-party accolades ( League of American Bicyclists, Walk Friendly Communities) should be revised and updated for accuracy and relevance, and removed where they are at odds with direct community feedback prioritized.</p> <p>*Addressing this expansion of freight movement by 2035 requires clear differentiation between truck and rail freight, with infrastructure planning tailored to each mode's requirements."</p>		Project Website	
5/10/2024	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the LRTP. I applaud the plan's focus on multi-modal transportation infrastructure, and especially the consideration of how shifts in working from home and increasing e-bike usage will increase the demand for safe, comfortable infrastructure for biking and walking. I would point out Hydraulic Rd as an area that has a bike lane which is virtually unusable because it is narrow, unprotected, and adjacent to fast-moving traffic (35-45 mph). This is also an area where many children walk to school (Albemarle, Journey, and Greer) and where these children might choose to bike if it weren't so dangerous. I also want to underline the dire need for more EV fast-charging stations in Charlottesville. The number of EVs appears to have grown exponentially in recent years, but the number of fast chargers remains very limited. Finally, please ensure that community outreach is also conducted in Spanish and Pashto for the benefit of Charlottesville's Hispanic and Afghan populations, who are major CAT customers.</p>		Project Website	


Date Received	Comment	Location(s)	Forum	Prompt
5/14/2024	<p>These documents are too lengthy to provide comments on. I don't have the attention span to read the entire 115 page documents and summarize my comments in this box. I will say that I am incredibly supportive of the inclusion of the Three Notched Trail project. Two thumbs way up! I'd like to see more inclusion of how the Three Notched Trail would move through Charlottesville so it does not have to stop at the Albemarle County border.</p>		Project Website	

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Appendix G: Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO Performance-Based Planning Process

The processes for identifying needs and prioritizing projects are outlined in detail in the following document.

# CHARLOTTESVILLE-ALBEMARLE MPO PERFORMANCE-BASED PLANNING PROCESS





# CHARLOTTESVILLE-ALBEMARLE MPO PERFORMANCE-BASED PLANNING PROCESS

Process for Identification of Needs and Process for Project Prioritization

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Christine Jacobs, Executive Director, Thomas Jefferson PDC  
Sandy Shackelford, Director of Planning and Transportation, Thomas Jefferson PDC

## ABOUT GAP-TA

Visit [vtrans.org/about/GAP-TA](https://vtrans.org/about/GAP-TA) for information about the Growth and Accessibility Planning Technical Assistance program.

## CONTACT INFORMATION

PO Box 1505  
Charlottesville, VA 22902  
Phone: (434) 979-7310  
Email: [info@tjpd.org](mailto:info@tjpd.org)

The opinions and conclusions expressed or implied in this report are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI).

OIPI does not endorse products or manufacturers. Any trade or manufacturers' names that appear herein are solely because they are considered essential to the object of the report.

# CONTENTS

1. Introduction	8
2. CAMPO's Planning Priorities	9
3. Process for the Identification of Needs	10
3.1 Need Category: Safety	13
3.1.1 Performance Measure: Roadway Safety	13
3.1.2 Performance Measure: Pedestrian Safety	16
3.2 Need Category: Accessibility and Equity	18
3.2.1 Performance Measure: Access to Jobs by Bicycle	19
3.2.2 Performance Measure: Access to Jobs by Transit	22
3.2.3 Performance Measure: Access to Jobs by Automobile	25
3.2.4 Performance Measure: Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations	28
3.3 Need Category: Mobility & System Efficiency	30
3.3.1 Performance Measure: Congestion Mitigation	30
3.3.2 Performance Measure: Travel Time Reliability	33
3.3.3 Performance Measure: Transit On-Time Performance	36
3.4 Need Category: Land Use and Economic Development	39
3.4.1 Performance Measure: Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations	39
3.4.2 Performance Measure: Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations	42
3.5 Need Category: Environment and Reliency	44
3.5.1 Performance Measure: Exposure to Projected Sea Level Rise, Storm Surge, or Historic Inland/Riverline Flooding	44

# CONTENTS

4. Process for the Prioritization of Projects	46
4.1 Prioritization Category: Safety	47
4.1.1 Performance Measure: Crash Frequency (S1)	47
4.1.2 Performance Measure: Crash Rate (S2)	48
4.2 Prioritization Category: Accessibility and Equity	49
4.2.1 Performance Measure: Access to Jobs (A1)	49
4.2.2 Performance Measure: Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations (A2)	51
4.2.3 Performance Measure: Access to Multimodal Choices (A3)	52
4.3 Prioritization Category: Mobility & System Efficiency	53
4.3.1 Performance Measure: Demand (M1)	53
4.3.2 Performance Measure: Congestion (M2)	54
4.4 Prioritization Category: Land Use and Economic Development	55
4.4.1 Performance Measure: Access to Non-Work Destinations (L1)	55
4.4.2 Performance Measure: Access to Non-Work Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations (L2)	56
4.4.3 Performance Measure: Proximity to Activity Centers (L3)	57
4.4.4 Performance Measure: Job Growth (L4)	58
4.5 Prioritization Category: Environmental Impact	59
4.5.1 Performance Measure: Sensitive Features (E1)	59
4.6 Project Scoring	60

## LIST OF FIGURES, TABLES, ETC.

<i>Figure 1</i> Need categories and need scores	10
<i>Table 1</i> Roles and Responsibility Matrix	11
<i>Table 2</i> Need Categories and Need Scores	12
<i>Table 3</i> Example of aggregate need score based on weighted category need scores	12
<i>Table 4</i> Crash value conversion table	13
<i>Table 5</i> Roadway safety need scores applied to District PSI ranks	14
<i>Table 6</i> Roadway safety need scores applied to EPDO	14
<i>Figure 2</i> Roadway Safety Geoprocessing Tool	15
<i>Table 7</i> Pedestrian safety need scores	16
<i>Figure 3</i> Pedestrian Safety Geoprocessing Tool	17
<i>Table 8</i> Bicycle access to jobs functional classification score	20
<i>Table 9</i> Bicycle access to jobs need score	20
<i>Figure 4</i> Access to Jobs (Non-Motorized) Geoprocessing Tool	21
<i>Table 10</i> Transit access to jobs functional classification score	23
<i>Table 11</i> Transit access to jobs need scores	23
<i>Figure 6</i> Access to Jobs (Transit) Geoprocessing Tool	24
<i>Table 12</i> Automobile access to jobs functional classification score	26
<i>Table 13</i> Automobile access to jobs need scores	26
<i>Figure 7</i> Access to Jobs (Auto) Geoprocessing Tool	27
<i>Table 14</i> Access to jobs for disadvantaged populations functional classification score	28
<i>Table 15</i> Access to jobs by disadvantaged populations need scores	28
<i>Figure 6</i> Access to Jobs (Transit - Disadvantaged Population) Geoprocessing Tool	29

## LIST OF FIGURES, TABLES, ETC.

<i>Table 16 Congestion mitigation need scores</i>	31
<i>Figure 7 Congestion Mitigation Geoprocessing Tool</i>	32
<i>Table 17 Travel time reliability need scores</i>	34
<i>Figure 8 Travel Time Reliability Geoprocessing Tool</i>	35
<i>Table 18 Bus Transit On-Time Performance need scores</i>	37
<i>Figure 9 Bus On Time Performance Geoprocessing Tool</i>	38
<i>Table 19 Walk access to non-work destinations need scores</i>	40
<i>Figure 10 Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations Geoprocessing Tool</i>	41
<i>Table 20 Walk access to non-work destinations for disadvantaged populations need scores</i>	42
<i>Figure 11 Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations Geoprocessing Tool</i>	43
<i>Table 21 Distressed Communities Index for Zip Codes in the Charlottesville-Albemarle Area</i>	44
<i>Table 22 Safety Performance Measure Weights</i>	47
<i>Table 23 Safety Project Prioritization Data by Project Type</i>	47
<i>Table 24 Accessibility and Equity Performance Measure Weights</i>	49
<i>Table 25 Accessibility and Equity Performance Measure Parameters</i>	49
<i>Table 26 Mobility and System Efficiency Performance Measure Weights</i>	53
<i>Table 27 Land Use and Economic Development Performance Measure Weights</i>	55
<i>Table 28 Functional Classification Buffer Size</i>	57
<i>Table 29 Environmental Impact Performance Measure Weights</i>	59
<i>Table 30 Project Prioritization Category Weights</i>	60

## GLOSSARY OR LIST OF ACRONYMS

CTB	Commonwealth Transportation Board
DRPT	Department of Rail and Public Transportation
EEA	Equity Emphasis Area
GAP	Growth and Accessibility Program
GIS	Geographic Information System
L RTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
OIPI	Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment
PDC	Planning District Commission
TDM	Travel Demand Management
V DOT	Virginia Department of Transportation
VEDP	Virginia Economic Development Partnership
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
RSTP	Regional Surface Transportation Program
PSI	Potential for Safety Improvement
EPDO	Equivalent Property Damage Only

# 1 - INTRODUCTION

In 2021, the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) was awarded a grant through the Virginia Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIP) Growth and Accessibility Planning (GAP) Technical Assistance program to develop a performance-based planning process that identifies transportation needs and prioritizes transportation projects for its Long Range Transportation Plan. Additionally, this process is intended to be managed and maintained over time within the constraints of CAMPO's limited staffing resources. The process resulting from this study is transparent, repeatable, and flexible to accommodate additional measures, new or updated data sources, and alternative analysis parameters, such as needs thresholds and weighting schemes. This data-driven performance-based planning process includes two parts:

1. Process for the Identification of Transportation Needs – This process involves a system evaluation of needs based on performance measures that address goals and objectives in the CAMPO's long range plan including safety, access and equity, mobility and system efficiency, and economic development.
2. Process for the Prioritization of Transportation Projects – This process involves a project-level evaluation of the benefits and costs associated with projects. Project benefits are evaluated based on each project's expected improvements related to safety, accessibility, congestion mitigation, environmental impacts, and economic development. While the prioritization of transportation projects is closely related to the identification of needs and there is a common set of metrics used by both, the analytical processes and combinations of metrics may differ between project prioritization and needs analyses. For example, an important difference is that while needs analysis focuses on existing or forecasted system-level conditions, project prioritization considers a particular project's impacts in its specific location.

This report is divided into four chapters, including this introduction explaining the purpose and organization of the report. Chapter 2 starts by outlining the dimensions of transportation needs indicated in CAMPO's policies and ongoing planning activities. These inform the metrics included in the needs analysis and project prioritization processes. As CAMPO's policies evolve, the performance-based planning process can be updated, extended, or modified accordingly. In addition to presenting the overall process for identifying transportation needs, Chapter 3 discusses the methodologies applied to evaluating needs for each performance measure and the steps for weighting and aggregating across need categories. Chapter 4 presents the process for the prioritization of transportation projects, including the methodologies for evaluating the benefits of all surface transportation improvements, including

highway and roadway, transit, active transportation (i.e., bicycle and pedestrian), and transportation demand management (TDM) projects. Chapter 4 also presents the methodology for normalizing benefit scores across measures, assessing the costs of projects, and developing a single project score that can be used to rank projects across project types. These methodologies were tested on a variety of project types including roadway widenings, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and transit projects.

## 2 - CAMPO'S PLANNING PRIORITIES

Through coordination with CAMPO staff and the CAMPO Technical Committee, the technical work group developed metrics that focus on five need categories: Safety, Accessibility and Equity, Mobility and System Efficiency, Environment, and Economic Development. These five need categories align with CAMPO's 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) vision, goals, and objectives while providing sufficient nuance in supportive measures to evaluate a project's competitiveness for a variety of funding opportunities including SMART SCALE, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP).

The five need categories include:

**Safety** –the aim of the safety category is to identify intersections and segments where safety improvements are needed and prioritize projects that can reduce crashes and/or exposure to risk.

**Accessibility and Equity** – the aim of the accessibility and equity category is to identify areas where the design and/or performance of the transportation system degrades travelers' ability to reach key destinations, like jobs, especially for disadvantaged users; and prioritize projects that are likely to enhance accessibility through improved connectivity, reduction in delay, more frequent transit services, and/or improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**Mobility and System Efficiency** – the aim of the mobility and system efficiency category is to identify segments where congestion-related delay degrades travel time and travel time reliability for automobiles and transit vehicles and to prioritize projects that will alleviate delay and/or enhance person throughput throughout the region. This category also includes a measure which considers the on-time performance of the bus system.

**Environmental** – the aim of the environmental category is to identify resiliency needs, especially where infrastructure is exposed to inland flooding and to prioritize projects that pose no environmental impacts, mitigate impacts, or offer environmental services.

**Land Use and Economic Development** – the aim of the land use and economic development category is to identify areas where there is access to non-work destinations to stimulate local economic activity or to create transportation choices for disadvantaged people and to prioritize projects that connect to areas of local economic development activity.

The technical team for the study conducted an internal capacity assessment to establish the technologies and staff capabilities available to CAMPO for the implementation and maintenance of this process in diverse planning applications. That assessment is summarized in detail in Appendix A. It informed the development of the needs analysis and project prioritization processes by focusing on measures that are supported by readily available data and

implementable in commonly used software, like Microsoft Excel or ArcMap, with no specialized expertise required. The measures described in the remaining chapters of this report are, therefore, accompanied by step-by-step instructions for their production in the appropriate software.



### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

A critical component of the transportation planning process is the identification of needs for future transportation improvements. Traditional needs assessments have focused on evaluating highway system performance including standard infrastructure condition deficiencies, crash hot spots, and network operational performance. Needs analysis methods have relied on these performance measures due to inadequate data for transit and active transportation modes. This process expands the needs analysis to consider transit and active transportation as part of a holistic multimodal needs assessment.

Figure 1 illustrates the general process for the identification of needs. The first step of this process is establishing the need categories and performance measures that align the scoring factors with the MPO’s goals and objectives. The needs addressed in the process developed for this study are organized into the planning priorities described above. A total of 11 performance measures are defined with each measure assigned to one of the four factors, meaning some factors are defined by combinations of several metrics. For example, safety needs are identified through three metrics: PSI ranking, EPDO crash frequency, and pedestrian safety. The confluence of PSI segments and segments with high crash density and segments with high pedestrian safety priorities will have the highest overall safety need.

The first part of step two is the identification of needs. This step screens the full street network to determine segments that are eligible for scoring. Eligibility is determined by using one of the two threshold options discussed in the following sections within each need category. After eligibility is determined, raw scores are calculated for all performance measures within each need category. The specific steps in calculating metrics are often complex, involving multiple input datasets, spatial analysis, computation, summarization, etc. When describing the metrics used in the needs analysis and project prioritization processes, follow the step-by-step instructions for transparency and replicability. However, most metrics can also be processed using automated procedures developed for this study, usually in custom geoprocessors that can be run in ArcGIS or Microsoft Excel spreadsheet tools. Table 1 illustrates a roles and responsibility matrix that indicates agencies that are responsible for different elements of the process.




Figure 1 Process for the identification of needs

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

Table 1 Roles and Responsibility Matrix

Agency	Role
OIPI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide technical help with data from VTrans Web Map</li> <li>▪ Update VTrans data as needed</li> </ul>
VDOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide technical help with VDOT data</li> <li>▪ Update VDOT data as needed</li> </ul>
CAMPO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop planning goals and objectives for the performance-based planning process</li> <li>▪ Collect and manage data from other agencies</li> <li>▪ Run the performance-based planning processes</li> </ul>
City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinate with CAMPO to develop goals and objectives</li> <li>▪ Update local data as needed</li> </ul>
Charlottesville Area Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Update transit data as needed</li> </ul>

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

Since each factor is composed of several performance measures, the measures need to be standardized and combined. In Step 3, all measures are expressed on a consistent seven-point scale, with a value of 1 indicating “Very Low” relative need and a value of 7 indicating “Very High” relative need. As shown by **Table 2**, raw metric values are translated into the seven-point scale based on thresholds that organize similar values into bins reflecting similar levels of need.

**Table 2** Need categories and need scores

Need Category	Need Score
Very Low	1
Low	2
Medium Low	3
Medium	4
Medium High	5
High	6
Very High	7

After metrics are standardized, they are combined into a need score for the need category they support (Step 4). In the combination step, all standardized values are summarized into a single score through a weighted-average score. For example, roadway safety needs may be given greater or lower weight than pedestrian safety needs in the safety analysis. This process allows different weights to be assigned to each metric in the scoring process for each factor. The result is that need category scores are combined into an aggregate needs score that reflects total need based on all five need categories. An example of how scores are combined across all needs categories is provided in **Table 3**.

Since project location is a critical component of environmental impacts, the Environment and Sustainability need category is applied after aggregating need scores. An environmental factor is applied to the overall score as an adjustment to roadway segments that are exposed to projected sea level rise, storm surge, or inland/riverine flooding and whether the segment is within an economically distressed community.

**Table 3** Example of aggregate need score based on weighted category need scores

Need Category	Performance Measure	Weight	Need Score	Weighted Need Score
Safety (30%)	Roadway Safety	15%	4	0.6
	Pedestrian Safety	15%	6	0.9
Accessibility and Equity (30%)	Bicycle Access to Jobs	8%	6	0.48
	Transit Access to Jobs	8%	4	0.32
	Automobile Access to Jobs	6%	6	0.36
	Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations	8%	5	0.4
Mobility and System Efficiency (20%)	Congestion Mitigation	5%	0	0
	Travel Time Reliability	5%	0	0
	Bus Transit On-Time Performance	10%	1	0.1
Land Use & Economic Development (20%)	Access to Non-Work Destinations	10%	5	0.5
	Access to Non-Work Destinations by Disadvantaged Populations	10%	5	0.5
Overall		100%	-	4.16 (Medium)

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

Details of each need category and supporting measures are provided in the sections the follow. The measures presented are applicable to all roadway segments. This process does not identify priorities for recreational trails that are not aligned with a public street, although the impacts of these facilities are accounted for in the bicycle access to jobs metric supporting the Accessibility and Equity need category. Similarly, segments where bicycles and pedestrians are not permitted, such as Interstates and other limited access facilities, are excluded from the bicycle access to jobs and pedestrian safety needs measures.

#### Need Category: Safety

The aim of the safety category is to identify intersections and segments where safety improvements are needed and prioritize projects that can reduce crashes and/or exposure to risk. Safety needs are assessed based on three supporting measures. Two measures: Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) ranking, and equivalent property damage only (EPDO) crash frequency are blended into a roadway safety score. This is complemented by a pedestrian safety score based on VDOT’s current Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.

#### Roadway Safety

Roadway safety needs are evaluated based on the combination of two separate performance measures: Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) ranking and equivalent property damage only (EPDO) crash frequency. The analysis of EPDO crash frequency is limited to segments that are eligible for scoring based on PSI ranking criteria.

PSI is identified by a data-driven safety analysis by VDOT for its Highway Safety Improve Plan (HSIP) that ranks locations by their potential for safety improvement. Locations are ranked within VDOT Construction Districts and statewide. A location’s PSI ranking is an estimate of the extent to which the number of crashes observed at an intersection or along a segment is higher than would be expected based on the facility type, traffic volume, and other factors. The PSI ranking is determined by its excess expected crash frequency, which is the number of observed or “expected” crashes modified by the Empirical Bayes (EB) adjustment method minus the number of typical or “predicted” crashes for the location based on state-specific safety performance functions (SPF). EB accounts for yearly variations and regression to the mean (RTM). SPFs are a mathematical relationship between the frequency of crashes and causal characteristics for a specific highway, including roadway facility type and traffic volume. A positive PSI value indicates a segment or intersection where the number of expected crashes exceeds the number of predicted crashes. Locations with a greater

number of excess expected crashes receive a higher ranking.

The PSI ranking is used to determine segments that are eligible for roadway safety scoring, including the EPDO crash frequency analysis. Segments that do not meet the PSI-based criteria are deemed to have no safety needs, while those that do qualify are differentiated based on their PSI ranking and/or their EPDO crash frequency. The following threshold options were tested to determine scoring eligibility:

1. All PSI Intersections and PSI Segments with three or more crashes in a five-year analysis period.
2. Top ten miles of PSI Segments and top twenty PSI intersections within CAMPO boundaries.

If the first threshold is selected, any feature that has a potential for safety improvement according to VDOT’s PSI analysis is eligible for roadway safety scoring. Alternatively, if the second option is selected, features eligible for scoring are limited to the top ranked segments PSI locations in the study area.

The EPDO crash frequency performance measure identifies locations that have a combined greater severity and frequency of crashes than other locations. It assigns weighting factors to fatal and injury crashes relative to PDO crashes, giving more weight to locations where more severe crashes have occurred. The weighting factors in **Table 4** are used for the identification of roadway safety needs. These values are based on VDOT’s crash costs by severity used for SMART SCALE.

Table 4 Crash value conversion table

Crash Severity	Rounded Value	Weight
Fatal (F) + Severe Injury (A)	\$2,200,000	160
Moderate Injury	\$260,000	20
Minor Injury	\$140,000	10

Source: VDOT EPDO Crash Value Conversion Table (SMART SCALE Technical Guide, 2022)

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for evaluating the level of roadway safety needs by segments:

1. Assign District-level PSI rankings to segments that are eligible for roadway safety scoring.
  - Create route events for PSI segments based on the direction indicated in the PSI segment tabular data. If the direction of the PSI segment applies to both sides of a divided roadway, ensure that route events are created for the opposite route name (WB and SB) in addition the route events created for the prime direction (NB and EB). Use the stated direction only for PSI segments where directionality is limited to eastbound, northbound, southbound, or westbound.
  - Convert PSI Intersections to segments using tabular data to identify the routes that approach PSI intersections. Assign node-based district PSI rankings to segments within a 250 feet influence area around the intersections.
  - Merge segments identified in steps 1a and 1b above into a single collection of segment features with PSI ranking values. If the merged segments needs layer contains both segment-based and intersection-based rankings, retain the higher of the two district PSI rankings.
2. Calculate EPDO crash frequency for segments that are eligible for roadway safety scoring.
  - Assign EPDO weighting factors (Table 3) to all crashes for the most recent five-year analysis period.
  - Assign crash events to segments using a spatial join and sum EPDO-weighted crashes along each segment.

#### Scoring of Roadway Safety Needs

Roadway safety is assessed as each segment’s average standardized score from the PSI ranking and EPDO crash frequency analyses described above. District PSI ranking standardization thresholds are shown in Table 5. EPDO crash frequency standardization is based on the distribution of raw results over the entire collection of segments scored, as shown in Table 6. This requires sorting segments based on their EPDO crash frequency in descending order, then assigning the need score based on the percentile ranking (in terms of total scored mileage) of each segment. For example, the segments representing the top five percent of scored mileage have “very high” need, while segments representing the bottom fifty percent of scored mileage have “very low” need.

Table 5 Roadway safety need scores applied to District PSI ranks

Need Category	Need Score	District PSI Rank
Very High	7	Rank <= 20
High	6	40 >= Rank > 20
Medium High	5	60 >= Rank > 40
Medium	4	80 >= Rank > 60
Medium Low	3	100 >= Rank > 80
Low	2	150 >= Rank > 100
Very Low	1	Rank > 150

Table 6 Roadway safety need scores applied to EPDO

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

Finally, calculate the overall roadway safety need score by averaging the PSI ranking and the EPDO crash frequency standardized scores. Recall that segments that are not ranked in terms of PSI are assumed not to be roadway safety needs, regardless of underlying EPDO crash frequency. Therefore, they are not part of the target layer that is joined with crashes for calculating EPDO crash frequency. Accordingly, although certain segments may have recorded crashes during a five-year period, the overall score may be zero because they are unranked in terms of district PSI ranking.

#### Data Requirements

- PSI Locations (source: 2016-2020 Top Potential Safety Improvement Segments and Intersections Web Map)
- 5 year crash data (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- VDOT Linear Reference System (LRS) Overlap Routes (source: VDOT)

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 2 Roadway Safety Geoprocessing Tool

#### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set parameters in the *Roadway Safety* geoprocessing tool exactly as shown in the above figure with input data saved in the following Input geodatabase and csv folder. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Location:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\csv\Safety

Output Location:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb  
(Safety Feature Dataset)

The *Roadway Safety* geoprocessing tool requires one input from the 'Inputs' geodatabase, Study Area (CAMPO), and three inputs from the 'Inputs\csv\Safety' directory: PSI Intersections, PSI Segments, and Crash Data which contains five years of crash history for all

crash types. To limit the analysis to PSI locations above a certain ranking, change the 'Select Intersection PSI Threshold' and 'Select Segment PSI Threshold' parameters to the desired values. To include all locations from the PSI analysis, set the threshold to greater than or equal the lowest ranked location in the study area.

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### Pedestrian Safety

Pedestrian safety needs are evaluated based on VDOT’s Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (PSAP) priority corridors. The PSAP corridors indicate locations where facility design, operations, context, performance, or other issues are likely to lead to pedestrian crashes. Priority corridors are identified through a systematic analysis of statewide data that includes crash history, design speed, number of lanes, traffic volume, demographics and land uses in the vicinity, and other factors. The PSAP process relies on these factors because pedestrian crash events are relatively rare, and the conditions that elevate pedestrian crash risk may be present on numerous facilities even if pedestrian crashes have not been observed in recent years. The PSAP process generates a score for highway segments across the state. The top scoring segments are mapped and made available for download via a web map

Eligibility for pedestrian safety scoring may be determined by one of the following threshold options, based on a segment’s PSAP score relative to other segments in the region:

1. Regional (District) Top 1% Corridors
2. Regional (District) Top 5% Corridor

The above threshold options reflect the available collections of segments generated by the PSAP process (i.e., scores for all segments are not available for download, and other percentile thresholds would require coordination with VDOT to obtain). The top 1% of corridors tend to emphasize major highways, while the top 5% also includes more local roads and may be more appropriate for MPO-scale applications.

### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for prioritization within the pedestrian safety need category.

1. Download the most recent PSAP Priority Corridors to identify segments eligible for pedestrian safety scoring, selecting the top 1% or top 5%. The PSAP analysis is conducted approximately every three years.
2. Identify the PSAP Score in the PSAP Priority Corridors. In VDOT’s Pedestrian Safety Action Plan 3.0, segments’ PSAP Scores are in the “MAX\_TOT\_SCORE” field.

### Scoring of Pedestrian Safety Needs

Sort the raw pedestrian safety need score (i.e., PSAP Score) in descending order. Then, using **Table 7**, assign the need score based on the segments’ cumulative length percentage of the combined mileage of all segments that have a need for pedestrian safety.

Table 7 Pedestrian safety need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

### Data Requirements

- PSAP 3.0 Regional Priorities (source: VDOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Map Viewer, retrieved from: (source: <https://vdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=02a155fedefa4e71bdb8c0cf524b636f>)

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS



Figure 3 Pedestrian Safety Geoprocessing Tool

### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set parameters in the *Pedestrian Safety* geoprocessing tool exactly as shown in the above figure with input data saved in the following Input geodatabase. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabase:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb  
(Pedestrian Safety Feature Dataset)

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb  
(Pedestrian Safety Feature Dataset)

The Pedestrian Safety geoprocessing tool requires two inputs from the 'Inputs' geodatabase: Study Area (CAMPO) and the Input Needs Segments from the Pedestrian Safety Feature Dataset which may be one of the following:

- District\_1\_Pct\_Segments
- District\_5\_Pct\_Segments



## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### Need Category: Accessibility and Equity

The aim of the accessibility and equity category is to identify areas where the design and/or performance of the transportation system degrades travelers' ability to reach key destinations, like jobs, especially for disadvantaged users; and prioritize projects that are likely to enhance accessibility through improved connectivity, reduction in delay, more frequent transit services, and/or improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Accessibility and equity needs are assessed based on four supporting measures: bicycle access to jobs, transit access to jobs, automobile access to jobs, and access to jobs by disadvantaged populations. These measures combine to provide a holistic, multimodal assessment of needs that accounts for different needs and abilities among travelers throughout the region.

Many of these supporting measures rely on several key concepts, described in general terms here and applied with specific parameters for each measure. Broadly, accessibility is analyzed on a zone basis and describes the ease with which destinations in other zones can be reached from each origin zone. Accessibility scores can be sensitive to the connectivity provided by the current network, its design and performance, traveler characteristics/preferences, and the number of activities (jobs, e.g.) in destination zones. Maps of accessibility scores show which zones can get to the higher or lower levels of activity in other zones. Since the scores derive from activities in other zones, projects to enhance accessibility may be displaced from the zone where need is indicated, as long as the project enhances the connectivity from the zone having the need to one or more other zones where activities are concentrated.

In this process, the identification of accessibility needs by mode is based on the "potential for accessibility improvement" (PAI), which is estimated as the difference between the "current" accessibility offered and a "reference" condition. The "current" condition refers to the cumulative number of activities (jobs in the case of all metrics generated in this process) accessible from a given location applying parameters, such as level of traffic stress (LTS) or average travel speed, that influence the estimated travel times among zones. The "reference" condition refers to the cumulative number of jobs accessible from the same location but with hypothetical parameters that yield an estimated maximum level of job accessibility. Details regarding the current and reference conditions for each mode are discussed in the subsequent sections on mode-specific accessibility performance measures.

The concepts of "maximum travel time" and "decay function" also determine the cumulative number of jobs that are accessible from a given location. In this analysis, maximum travel time defines the maximum amount of time for traveling from an origin census

block to a destination census block. This maximum travel time parameter may reflect, for example, the idea that walking trips longer than 30 minutes are uncommon. Under this assumption, activities in blocks beyond a 30-minute walk would be ignored in a pedestrian accessibility analysis. Decay functions are commonly used in accessibility analyses to provide more weight to jobs that are closer to origin census blocks than jobs that are located further away. Decay functions are applied in the Access Across America data used in the accessibility metrics described below to reflect the tendency for travelers to choose destinations that are nearby, all else being equal.

The accessibility measures described below also employ the concept of a "catchment area." This refers to the area around a zone that is likely to contribute most substantially to its accessibility score, based on the maximum travel time associated with the mode of travel being analyzed. Catchment areas are included in this analysis primarily because project opportunities to enhance accessibility can be displaced from the zone of need and because the Access Across America data that support the analysis do not include underlying data (such as block-to-block travel time estimates) but only the current and reference accessibility conditions. Thus, the catchment area is used to calculate areawide PAI averages around street segments to rank segments according to the PAI in its surrounding travel shed.

Lastly, functional classification is used to scale the weighted average PAI for each segment by the volume of trips the street is expected to carry. Functional classification refers to the grouping of streets and highways into various classes based on the services they provide. This analysis assumes higher classified streets are more heavily utilized than lower classified streets. Therefore, road segments with a higher functional classification are weighted higher than road segments with a lower function classification as opportunities to provide accessibility enhancements.

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### *Bicycle Access to Jobs*

Bicycle access to jobs needs are based on the Access Across America study by the Accessibility Observatory at the University of Minnesota Center for Transportation Studies. This study estimates the number of destinations reachable by bicycle within a given travel time for all census blocks in the United States. In brief, the accessibility calculations performed in the Access Across America study are as follows:

- Calculate travel times by biking from each census block to all other blocks within 20 km using detailed bicycling and walking networks based on OpenStreetMap (OSM) data.
- Calculate cumulative opportunity accessibility to jobs for each block and Level of Traffic Stress score using travel time thresholds of five minutes to one hour. A destination decay function is used to weight the number of jobs reachable such that nearby jobs contribute more to the access score than jobs that are farther away.

Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) is a metric used to evaluate the perception of safety by quantifying the level of discomfort people feel when they bicycle next to traffic. The LTS process assigns numerical values to segments based on OSM tags that indicate the presence or absence of bicycle facilities, number of lanes, and posted roadway posted, and assigns a numerical value of 1 (lowest stress) to 4 (highest stress) to street segments based on these characteristics. For the purposes of applying LTS parameters to the estimation of travel times by biking, LTS values determine segments' traversability. In this case, the tolerance is set to the maximal LTS value. For example, the LTS 3 analysis allows bike trips along facilities classified as LTS 1, 2, or 3, while the LTS 1 analysis only allows bike trips along the LTS 1 facilities. These tolerances reflect the preferences and abilities of different types of users, where LTS 1 is the most inclusive of all users while LTS 4 represents avid cyclists who may tolerate conditions (heavy mixed traffic, e.g.) that are deemed intolerable by other cyclists.

The Access Across America analysis calculates bicycle travel times using an assumed travel speed of 18 kph (approximately 11 mph), while travel times associated with walking portions of trip, including initial access time to reach the nearest network link by foot, barrier-crossing time for segments with a higher stress level than the trip's maximal LRS tolerance, and destination access time, take place at a speed of 5 kph (approximately 3 mph). While bicycle travel time on a network without bicycle infrastructure would be negatively impacted by automobile congestion, this analysis is not sensitive to congestion effects at certain times of the day. The data generated by the study are estimates for each census block of the number of jobs reachable by cycling.

In this analysis, the "current condition" is access to jobs by bicycle along low stress (LTS1) segments and the "reference condition" is access to jobs by bicycling along high stress (LTS4) segments. The reference condition approximates the jobs accessible by cycling assuming all facilities were comfortable for all users rather than only the most avid and experienced cyclists (i.e., how many jobs could be reached by cycling if all facilities were LTS1 facilities?). The deficit that results from subtracting the current condition from the reference condition is the potential accessibility increase (PAI).

The zone (block) data from Access Across America are intersected with 3-mile buffers defining each segment's catchment area. Within each catchment area, the population weighted average PAI is calculated, and the result is multiplied by the segment's functional classification weight. This elevates facilities that are likely to carry relatively high volumes of person trips and that are in areas where bicycle access to jobs could be improved. The segments identified in this process do not necessarily lack suitable facilities for cyclists, so the results should be compared with available inventories of bicycle facilities to determine what projects or investments may be appropriate to enhance bicycle accessibility.

Eligibility for bicycle access to jobs scoring is determined by population weighted PAI for each segment and may be determined by one of the following optional thresholds:

1. All segments where population weighted PAI is greater than zero.
2. All segments where population weighted PAI is greater than the region's median population weighted PAI.

The first option acknowledges all opportunities for potential accessibility enhancements while the second option focuses on the most acute needs. Note that functional classification weightings apply after eligibility is determined.

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for prioritization within the access to jobs by bicycle need category.

1. Obtain the Access Across America datasets given the following parameters:
  - Current Condition: Bicycle LTS 1 (Lowest Stress)
  - Reference Condition: Bicycle LTS 4 (Highest Stress)
  - Maximum Travel Time: 20 minutes
  - Maximum Travel Distance: 3 miles

2. For each census block, calculate PAI as the difference between the reference condition and current condition, or the accessibility deficit between the current condition and the reference condition.

$$\text{Bike PAI} = \text{Reference} - \text{Current}$$

3. Calculate the population weighted PAI for each census block by multiplying PAI by the population of the census block in which the segment is located.

$$\text{Population Weighted PAI} = \text{Population} \times \text{PAI}$$

4. Sum the population weighted PAI and total population in the catchment area around each segment. Next, divide the summed population-weighted PAI by the total population in the catchment area to yield the population-weighted average PAI.

$$\text{Weighted Average PAI} = \frac{\text{Population Weighted PAI}_i}{\text{Catchment Population}_i}$$

5. Calculate the bicycle access to jobs performance measure
  - Assign a functional classification (FC) score to all road segments. Segments where cyclists are not permitted such as Interstates and other limited-access facilities are ignored (receive a score of zero) since they are not relevant to bicycle accessibility.
  - Calculate the raw score for bicycle access to jobs performance measure by multiplying segments' weighted average accessibility improvement by its FC score (see Table 8).

$$\text{Raw Need Score} = \text{Weighted Average PAI} \times \text{FC Score}$$

Table 8 Bicycle access to jobs functional classification score

Functional Class	FC Score
Other Principal Arterial	4
Minor Arterial	3
Major Collector	2
Minor Collector	1
Interstates, Other Freeways & Expressways	0

#### Scoring of Bicycle Access to Jobs Needs

Sort the raw bicycle need score in descending order for all eligible segments. Then, using Table 9 assign the need score based on the segments' cumulative length percentage of the combined mileage of all segments that have a need for bicycle access to jobs.

Table 9 Bicycle access to jobs need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

#### Data Requirements

- Block-Level Access to Jobs (source: Access Across America analysis by the Accessibility Observatory)
- Functional Classification (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 4 Access to Jobs (Non-Motorized) Geoprocessing Tool

### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set parameters in the *Access to Jobs (Non-Motorized)* geoprocessing tool exactly as shown in the above figure with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\NAE\_Tables.gdb
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb (Accessibility Feature Dataset)

The *Access to Jobs (Non-Motorized)* geoprocessing tool requires one input from the 'Inputs' geodatabase: Study Area (CAMPO) The geoprocessing tool also needs the current and reference condition accessibility tables from the 'NAE\_Tables' geodatabase.

Edit the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter to filter which segments

are included in the output. The Bicycle Access to Jobs performance measure excludes features with the functional classification attribute 'Interstate' or 'Other Freeways and Expressways' functional classification because bus bus stops do not exist on these facilities. To limit the Bicycle Access to Jobs needs analysis to segments that are greater than the region's average PAI, change the PAI value in the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter.

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### *Transit Access to Jobs*

Transit access to jobs needs are based on the Access Across America study by the Accessibility Observatory at the University of Minnesota Center for Transportation Studies. This study estimates the number of destinations reachable by transit and by automobile (see Automobile Access to Jobs) within a given travel time for all census blocks in the United States. In brief, the accessibility calculations performed in the Access Across America study are as follows:

- Calculate travel times by transit from each census block to all other blocks within 60km using transit schedules for the 7:00 – 9:00 AM period and detailed walking networks based on OpenStreetMap (OSM) data.
- Calculate cumulative opportunity accessibility to jobs for each block and departure time using travel time thresholds of five minutes to one hour. A destination decay function is used to weight the number of jobs reachable such that nearby jobs contribute more to the access score than jobs that are farther away

In the Access Across America data, the time cost of travel by transit includes all components of a transit journey, including initial access time, initial wait time, on-vehicle time, transfer access time, transfer wait time, and destination access time. On-vehicle travel time, which is derived from GTFS transit schedules, accounts for variations in service frequency by time of day. Access and egress components of trips (i.e., initial, transfer, and access) are assumed to be made by walking at a speed of 5 kph (3 mph). There is no constraint on the number of transfers required, and it is possible for a block-to-block path to be found that does not use a transit vehicle (i.e., the shortest path from an origin block to a destination block requires walking only).

In the Access Across America data, the time cost of travel by transit includes all components of a transit journey, including initial access time, initial wait time, on-vehicle time, transfer access time, transfer wait time, and destination access time. On-vehicle travel time, which is derived from GTFS transit schedules, accounts for variations in service frequency by time of day. Access and egress components of trips (i.e., initial, transfer, and access) are assumed to be made by walking at a speed of 5 kph (3 mph). There is no constraint on the number of transfers required, and it is possible for a block-to-block path to be found that does not use a transit vehicle (i.e., the shortest path from an origin block to a destination block requires walking only).

In the CAMPO needs analysis, the magnitude of need arising from transit access to jobs performance is determined by the difference in block-level access to jobs between the current condition and the

reference condition. The current condition is access to jobs by transit during the 7:00 – 9:00 AM period and the reference condition is access to jobs by automobile during 8:00 – 9:00 AM period. This elevates areas where jobs access by car is significantly higher than by transit, suggesting an opportunity to enhance transit service to make it more competitive with driving. The deficit that results from subtracting the current condition from the reference condition is the potential accessibility increase (PAI).

The zone (block) data from Access Across America are intersected with 5-mile buffers defining each segment's catchment area. Within each catchment area, the population weighted average PAI is calculated, and the result is multiplied by the segment's functional classification weight. This elevates facilities that are likely to carry relatively high volumes of person trips and that are in areas where transit access to jobs could be improved. The segments identified in this process do not necessarily lack existing transit service, so the results should be compared with current transit routes and schedules to determine what projects or investments may be appropriate to enhance transit accessibility.

Eligibility for transit access to jobs scoring is determined by population weighted PAI for each segment and may be determined by one of the following optional thresholds:

1. All segments where population weighted PAI is greater than zero.
2. All segments where population weighted PAI is greater than the region's median population weighted PAI.

The first option acknowledges all opportunities for potential accessibility enhancements while the second option focuses on the most acute needs. Note that functional classification weightings apply after eligibility is determined.

# 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

## Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for estimating the magnitude of need under the *access to jobs by transit score*:

1. Obtain the Access Across America datasets given the following parameters:
  - Current Condition: Transit
  - Reference Condition: Automobile (8 AM)
  - Maximum Travel Time: 45 minutes
  - Maximum Travel Distance: 5 miles
2. For each census block, calculate PAI as the difference between the reference condition and current condition, or the accessibility deficit between the current condition and the reference condition.

$$\text{Transit PAI} = \text{Reference} - \text{Current}$$

3. Calculate the population weighted PAI for each census block by multiplying PAI by the population of the census block in which the segment is located.

$$\text{Population Weighted PAI} = \text{Population} \times \text{PAI}$$

4. Sum the population weighted PAI and total population in the catchment area around each segment. Next, divide the summed population-weighted PAI by the total population in the catchment area to yield the population-weighted average PAI.

$$\text{Weighted Average PAI} = \frac{\text{Population Weighted PAI}_i}{\text{Catchment Population}_i}$$

5. Calculate the *transit access to jobs* performance measure
  - Assign a functional classification (FC) score to all road segments.
  - Calculate the raw score for *transit access to jobs* performance measure by multiplying segments' weighted average accessibility improvement by its FC score (see Table 10).

$$\text{Raw Need Score} = \text{Weighted Average PAI} \times \text{FC Score}$$

Table 10 Transit access to jobs functional classification score

Functional Class	FC Score
Other Principal Arterial	4
Minor Arterial	3
Major Collector	2
Minor Collector	1

## Scoring of Transit Access to Jobs Needs

Sort the raw transit need score in descending order. Then, using Table 11, assign the need score based on the segments' cumulative length percentage of the combined mileage of all segments that have a need for *transit access to jobs*.

Table 11 Transit access to jobs need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

## Data Requirements

- Block-Level Access to Jobs (source: Access Across America analysis by the Accessibility Observatory)
- Functional Classification (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 5 Access to Jobs (Transit) Geoprocessing Tool

#### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set parameters in the *Access to Jobs (Transit)* geoprocessing tool exactly as shown in the above figure with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\NAE\_Tables.gdb
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb (Accessibility Feature Dataset)

The *Access to Jobs (Transit)* geoprocessing tool requires one input from the 'Inputs' geodatabase: Study Area (CAMPO) The geoprocessing tool also needs the current and reference condition accessibility tables from the 'NAE\_Tables' geodatabase.

Edit the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter to filter which segments are included in the output. The Transit Access to Jobs performance

measure excludes features with the functional classification attribute 'Interstate' or 'Other Freeways and Expressways' functional classification because bus bus stops do not exist on these facilities. To limit the Transit Access to Jobs needs analysis to segments that are greater than the region's average PAI, change the PAI value in the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter.

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### *Automobile Access to Jobs*

Automobile access to jobs needs are based on the Access Across America study by the Accessibility Observatory at the University of Minnesota Center for Transportation Studies. This study estimates the number of destinations reachable by automobile within a given travel time for all census blocks in the United States. In brief, the accessibility calculations performed in the Access Across America study are as follows:

- Calculate travel times by car from each census block to all other blocks within 120km for each departure time at 1-hour intervals over the 24-hour period. Block-Level Access to Jobs (source: Access Across America)
- Calculate cumulative opportunity accessibility to jobs for each block and departure time using travel time thresholds of five minutes to one hour. A destination decay function is used to weight the number of jobs reachable such that nearby jobs contribute more to the access score than jobs that are farther away.

In the Access Across America data, the time cost of travel by automobile is evaluated by time of day with average link speeds estimated from TomTom, which reports typical speeds based on data collected from GPS devices. Average speed data reflect conditions on Wednesdays (representing a typical weekday) during the June 2017 to June 2019 period.

In the CAMPO needs analysis, the magnitude of need arising from automobile access to jobs performance is determined by the difference in block-level access to jobs between the current condition and the reference condition. The current condition is access to jobs by automobile during the 8:00 – 9:00 AM period and the reference condition is access to jobs by automobile during the 12:00 – 1:00 AM period. This elevates areas where jobs access by car is significantly lower during the morning commute period than it would be under a free flow condition, suggesting an opportunity to enhance highway operations and/or capacity to offer greater access to destinations when highway demand is highest. The deficit that results from subtracting the current condition from the reference condition is the potential accessibility increase (PAI).

The zone (block) data from Access Across America are intersected with 10-mile buffers defining each segment's catchment area. Within each catchment area, the population weighted average PAI is calculated, and the result is multiplied by the segment's functional classification weight. This elevates facilities that are likely to carry relatively high volumes of person trips and that are in areas where automobile access to jobs could be improved. The segments identified in this process do not necessarily experience acute congestion-related delays, so the results should be compared with measures of

delay and reliability to determine what projects or investments may be appropriate to enhance automobile accessibility.

Eligibility for automobile access to jobs scoring is determined by population weighted PAI for each segment and may be determined by one of the following optional thresholds:

1. All segments where PAI deficit is greater than zero
2. All segments where PAI deficit is greater than the region's median PAI deficit

The first option acknowledges all opportunities for potential accessibility enhancements while the second option focuses on the most acute needs. Note that functional classification weightings apply after eligibility is determined.



### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for estimating the magnitude of need under the *access to jobs by automobile* score:

1. Obtain the Access Across America datasets given the following parameters:
  - Current Condition: Auto (8 AM - 9AM, Peak Period)
  - Reference Condition: Automobile (12 AM - 1 AM, Off Peak Period)
  - Maximum Travel Time: 45 minutes  
Maximum Travel Distance: 10 miles
2. For each census block, calculate PAI as the difference between the reference condition and current condition, or the accessibility deficit between the current condition and the reference condition.

$$\text{Auto PAI} = \text{Reference} - \text{Current}$$

3. Calculate the population weighted PAI for each census block by multiplying PAI by the population of the census block in which the segment is located.

$$\text{Population Weighted PAI} = \text{Population} \times \text{PAI}$$

4. Sum the population in the catchment area around each segment. Next, divide the population weighted PAI by the population in the catchment area to yield the population-weighted average PAI.

$$\text{Weighted Average PAI} = \frac{\text{Population Weighted PAI}_i}{\text{Catchment Population}_i}$$

4. Calculate the *automobile access to jobs* performance measure
  - Assign a functional classification (FC) score to all road segments.
  - Calculate the raw score for automobile access to jobs performance measure by multiplying segments' weighted average accessibility improvement by its FC score (see **Table 12**).

$$\text{Raw Need Score} = \text{Weighted Average PAI} \times \text{FC Score}$$

**Table 12** Automobile access to jobs functional classification score standardization

Functional Class	FC Score
Interstates, Other Freeways & Express, and Other Principal Arterial	4
Minor Arterial	3
Major Collector	2
Minor Collector	1

#### Scoring of Automobile Access to Jobs Needs

Sort the raw automobile need score in descending order. Then, using **Table 13**, assign the need score based on the segments' cumulative length percentage of the combined mileage of all segments that have a need for *automobile access to jobs*.

**Table 13** Automobile access to jobs need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

#### Data Requirements

- Block-Level Access to Jobs (source: National Accessibility Evaluation, retrieved through VTRC)
- Functional Classification (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 6 Access to Jobs (Auto) Geoprocessing Tool

#### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set parameters in the *Access to Jobs (Auto)* geoprocessing tool exactly as shown in the above figure with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\NAE\_Tables.gdb
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb (Accessibility Feature Dataset)

The *Access to Jobs (Transit)* geoprocessing tool requires one input from the 'Inputs' geodatabase: Study Area (CAMPO) The geoprocessing tool also needs the current and reference condition accessibility tables from the 'NAE\_Tables' geodatabase.

Edit the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter to filter which segments are included in the output. The *Automobile Access to Jobs*

performance measure includes all functional classification types. To limit the *Automobile Access to Jobs* needs analysis to segments that are greater than the region's average PAI, change the PAI value in the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter.

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations

Access to jobs by disadvantaged populations needs are based on the analysis of transit access to jobs. However, transit access to jobs results are filtered to segments within areas that are identified as Equity Emphasis Areas (EEA) where transit is available. EEA is an existing dataset provided by OIPI, so no additional calculations are necessary. The full process and data needs are discussed in the Technical Guide for the Identification and Prioritization of the VTrans Mid-Term Needs.

In the CAMPO needs analysis, the magnitude of need arising from access to job for disadvantaged populations is assessed in the same way that transit access to jobs needs are assessed, except that the population weighting is based on populations in EEAs only.

Eligibility for access to jobs for disadvantaged populations scoring is limited to segments within EEAs and determined by population weighted PAI for each segment and may be determined by one of the following optional thresholds:

1. All segments in EEAs where transit is available and where PAI is greater than zero.
2. All segments in EEAs where population weighted PAI is greater than the region’s median population weighted PAI.

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for prioritization within the Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations need category:

3. Obtain the NAE datasets given the following parameters:
  - Current Condition: Transit
  - Reference Condition: Automobile (8 AM)
  - Maximum Travel Time: 45 minutes
  - Maximum Travel Distance: 5 miles
4. For each census block, calculate PAI as the difference between the reference condition and current condition, or the accessibility deficit between the current condition and the reference condition.

$$\text{Transit PAI} = \text{Reference} - \text{Current}$$

5. Calculate the disadvantaged population (DP) weighted PAI for each census block by multiplying PAI by the disadvantaged population of the census block in which the segment is located.

$$\text{DP Weighted PAI} = \text{Population} \times \text{PAI}$$

4. Sum the disadvantaged population in the catchment area

around each segment. Next, divide the population-weighted PAI by the disadvantaged population in the catchment area to yield the population-weighted average PAI.

$$\text{DP Weighted Average PAI} = \frac{\text{DP Weighted PAI}_i}{\text{Catchment DP}_i}$$

5. Calculate the transit access to jobs performance measure
  - Assign a functional classification (FC) score to all road segments.
  - Calculate the raw score for transit access to jobs performance measure by multiplying segments’ weighted average accessibility improvement by its FC score (see **Table 14**).

$$\text{Raw Need Score} = \text{Weighted Average PAI} \times \text{FC Score}$$

**Table 14** Access to jobs for disadvantaged populations functional classification score

Functional Class	FC Score
Other Principal Arterial	4
Minor Arterial	3
Major Collector	2
Minor Collector	1

#### Scoring of Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations Needs

Sort the raw automobile need score in descending order. Then, using **Table 15**, assign the need score based on the segments’ cumulative length percentage of the combined mileage of all segments that have a need for Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations.

**Table 15** Access to jobs by disadvantaged populations need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

#### Data Requirements

- Block-Level Access to Jobs (source: National Accessibility Evaluation, retrieved through VTRC)
- Equity Emphasis Areas (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- Functional Classification (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 7 Access to Jobs (Transit - Disadvantaged Population) Geoprocessing Tool

#### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set parameters in the *Access to Jobs (Transit - Disadvantaged Population)* geoprocessing tool exactly as shown in the above figure with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\NAE\_Tables.gdb
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb (Accessibility Feature Dataset)

The *Access to Jobs (Transit - Disadvantaged Population)* geoprocessing tool requires one input from the 'Inputs' geodatabase: Study Area (CAMPO) The geoprocessing tool also needs the current and reference condition accessibility tables from the 'NAE\_Tables' geodatabase.

The *Disadvantaged Population Access to Jobs* performance measure excludes features with the functional classification attribute 'Interstate' or 'Other Freeways and Expressways' functional classification because bus bus stops do not exist on these facilities. Edit the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter to filter which segments are included in the output. To limit the *Access to Jobs by Disadvantaged Populations* needs analysis to segments that are greater than the region's average PAI, change the PAI value in the 'Filter Accessibility Needs' parameter. Additionally, the EEA Filter Expression limits the analysis to segments in Equity Emphasis Areas (EEA = 'Y') where transit is available (transit = 'Y').

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### *Need Category: Mobility and System Efficiency*

The aim of the mobility and system efficiency category is to identify segments where congestion-related delay degrades travel time and travel time reliability for automobiles and transit vehicles and to prioritize projects that will alleviate delay and/or enhance person throughput throughout the region. Mobility needs are assessed using two measures: congestion mitigation and travel time reliability. Both measures compare congested travel conditions to free flow conditions, assessing the severity of congestion under typical and extreme conditions, respectively.

#### Congestion Mitigation

Congestion mitigation needs are identified through Travel Time Index (TTI), which is the ratio of a segment's typical travel time during an observed period (such as the morning or evening peak commuting period) to the time required to travel the same distance in a reference period (under free-flow conditions, e.g.). A TTI value greater than one indicates there is delay during the observation period, and higher numbers indicate increasingly severe delay due to congestion. TTI is usually measured at a segment level. For example, a TTI of 1.3 indicates typical travel times along a particular segment are 30% longer. If it would take 2 minutes to traverse the segment under free-flow conditions, the TTI of 1.3 would imply it typically takes 2 minutes and 40 seconds during congested conditions.

The dataset used for this analysis contains TTI measures by segment that cover a 14-hour period from 6 AM to 8 PM on weekdays and weekends for multiple years (i.e., TTI for weekdays and weekends in 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 for each hour from 6 AM to 8 PM). The TTI measures, which are calculated by OIPI using INRIX TMC data from the Regional Integrated Transportation System (RITIS), can be obtained from the InteractVTrans Map Explorer, and reflect the ratio of the 50th percentile travel time to the estimated free flow time.

The identification of qualifying segments requires that a given segment at any time in the previous four years exceeds the congestion mitigation need threshold discussed in the following sections.

The following steps outline the process for identifying congestion mitigation needs. In this process the focus is on weekday and weekend TTI from 6 AM to 8 PM analysis periods.

1. For each segment and each year, calculate the weeklong average TTI for each hour in the analysis period by combining the separate estimates of weekday TTI and weekend TTI as follows:
  - Multiply weekday TTI values by 5/7 (five of seven days)
  - Multiply weekend TTI values by 2/7 (two of seven days)
  - Sum the results of 1a and 1b to obtain weeklong average TTI
2. For each segment, tally the number of hours in the analysis period where the weeklong average TTI in any year is above the eligibility threshold. Select eligible segments where the thresholds are satisfied.

Eligibility for congestion mitigation scoring may be determined by one of the following alternative thresholds:

1. Average weeklong TTI in any year is greater than 1.3 for three or more hours or average weeklong TTI is greater than 1.5 for one or more hours.
2. Average weeklong TTI in any year is greater than 1.5 for three or more hours or average weeklong TTI is greater than 1.7 for one more hours.

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for assessing the magnitude of the congestion mitigation need:

1. Calculate the daily cumulative TTI values from 6 AM to 8 PM. This step accumulates over all qualifying hours in a single year to calculate a "daily cumulative TTI" value.

$$\text{Daily Cumulative TTI} = \frac{5}{7} \left( \sum_{\text{Weekday TTI} > T} \text{Weekday TTI} \right) + \frac{2}{7} \left( \sum_{\text{Weekend TTI} > T} \text{Weekend TTI} \right)$$

Where:

T = TTI threshold (1.3, 1.5, 1.7, e.g.)

2. Adjust for magnitude of congestion by multiplying cumulative congested hours by traffic volume using length weighted Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)

$$\text{Normalized TTI\_AADT}_i = \frac{\text{TTI\_AADT}_i - \text{TTI\_AADT}_{\min}}{\text{TTI\_AADT}_i - \text{TTI\_AADT}_{\max}}$$

Where:

TTI\_AADT<sub>i</sub> = Cumulative TTI × AADT for segment i

TTI\_AADT<sub>min</sub> = Minimum Cumulative TTI × AADT for all segments

TTI\_AADT<sub>max</sub> = Maximum Cumulative TTI × AADT for all segments

#### Scoring of Congestion Mitigation Needs

Using **Table 18**, assign need scores based on segments' normalized volume adjusted weekly average TTI.

Table 16 Congestion mitigation need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Normalized Congestion Need Score
Very High	7	0.95 to 1
High	6	0.9 to 0.95
Medium High	5	0.85 to 0.9
Medium	4	0.8 to 0.85
Medium Low	3	0.75 to 0.8
Low	2	0.5 to 0.75
Very Low	1	0 to 0.5

#### Data Requirements

- Travel Time Index (source: INRIX provided by RITIS via InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- AADT (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 8 Congestion Mitigation Geoprocessing Tool

### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set the parameters in the *Calculate Daily Cumulative TTI* and *Congestion Mitigation* geoprocessing tools exactly as shown in the above figures with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Then, run the Calculate Daily Cumulative Travel Time Index geoprocessing tool prior to running the Congestion Mitigation geoprocessing tool. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\csv\Mobility
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb  
(Mobility Feature Dataset)

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb  
(Mobility Feature Dataset)

In the *Calculate Daily Cumulative TTI* geoprocessing tool, set the Travel Time Index Threshold equal to the desired value. This parameter limits the analysis to segments with TTI greater than the value set for the threshold.

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### *Travel Time Reliability*

Travel time reliability needs are identified through Planning Time Index (PTI), which is the ratio of a segment's 95th percentile travel time compared to the time needed to travel the same distance in a reference period (free-flow traffic, e.g.). PTI refers to the total planned duration of travel (expected delay plus unexpected delay) that is required for an on-time arrival for 95% of trips on a given segment. For example, a PTI of 1.5 at a given time indicates that a trip that normally takes 10 minutes in uncongested conditions should be planned to take 15 minutes to ensure that 95% of trips arrive on time. PTI is a measure of travel time reliability because it measures the extent of unexpected delay against free flow traffic and measures the consistency or dependability in travel times across different times of day.

The dataset used for this analysis contains PTI measures that cover a 14-hour period from 6 AM to 8 PM on weekdays and weekends for multiple years (i.e., PTI for weekdays and weekends in 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 for each hour from 6 AM to 8 PM). The PTI measures, which are calculated by OIPI using INRIX TMC data from the Regional Integrated Transportation System (RITIS), can be obtained from the InteractVTrans Map Explorer and reflect the ratio of the 95th percentile travel time to the estimated free flow time.

The identification of qualifying segments requires that a given segment at any time in the previous four years exceeds the congestion mitigation need threshold discussed in the following sections. The following steps outline the process for identifying travel time reliability needs. In this process the focus is on weekday and weekend PTI from 6 AM to 8 PM analysis periods.

1. For each segment and each year, calculate the PTI for each hour in the analysis period by combining the separate estimates of weekday PTI and weekend PTI as follows:
  - Multiply weekday PTI values by 5/7 (five of seven days)
  - Multiply weekend PTI values by 2/7 (two of seven days)
  - Sum the results of 1a and 1b to obtain weeklong average PTI
2. For each segment, tally the number of hours in the analysis period where the weeklong average PTI in any year is above the eligibility threshold. Select eligible segments where the thresholds are satisfied.

Eligibility for travel time reliability scoring may be determined by one of the following alternative thresholds::

1. Average weekday and weekend PTI is greater than 1.3 for three hours or greater than 1.5 for one hour.
2. Average weekday and weekend PTI is greater than 1.5 for three hours or greater than 1.7 for one hour.



# 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

## Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for assessing the magnitude of the congestion mitigation need:

1. Calculate the daily cumulative PTI values from 6 AM to 8 PM. This step accumulates over all qualifying hours in a single year to calculate a "daily cumulative PTI" value.

$$\text{Daily Cumulative PTI} = \frac{5}{7} \left( \sum_{\text{Weekday PTI} > T} \text{Weekday PTI} \right) + \frac{2}{7} \left( \sum_{\text{Weekend PTI} > T} \text{Weekend PTI} \right)$$

Where:

T = TTI threshold (1.3, 1.5, 1.7, e.g.)

2. Adjust for magnitude of congestion by multiplying cumulative congested hours by traffic volume using length weighted Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)
3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 for all years available in the PTI dataset to calculate AADT-weighted daily cumulative PTI for each year. Retain the maximum result across all years for each segment.
4. Normalize the AADT adjusted PTI for all years available in the dataset using the following equation. Normalization results in values ranging from 0.0 to 1.0, with the segment that has the lowest volume adjusted PTI receiving a score of 0.0 and the segment that has the highest volume adjusted PTI receiving a score of 1.0.

$$\text{Normalized TTI\_AADT}_i = \frac{\text{PTI\_AADT}_i - \text{PTI\_AADT}_{\min}}{\text{PTI\_AADT}_i - \text{PTI\_AADT}_{\max}}$$

Where:

PTI\_AADTi = Cumulative PTI × AADT for segment i

PTI\_AADT<sub>min</sub> = Minimum Cumulative PTI × AADT for all segments

PTI\_AADT<sub>max</sub> = Maximum Cumulative PTI × AADT for all segments

## Scoring of Travel Time Reliability Needs

Using **Table 17**, assign need scores based on segments' normalized volume adjusted weekly average PTI.

**Table 17** Travel time reliability need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Normalized Congestion Need Score
Very High	7	0.95 to 1
High	6	0.9 to 0.95
Medium High	5	0.85 to 0.9
Medium	4	0.8 to 0.85
Medium Low	3	0.75 to 0.8
Low	2	0.5 to 0.75
Very Low	1	0 to 0.5

## Data Requirements

- Planning Time Index (source: INRIX provided by RITIS via InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- AADT (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 9 Travel Time Reliability Geoprocessing Tool

### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set the parameters in the *Calculate Daily Cumulative PTI* and *Travel Time Reliability* geoprocessing tools exactly as shown in the above figures with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Then, run the *Calculate Daily Cumulative Travel Time Index* geoprocessing tool prior to running the *Congestion Mitigation* geoprocessing tool. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\csv\Mobility
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb  
(Mobility Feature Dataset)

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb  
(Mobility Feature Dataset)

In the *Calculate Daily Cumulative PTI* geoprocessing tool, set the *Travel Time Index Threshold* equal to the desired value. This parameter limits the analysis to segments with PTI greater than the value set for the threshold.

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### *Bus Transit On-Time Performance*

While there are multiple factors that influence people’s decisions to use public transportation, one of the most important decision-making factors in low-frequency bus systems such as Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) is passenger waiting time, which is influenced by the reliability of the transit service and adherence to published schedules. When buses regularly depart from stops at the scheduled time, passengers can time their arrival at the stop to minimize wait time. However, if the bus is not usually on time, passengers can face unpredictable wait times. Accordingly, one of the most common measures of the effectiveness of the bus transportation system is on-time performance (OTP).

For the purpose of this analysis, OTP measures how well transit vehicles adhere to the published schedule within an acceptable level of deviation measured in time and serves as an indicator of the attractiveness of bus transit as a travel option. OTP is expressed as a percentage and is calculated by the count of bus timepoint departures that are on time divided by the count of total departures multiplied by 100. Buses are considered “on-time” if they are no more than 30 seconds early and no more than 5 minutes late to the major stops on the route schedule.

Since OTP data is only collected at stops where departure times are scheduled (i.e., timepoints), this analysis does not include intermediate stops with scheduled departure times. Since stop locations may include bus stops for more than one route, the term “timepoint” refers to bus stops associated with a specific route (i.e., there may be multiple timepoint features at a single stop location). Additionally, this analysis does not consider reliability in terms of service consistency or the change in reliability over time. For example, a bus that is consistently six minutes late is not on time but is reliable. Furthermore, the analysis of OTP does not provide reasons for poor performance including predictable events such as traffic congestion, passenger loads, and delays due to at-grade railroad crossings or unexpected events like crashes, disabled buses, temporary detours, weather, and issues related to labor.

The following threshold options were tested to determine scoring eligibility:

1. Stops where OTP is less than the systemwide weekly average OTP from the previous year.
2. Stops where OTP is less than 85% or an alternative target value in accordance with CAMPO’s transit performance goals.

Calculate OTP for all timepoints in the analysis period for weekdays and weekends separately.

1. Calculate OTP in two steps:
  - Find the percentage of on-time departures by dividing the sum of on-time departures by the sum of total departures, then multiply by 100.
  - Subtract the result from 100 to obtain the share of departures that are not on time.
2. Multiply timepoints’ weekday OTP values by 5/7 (five of seven days)
3. Multiply timepoints’ weekend OTP values by 2/7 (two of seven days)
4. Sum the results of step 2 and step 3 to obtain weeklong average OTP by timepoint

OTP is used in the identification of needs to determine if stops are eligible for bus transit on-time performance scoring. The first threshold option determines eligibility if OTP at a timepoint is worse than the systemwide weekly average OTP from the previous year or analysis period. Alternatively, if the second threshold option is selected, timepoints are eligible for scoring if OTP is less than a target value set by CAMPO (e.g., 85%). The second threshold option does not require computation of an average weeklong average OTP.

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for assessing the magnitude of the *congestion mitigation* need:

1. Calculate the daily cumulative OTP values from 6 AM to 8 PM. This step accumulates over all qualifying hours in a single year to calculate a “weeklong OTP” value.

$$\text{Weeklong OTP} = \frac{5}{7} \left( \sum_{\text{Weekday OTP} > T} \text{Weekday OTP} \right) + \frac{2}{7} \left( \sum_{\text{Weekend OTP} > T} \text{Weekend OTP} \right)$$

Where:

Weeklong OTP = Average OTP for each stop by route

T = OTP threshold (83%, 85%, 90%, e.g.)

2. Adjust Weeklong OTP by subtracting the on-time rate from 100%. This will ensure that the timepoints with greater needs receive a higher value. For example, a timepoint with an OTP of 80% will become 20%, while a timepoint with an OTP of 60% will become 40%.
3. Account for the magnitude of needs by multiplying the adjusted weeklong OTP by the number of daily boardings and alightings at each timepoint (boardings and alightings are treated as a proxy for ridership in this analysis).

$$\text{OTP}_{\text{Ridership}_i} = \text{Ridership}_i \times \text{Adjusted Weeklong OTP}_i$$

Where,

OTP<sub>Ridership</sub><sub>i</sub> = Ridership Adjusted OTP at timepoint i

Ridership<sub>i</sub> = Daily Ridership at timepoint i

Weeklong OTP<sub>i</sub> = Adjusted Weeklong OTP at timepoint i

4. Normalize ridership adjusted OTP.

$$\text{Normalized OTP}_{\text{Ridership}_i} = \frac{\text{OTP}_{\text{Ridership}_i} - \text{OTP}_{\text{Ridership}_{\min}}}{\text{OTP}_{\text{Ridership}_i} - \text{OTP}_{\text{Ridership}_{\max}}}$$

Where:

OTP<sub>Ridership</sub><sub>min</sub> = Minimum ridership adjusted OTP across all timepoints

OTP<sub>Ridership</sub><sub>max</sub> = Maximum ridership adjusted OTP across all timepoints

#### Scoring of Bus On Time Performance Needs

Using **Table 18**, assign need scores based on segments’ normalized volume adjusted weekly average OTP.

**Table 18** Bus Transit On-Time Performance need scores

Need Category	Need Score	Normalized Reliability Need Score
Very High	7	0.95 to 1
High	6	0.9 to 0.95
Medium High	5	0.85 to 0.9
Medium	4	0.8 to 0.85
Medium Low	3	0.75 to 0.8
Low	2	0.5 to 0.75
Very Low	1	0 to 0.5

#### Data Requirements

- Charlottesville Area Transit On-Time Performance (source: CAT)
- Charlottesville Area Transit Daily Ridership (source: CAT)

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 10 Bus On-Time Performance Geoprocessing Tool

#### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set the parameters in the *Calculate Ridership Adjusted OTP* and *On Time Performance* geoprocessing tools exactly as shown in the above figures with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Then, run the *Calculate Daily Cumulative Travel Time Index* geoprocessing tool prior to running the *Congestion Mitigation* geoprocessing tool. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\csv\Mobility
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb (Mobility Feature Dataset)

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb (Mobility Feature Dataset)

In the *Calculate Ridership Adjusted OTP* geoprocessing tool, set the *On Time Performance Threshold* equal to the desired value. This parameter limits the analysis to timepoints with on-time arrivals less than the value set for the threshold.

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### Need Category: Land Use and Economic Development

The aim of the land use and economic development category is to identify areas where there is access to non-work destinations to stimulate local economic activity or to create transportation choices for disadvantaged people and to prioritize projects that connect to areas of local economic development activity. Land use needs are assessed using two measures: walk access to *non-work destinations* and *walk access to non-work destinations by disadvantaged populations*. Both measures rely on WalkScore and BikeScore indices, focusing on the general population and disadvantaged populations, respectively.

#### *Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations*

The need for walk access to non-work destinations is determined by a segment's maximum of WalkScore and BikeScore and its future population and employment level (i.e., activity level). WalkScore3 measures walkability through measures of access to non-work destinations (cultural, restaurants, groceries, parks, errands) and roadway connectivity such as intersection density and average block length. In this needs assessment process, the maximum WalkScore or BikeScore is weighted by future activity level from the regional travel demand model. This performance measure shows locations that are in close proximity to non-work destinations, population and employment. Through the WalkScore component, the performance measures indicates where there is high network connectivity. However, these locations may have barriers to walking not accounted for in the WalkScore methodology including lack of sidewalks or crosswalks along existing facilities. Therefore, the walk access to non-work destinations performance measures indicates where investments in pedestrian improvements would likely yield the greatest benefits.

Segment eligibility for walk access to non-work destinations scoring may be determined by one of the following optional thresholds:

1. All segments in the City of Charlottesville and in Albemarle County Development Areas
2. All segments in "somewhat walkable" census tracts (i.e., WalkScores greater than 49)

If the first threshold option is selected, all segments in the City of Charlottesville or in one of Albemarle County's five Development Areas are eligible for *walk access to non-work destinations* scoring. Development areas, which are defined by the County's Comprehensive Plan, are intended "to focus development into the urban areas to create quality living areas, avoid sprawl, improve

access to services, and protect the natural and agricultural resources and uses of the rural areas." Development areas include Crozet, Pantops, the US-29 corridor from Hydraulic Road to north of the airport, the Southern and Western neighborhoods adjacent to Charlottesville, and the Village of Rivanna. The effect of selecting this threshold option is that needs will be considered for all areas regardless of the current WalkScore.

Alternatively, if the second threshold option is selected, segments are eligible for *walk access to non-work destinations* scoring if they are in "somewhat walkable" census tracts which is defined by WalkScores that are greater than 49. The result of selecting this threshold option is that needs will be considered for all areas regardless of its designation as a Development Area (for Albemarle County only). However, given that WalkScores are higher in more urban areas due to better network connectivity and shorter distances to amenities, the more realistic outcome is that needs will be identified in areas within Development Areas where there is the greatest potential for improving access to non-work destinations.

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for assessing the magnitude of the *walk access to non-work destinations* need:

1. Calculate segments’ average WalkScore by performing a spatial join of segments that intersect the WalkScore feature layer.
2. Calculate segments’ average activity level by performing a spatial join of segments that intersect the regional travel demand model’s Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) layer that contains total population and all employment. Summarize the average activity level for segments that span two or more TAZs.
3. Calculate segments’ activity weighted WalkScore by multiplying average WalkScore by average future activity level.

$$\text{Weighted Walk Score} = \text{Walk Score} \times (\text{Average Population} + \text{Average Jobs})$$

4. Normalize the weighted WalkScore using the following equation:

$$\text{Normalized Walk Score} = \frac{\text{Weighted Walk Score}_i - \text{Weighted Walk Score}_{\min}}{\text{Weighted Walk Score}_i - \text{Weighted Walk Score}_{\max}}$$

Where:

Weighted WalkScore<sub>i</sub> = WalkScore × Activity level for Segment i

Weighted WalkScore<sub>min</sub> = Minimum WalkScore × Activity level

Weighted WalkScore<sub>max</sub> = Maximum WalkScore × Activity level

#### Scoring of Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations Needs

Sort the normalized average WalkScore weighted by average activity level. Then, using **Table 19**, assign the need score based on the segments’ cumulative length percentage of the combined mileage of all segments that have a need for *walk access to non-work destinations*.

**Table 19** Walk access to non-work destinations need scores applied to segments by population weighted WalkScore

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

#### Data Requirements

- WalkScore and BikeScore (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- Future population and employment (source: Charlottesville-Albemarle Regional Model)

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 11 Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations Geoprocessing Tool

### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set the parameters in the *Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations* geoprocessing tools exactly as shown in the above figures with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\csv\Mobility
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb (Land Use Feature Dataset)

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb (Land Use Feature Dataset)

The Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations performance measure excludes features with the functional classification attribute 'Interstate'

or 'Other Freeways and Expressways' functional classification because pedestrians are not permitted on these facilities.

Edit the 'Select Comprehensive Plan Development Areas' parameter to filter segments by name or by type. Edit the 'Select WalkScore Threshold' parameter walk\_score variable to limit the analysis to segments where the WalkScore is greater than or equal to 50 (i.e., 'Somewhat Walkable' according to WalkScore analysis).



### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations by Disadvantaged Populations

The need for walk access to non-work destinations by disadvantaged populations is similar to the performance measure described in the previous section but the combined WalkScore and BikeScore is weighted by disadvantaged population from Equity Emphasis Areas in the InteractVTrans Map Explorer instead of future activity level. Like walk access to non-work destinations, this performance measure shows locations that are in close proximity to non-work destinations and disadvantaged populations and where there is high network connectivity. However, these locations may still have barriers to walking not accounted for in the WalkScore methodology including lack of sidewalks or crosswalks along existing facilities. Therefore, the walk access to non-work destinations by disadvantaged populations performance measure indicates where investments in pedestrian improvements would likely yield the greatest benefits for disadvantaged residents.

Segment eligibility for walk access to non-work destinations for disadvantaged populations scoring may be determined by one of the following optional thresholds:

1. All segments in EEAs where transit is available
2. All segments in EEAs where transit is available and that are also in “somewhat walkable” census tracts (i.e., WalkScores of 50 or higher)

The implication of selecting all segments in transit EEAs for walk access to non-work destinations scoring is that the current WalkScore does not affect which segments are scored for walk access to jobs by disadvantaged populations. Conversely, the effect of choosing the threshold option that limits scoring to segments in “somewhat walkable” locations is that “car-dependent” EEAs which have a combined WalkScore and BikeScore of less than 50 will not be considered for scoring.

#### Calculation Steps

The following steps outline the process for assessing the magnitude of the walk access to non-work destinations need:

1. Calculate segments’ average WalkScore by performing a spatial join of segments that intersect the WalkScore feature layer.
2. Calculate segments’ disadvantaged population by performing a spatial join of segments that intersect the Equity Emphasis Areas (EEA) Census tract layer. Sum the low-income population, age 75-plus population, disabled population, limited English proficiency population, minority population, and Hispanic

population for each segment.

3. Calculate segments’ weighted WalkScore by multiplying average WalkScore by average disadvantaged populations in intersecting zones.

$$\text{Weighted Walk Score} = \text{Walk Score} \times \text{Segment Disadvantaged Population}$$

4. Normalize the weighted WalkScore using the following equation:

$$\text{Normalized Walk Score} = \frac{\text{Weighted Walk Score}_i - \text{Weighted Walk Score}_{\min}}{\text{Weighted Walk Score}_i - \text{Weighted Walk Score}_{\max}}$$

Where:

Weighted WalkScore<sub>i</sub> = WalkScore × disadvantaged population of Segment i

Weighted WalkScore<sub>min</sub> = Minimum WalkScore × disadvantaged population of all segments

Weighted WalkScore<sub>max</sub> = Maximum WalkScore × disadvantaged population of all segments

#### Scoring of Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations Needs

Sort the normalized average WalkScore weighted by disadvantaged population. Then, using **Table 20**, assign the need score based on the segments’ cumulative length percentage of the combined mileage of all segments that have a need for walk access to non-work destinations.

*Table 20 Walk access to non-work destinations for disadvantaged populations need scores*

Need Category	Need Score	Percent of Total Mileage
Very High	7	0% to 5%
High	6	5.001% to 10%
Medium High	5	10.001% to 15%
Medium	4	15.001% to 20%
Medium Low	3	20.001% to 25%
Low	2	25.001% to 50%
Very Low	1	50.001% to 100%

#### Data Requirements

- WalkScore and BikeScore (source: InteractVTrans)
- Equity Emphasis Areas (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS




Figure 12 Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations Geoprocessing Tool

### Geoprocessing Tool Overview

Set the parameters in the *Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations* geoprocessing tools exactly as shown in the above figures with input data saved in the following Input geodatabases. Save outputs with a descriptive name in the following output geodatabase.

Input Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\csv\Mobility
- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Inputs\Inputs.gdb (Land Use Feature Dataset)

Output Geodatabases:

- C:\PerformanceBasedPlanningProcess\Outputs\Outputs.gdb (Land Use Feature Dataset)

The *Walk Access to Non-Work Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations* performance measure excludes features with the functional classification attribute 'Interstate' or 'Other Freeways and Expressways' functional classification because pedestrians are not permitted on these facilities.

Edit the 'Select Comprehensive Plan Development Areas' parameter to filter segments by area name or by type (e.g., 'Community', 'Town', 'Village', or 'Neighborhood'). Edit the 'Select WalkScore Threshold' parameter `walk_score` variable to limit the analysis to segments where the WalkScore is greater than or equal to 50 (i.e., 'Somewhat Walkable' according to WalkScore analysis).

### 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

#### Need Category: Environment and Resiliency

The aim of the environmental category is to identify resiliency needs, especially where infrastructure is exposed to inland flooding and to prioritize projects that pose no environmental impacts, mitigate impacts, or offer environmental services.

#### Exposure to Projected Sea Level Rise, Storm Surge, or Historical Inland/Riverine Flooding

Environmental and Resiliency needs are accounted for as an adjustment to combined needs scores for segments that are exposed to sea level rise, storm surge, or historical flooding and are within an Economically Distressed Community. This metric adjusts the aggregate scores of all roadway segments with a need based on Flooding Risk Assessment and the Distressed Communities Index (DCI).

OIPI’s Flooding Risk Assessment is a system level analysis of the system’s assets’ (i.e., roads and bridges) vulnerability to climate change, including sea level rise, storm surge, and inland flooding. The components of vulnerability as defined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) include exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity. For the purposes of CAMPO’s environmental needs analysis, only system exposure to inland flooding is considered. The following definitions, which are taken from the VTrans Vulnerability

Assessment Tech Memo, reflect the components of vulnerability as defined by FHWA.

- Exposure determines whether the asset is experiencing the direct effects of climate change
- Sensitivity determines how well the system fares when exposed to climatic events
- Adaptive Capacity determines the system’s ability to adjust with future climate impacts

The Distressed Communities Index (DCI), which derives data from the American Community Survey (ACS), sorts zip codes into quintiles of economic well-being: prosperous, comfortable, mid-tier, at risk, and distressed. The seven components of DCI is the share of residents who are 25 or older who do not have a high school diploma or equivalent, housing vacancy rate, unemployment rate for working-age adults (25-54), the share of the population living under the poverty line, median household income as a percent of metro area/state median household income, the percent change in employment from 2016 to 2020, and the percent change in the number of business establishments from 2016 to 2020. **Table 21** lists zip codes in the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO area by DCI.

Table 21 Distressed Communities Index for Zip Codes in the Charlottesville-Albemarle Area

Zip Code	Post Office	Distressed Communities Index	Population (2021)
22901	Charlottesville	35.6 (Comfortable)	36,964
22902	Charlottesville	38.5 (Comfortable)	24,018
22903	Charlottesville	62.9 (At Risk)	44,101
22904 <sub>4</sub>	Charlottesville	n/a	3,119
22911	Charlottesville	7.4 (Prosperous)	18,627
22923	Barboursville	9.4 (Prosperous)	6,004
22932	Crozet	15.3 (Prosperous)	10,102
22936	Earlysville	15.4 (Prosperous)	5,186
22947	Keswick	47.4 (Mid-Tier)	5,150
22959	North Garden	60.7 (At Risk)	1,932
22968	Ruckersville	21.9 (Comfortable)	11,239
22974	22974	34.5 (Comfortable)	5,441

## 3 – PROCESS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

### Calculation Steps

Since project location is a critical component of environmental impacts, the Environment and Sustainability need category is applied after aggregating need scores across the other metrics described in previous sections. The adjustment factors apply to aggregate scores for road segments that are exposed to projected sea level rise, storm surge, or inland/riverine flooding and to segments in economically distressed communities.

- 5% adjustment for segments exposed to historical flooding in a 100-year flood zone
- Adjustments for economically distressed communities
  - 5.0% adjustment applied to aggregate score of road segments in a zip code that has a DCI index of 80 to 100 (i.e., distressed)
  - 3.5% adjustment applied to aggregate score of road segment in a zip code that has a DCI rating of 60 to 80 (i.e., at risk)
  - Additional 2.0% if a roadway segment falls within a zip code that has a DCI rating of 40 to 60 (i.e., mid-tier)

### Data Requirements

- VTrans Flood Risk Assessment (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- Distressed Communities Index (source: Economic Innovation Group)<sup>5</sup>

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

This chapter describes the overall process, performance measures, and methodologies for evaluating and prioritizing surface transportation projects, including highway and roadway, active transportation (i.e., bicycle and pedestrian), transit, and travel demand management (TDM) improvements. While the project prioritization is separate from the process for identifying needs, the process includes the same goal categories.

In general, the project prioritization performance measures evaluate changes due to project implementation, or between the base year with existing conditions and the horizon year with future conditions. Project types that are not eligible for scoring under this process are standalone studies and the maintenance of existing facilities including bridge rehabilitation, pavement repair/replacement, guardrail repair/replacement, and other activities eligible for State of Good Repair funding.

- The Crash Frequency (S1) and Crash Rate (S2) performance measures within the Safety prioritization category indicate projects where there is the highest expected reduction in the annual number of crashes after the implementation a safety treatment, improvement, or countermeasure. Projects that are expected to reduce higher numbers of crashes receive higher scores.
- The Access to Jobs (A1) and Access to Jobs for Disadvantaged Populations (A2) performance measures in the Accessibility and Equity prioritization category indicate projects where there is the most potential for improving access to employment opportunities. Projects that have the greatest potential for accessibility improvement (i.e., constructing new bike and pedestrian facilities, increasing transit frequency, reducing vehicular delay) and are located near where people live will be assigned the highest scores. The Access to Multimodal Choices (A3) performance measure assigns points to projects for increasing multimodal transportation choices such as constructing new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, increasing transit frequency, or providing additional park and ride spaces. Projects that are likely to have the greatest impacts on improving access to multimodal choices and improving air quality will receive higher scores.
- The Demand (M1) performance measures in the Mobility and System Efficiency prioritization category identify projects in areas with the highest potential volume of users who are likely to benefit from the project. Likewise, the Congestion (M2) performance measure identifies projects located in areas with the most congestion. Projects in in areas with more traffic and congestion receive higher scores.
- The Access to Non-Work Destinations (L1) and Access to Non-Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations (L2) performance

measures in the Land use and Economic Development prioritization categories identify high 'walkability' areas through the MPO and within equity emphasis areas. Projects that score highly in this measure are most likely to integrate into the existing bicycle and pedestrian network. The Proximity to Activity Centers (L3) and Job Growth (L4) performance measures identify projects which are closest to concentrations of regional economic activity. These projects are likely to have the greatest impact on economic development.

- The Sensitive Features (E1) performance measure within the Environmental Impacts prioritization category identify projects that the fewest environmental impacts. This measure in an inverse measure which means that projects with the fewest impacts will receive the highest score.

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Prioritization Category: Safety

The Safety prioritization category is evaluated based on the performance measure weights shown **Table 22**.

**Table 22** Safety Performance Measure Weights

Performance Measure	Weight
Crash Frequency (S1)	50%
Crash Rate (S2)	50%
Total	100%

These performance measures are appropriate for measuring the safety benefits of highway and roadway improvements at intersections, interchanges, bridges, freeway segments, and non-freeway segments, as well as bicycle and pedestrian related improvements such as new sidewalks, bicycle lanes, shared use paths, and crossing improvements.

Estimation of changes in crash frequency and rate relies on the use of Crash Modification Factors (CMF). The CMF is a multiplicative factor used to compute the expected reduction in the number of crashes after implementing a safety improvement, treatment, or countermeasure at a specific site. While the Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse contains thousands of CMFs covering hundreds of treatment options for a variety of crash types, crash severities, and site locations, this process uses a simplified list of fatal and injury CMFs used for SMART SCALE. For example, the conversion of stop/yield control to a signal is expected to reduce the number of fatal and injury crashes by 35% because of a planning level CMF of 0.65 ( $1 - 0.65 = 0.35 \times 100 = 35\%$ )

Project types where CMFs are not available, including standalone transit and travel demand management (TDM) projects do not qualify for Safety scoring. **Table 23** lists the relationship between project type and the crash data needed for the safety analysis of highway and roadway projects and bicycle and pedestrian projects.

**Table 23** Safety Project Prioritization Data by Project Type

Project Type	Crash Type	Crash Severity
Highway and Roadway	Motor vehicle	Fatal and Injury
Active Transportation	Bicycle and pedestrian	Fatal and Injury

### Crash Frequency (S1)

This measure calculates the reduction in Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) crash frequency. The expected change in crashes is calculated using simplified planning level crash modification factors (CMF) associated with the project improvement. The outcome of this measure is the annual change in the number of fatal and injury crashes due to project implementation.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits layer to an ArcMap document and create 250 foot buffers around each project.
2. Add crash data to the map document, then calculate EPDO weights for each row in a new field using the crash severity conversion values in **Table 3**.
3. Use the 'Spatial Join' tool to join points in the crash layer that intersect the project limits buffer layer. Calculate the sum of crashes by EPDO that intersect the project limits buffer.
4. Calculate the average annual EPDO by dividing the sum of crashes in the project area weighted by EPDO by the number of years included in the analysis.
5. Calculate the Percent Expected Crash Reduction (PECR) using the appropriate CMF for the project improvements with the following equation:
 
$$PECR = 1 - CMF$$
6. Calculate the expected annual reduction in crashes by multiplying the annual average EPDO of fatal and injury crashes by PECR.

### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- 5 year crash data (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- SMART SCALE Planning Level CMFs (source: [https://smartscale.org/documents/cmf-list-smart-scale-rd4\\_fy2022.pdf](https://smartscale.org/documents/cmf-list-smart-scale-rd4_fy2022.pdf))

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Crash Rate (S2)

This measure calculates the annual reduction in EPDO of fatal and injury crashes (EPDOF+I) per Hundred Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (HMVMT) on a roadway segment or Million Entering Vehicles (MEV) for an intersection. Crash rate allows for better comparison between projects on routes with different traffic volumes. The outcome of this measure is the change in the annual rate of fatal and injury crashes weighted by severity (EPDOF+I) per HMVMT (segments) or MVE (intersections) due to project implementation.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits layer to an ArcMap document and create 250 foot buffers around each project.
2. Add the AADT layer.
3. Use Select by Location to select segments in the AADT layer that intersect the project limits. Manually deselect segments in the buffer that are on roads not part of the project. For intersection improvements, include all segment approaches and exclude parallel segments. For highway and road projects that are not at an intersection, include the segments where the project is physically located and exclude side streets and parallel segments
4. Calculate the length of segments that intersect the project limits buffer layer using the 'Calculate Geometry' tool. Ensure that all other segments have a zero or null value
5. Use the 'Spatial Join' tool to join segments in the AADT layer that intersect the project limits buffer layer.
6. For segments (i.e., non-intersection projects), calculate the annual traffic volume in HMVMT. For projects that cross multiple segments, HMVMT is the cumulative annual VMT for all segments, calculated for each segment using its AADT and length. For intersections, calculate the annual traffic volume in Million Entering Vehicles (MEV)

$$HMVMT = \frac{\sum AADT_i \times Segment\ Length_i \times 365}{1,000,000}$$

$$MEV = \frac{\sum AADT_i \times 365}{1,000,000}$$

7. Calculate reduction in annual EPDO of fatal and injury crashes due to project implementation (measure S1)

$$Segment\ Crash\ Rate = \frac{EPDO_{K+1}}{HMVMT}$$

$$Intersection\ Crash\ Rate = \frac{EPDO_{K+1}}{MEV}$$

8. Convert reduction in annual EPDO of fatal and injury crashes into the reduced crash rate using the following formulas

### Data Requirements

- Project Limits
- 5 year crash data (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- Planning Level Crash Modification Factors (CMF) (source: SMART SCALE Planning Level Crash Modification Factors)
- Average Annual Daily Traffic (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

# 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

## Prioritization Category: Accessibility and Equity

The Accessibility and Equity prioritization category is evaluated based on the performance measure weights shown **Table 24**.

**Table 24** Accessibility and Equity Performance Measure Weights

Performance Measure	Weight
Access to Jobs (A1)	40%
Access to Jobs for Disadvantaged Populations (A2)	40%
Access to Multimodal Choices (A3)	20%
Total	100%

### Access to Jobs (A1)

The Access to Jobs measure calculates a project’s potential for improving access to job opportunities for all populations. Scores are determined by the project’s weighted average Potential for Accessibility Improvement (PAI) within a buffer distance of the project limits. The buffer distance for evaluating the Census blocks impacted by project implementation is determined by project mode (auto, transit, non-motorized).

PAI is estimated as the difference between the “current” accessibility offered and a “reference” condition. The “current” condition refers to the cumulative number of activities (jobs in the case of all metrics generated in this process) accessible from a given location applying parameters, such as level of traffic stress (LTS) or average travel speed, that influence the estimated travel times among zones. The “reference” condition refers to the cumulative number of jobs accessible from the same location but with hypothetical parameters that yield an estimated maximum level of job accessibility. Refer to the chapter on the Process for the Identification of Needs for more information about terms referred to in the project prioritization process.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits layer to an ArcMap document and create buffers to select Census blocks within a specified distance of the project (catchment area).
2. Add the Census blocks layer and block-level accessibility and population attribute data to an ArcMap document. See **Table 25** to determine data tables needed for each project type. Create buffers based on project type using the catchment area.

**Table 25** Accessibility and Equity Performance Measure Parameters

Project Type	Current Condition	Reference Condition	Maximum Travel Time (minutes)	Catchment Area (miles)
Bicycle and Pedestrian	Bike LTS 1 (High Stress)	Bike LTS 4 (Low Stress)	20	3
Transit	Transit	Auto 8 AM (Off Peak)	45	5
Highway and Roadway	Auto 8 AM (Peak)	Auto 12 AM (Off Peak)	45	10

3. In the Census blocks layer, create four new fields (data type Long) named ‘reference’, ‘current’, ‘PAI’, and ‘population’. Join the block-level accessibility and population attribute data to the Census block layer then calculate the ‘current’, ‘reference’, and ‘population’ fields from the joined data.
4. For each Census block, calculate ‘PAI’ as the difference between the reference condition and current condition, or the accessibility deficit between the current condition and the reference condition.

$$PAI = Reference - Current$$

5. Add the Functional Classification layer and then use the ‘Spatial Join’ tool to join the Census blocks that have their center within the catchment area. Sum the population of blocks within the catchment area.
6. Calculate the weighted average PAI for each functional classification segment by multiplying PAI by the total population of the census block in which the segment is located then divide by the total population of the catchment area.

$$Population\ Weighted\ PAI = Population \times PAI$$

$$Weighted\ Average\ PAI = \frac{Population\ Weighted\ PAI_i}{Catchment\ Population_i}$$



## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

7. Calculate the raw access score. First, assign a functional classification (FC) score to all road segments. Next, calculate the raw score for transit access to jobs performance measure by multiplying segments' weighted average accessibility improvement by its FC score. In Chapter 3 on the Process for the Identification of Needs, see **Table 9** for Functional Classification Value for Transit and Active Transportation Projects and **Table 11** for Highway and Roadway Projects.

$$\text{Raw Score} = \text{Weighted Average PAI} \times \text{FC Score}$$

8. Calculate the project accessibility score with the following steps:
  - Intersect the Project Limits layer with the Census Block layer that contains population and Potential for Accessibility Improvement
  - Spatial Join the intersected Project Limits layer with the Census Census Block layer that contains population and sum the population in the catchment area
  - Calculate the raw score for the project's intersects with the Census Block layer using the raw need score equation from the Access to Jobs needs identification category
  - Calculate the length-weighted average for the project

### Data Requirements

- Project Limits
- Census blocks
- NAE Current Condition and NAE Reference Condition
- Census block population
- Functional Classification (source: InteracVTrans Map Explorer)

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Access to Jobs for Disadvantaged Populations (A2)

The Access to Jobs measure calculates a project’s potential for improving access to job opportunities for disadvantaged populations. Scores are determined by the project’s weighted average Potential for Accessibility Improvement (PAI) in Equity Emphasis Areas (EEA) within a buffer distance of the project limits. The buffer distance for evaluating the Census blocks impacted by project implementation is determined by project mode (auto, transit, non-motorized).

PAI is estimated as the difference between the “current” accessibility offered and a “reference” condition. The “current” condition refers to the cumulative number of activities (jobs in the case of all metrics generated in this process) accessible from a given location applying parameters, such as level of traffic stress (LTS) or average travel speed, that influence the estimated travel times among zones. The “reference” condition refers to the cumulative number of jobs accessible from the same location but with hypothetical parameters that yield an estimated maximum level of job accessibility. Refer to the chapter on the Process for the Identification of Needs for more information about terms referred to in the project prioritization process.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits layer to an ArcMap document and create buffers to select Census blocks within a specified distance of the project (catchment area).
2. Add the Census blocks layer and block-level accessibility and population attribute data to an ArcMap document. See **Table 25** to determine data tables needed for each project type. Create buffers based on project type using the maximum travel distance thresholds.
3. In the Census blocks layer, create four new fields (data type Long) named ‘reference’, ‘current’, ‘PAI’, and ‘population’. Join the block-level accessibility and population attribute data to the Census block layer then calculate the ‘current’, ‘reference’, and ‘population’ fields from the joined data.
4. For each Census block, calculate ‘PAI’ as the difference between the reference condition and current condition, or the accessibility deficit between the current condition and the reference condition.

$$PAI = Reference - Current$$

5. Add the Functional Classification layer and then use the ‘Spatial Join’ tool to join the Census blocks that have their center within the catchment area. Sum the population of blocks within the

catchment area.

6. Calculate the eligible disadvantaged population (EDP) weighted average PAI for each functional classification segment by multiplying PAI by the EDP of the census block in which the segment is located then divide by the EDP of the catchment area

$$Population\ Weighted\ PAI = Population \times PAI$$

$$Weighted\ Average\ PAI = \frac{Population\ Weighted\ PAI_i}{Catchment\ Population_i}$$

7. Calculate the raw access score. First, assign a functional classification (FC) score to all road segments. Next, calculate the raw score for transit access to jobs performance measure by multiplying segments’ weighted average accessibility improvement by its FC score. In Chapter 3 on the Process for the Identification of Needs, see **Table 9** for Functional Classification Value for Transit and Active Transportation Projects and **Table 11** for Highway and Roadway Projects.

$$Raw\ Need\ Score = Weighted\ Average\ PAI \times FC\ Score$$

8. Calculate the project accessibility score with the following steps:
  - Intersect the Project Limits layer with the Census Block layer that contains population and Potential for Accessibility Improvement
  - Spatial Join the intersected Project Limits layer with the Census Census Block layer that contains population and sum the population in the catchment area
  - Calculate the raw score for the project’s intersects with the Census Block layer using the raw need score equation from the Access to Jobs needs identification category
  - Calculate the length-weighted average for the project

### Data Requirements

- Project Limits
- Census blocks
- NAE Current Condition and NAE Reference Condition
- Census block population
- Functional Classification (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- Equity Emphasis Areas (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### *Access to Multimodal Choices (A3)*

This measure considers the degree to which a project can increase access to non-single occupant vehicle (SOV) travel options. The objective is to assign more points to projects that that promote multimodal transportation, enhance connections between modes or create new connections to travel destinations. The outcome of this measure is points assigned to projects for providing elements that increase access to multimodal transportation.

### Calculation Steps

1. Assign total points to TDM projects that include the following active transportation and transit elements (maximum of five points):
  - Transit system improvements on a route with at least 1 transit vehicle per hour = 5 points
  - Improvements to an existing or proposed park-and-ride lot = 4 points
  - Construction, enhancement, or replacement of substandard bicycle facilities = 1.5 points
  - Construction, enhancement, or replacement of substandard pedestrian facilities = 1.5 points

### Data Requirements

- Project Improvements

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Prioritization Category: Mobility and System Efficiency

The performance measures in the Mobility and System Efficiency prioritization category are evaluated based on the performance measure weights in **Table 26**.

*Table 26 Mobility and System Efficiency Performance Measure Weights*

Performance Measure	Weight
Demand (M1)	50%
Congestion (M2)	50%
Total	100%

#### *Demand (M1)*

This measure calculates the demand for the project based on existing traffic volumes around the project limits for highway and roadway projects. The demand measure uses Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) to identify the potential volume of users who are likely to benefit from the project.

#### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits and AADT layers to an ArcMap document and create quarter mile buffers around each project.
2. Use Select by Location to select segments in the AADT layer that intersect the project limits buffer. Manually deselect segments in the buffer that are on roads not part of the project. For intersection improvements, include all segment approaches and exclude parallel segments. For highway and road projects that are not at an intersection, include the segments where the project is physically located and exclude side streets and parallel segments.
3. If necessary, create a 'Mileage' field (data type Double), then calculate the length of the AADT segments that intersect the project limits buffer, then use the 'Calculate Geometry' tool to calculate the length of each segment.
4. Use the 'Spatial Join' tool to calculate the length sum of all AADT segments that intersect the project limits buffer.
5. Add a field named 'VMT' (data type Long) to the attribute table in which to calculate Vehicle Miles Traveled for each selected segment. Multiply the AADT field by 'Mileage' using the field calculator to calculate Vehicle Miles Traveled.
6. Calculate the weighted-average AADT for the project by dividing the total VMT of all segments by the total length of all segments:

$$\overline{\text{AADT}} = \frac{\sum \text{VMT}_n}{\sum \text{Length}_n}$$

#### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- Average Annual Daily Traffic

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Congestion (M2)

This measure estimates the level of traffic congestion around the project limits. Congestion is measured by the average Travel Time Index (TTI) of segments within a quarter mile of the project. TTI is the ratio of a segment's typical travel time during an observed period (such as the morning or evening peak commuting period) to the time required to travel the same distance in a reference period (under free-flow conditions, e.g.). For example, a value of 1.3 indicates a 20-minute trip during free-flow conditions requires 26 minutes to complete during the peak period.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits and TTI layers to an ArcMap document and create quarter mile buffers around each project.
2. Identify the segment TTI as the maximum hourly travel time index across all hours in the most recent year for each segment.
3. Use Select by Location to select segments in the TTI layer that intersect the project limits buffer. Manually deselect segments in the buffer that are on roads not part of the project. For intersection improvements, include all segment approaches and exclude parallel segments. For highway and road projects that are not at an intersection, include the segments where the project is physically located and exclude side streets and parallel segments.
4. If necessary, create a 'Mileage' field (data type Double), then calculate the length of the TTI segments that intersect the project limits buffer, then use the 'Calculate Geometry' tool to calculate the length of each segment.
5. Use the 'Spatial Join' tool to calculate the length sum of all TTI segments that intersect the project limits buffer.
6. Add a field named 'WeightedTTI' (data type Double) to the attribute table in which to calculate weighted Travel Time Index for each selected segment. Multiply the TTI field by 'Mileage' using the field calculator to calculate weighted Travel Time Index.
7. Calculate the length weighted-average TTI for the project by dividing the cumulative TTI of all segments by the total length of all segments:

### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- Travel Time Index (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Prioritization Category: Land Use and Economic Development

The performance measures in the Land Use and Economic Development prioritization category are evaluated based on the performance measure weights in **Table 27**.

*Table 27 Land Use and Economic Development Performance Measure Weights*

Performance Measure	Weight
Access to Non-Work Destinations (L1)	35%
Access to Non-Work Destinations for Disadvantaged Populations (L2)	35%
Proximity to Activity Centers (L3)	10%
Job Growth (L4)	20%
Total	100%

#### Access to Non-Work Destination (L1)

This measure combines Walk Score and Bike Score metrics with job growth to evaluate the ease of accessing non-work destinations on foot or bike at a given location. The outcome of this performance measure is the ability to access non-work destinations by bike or on foot and the potential of the project to improve network connectivity for travel by bike or pedestrian modes.

Factors that are considered in the Walk Score include population density, block length, intersection density, and proximity to amenities. Bike Score considers existing bike facilities, hills, road connectivity, and the share of bike commuters. The Access to Non-Work destinations measure is applied to active transportation, transit, and TDM projects only.

#### Calculation Steps

1. Add the Walk Score, Bike Score, and the project limits layers to an ArcMap document.
2. Use the 'Buffer' tool to create a quarter mile buffer around the project limits.
3. Intersect the project limits buffer with the Walk Score and Bike Score layers.
4. Recalculate the length of each segment resulting from the intersection.

5. Calculate what proportion of each Walk Score and Bike Score zone belongs to each segment.
  - For point or polygons projects (such as park-and-ride lots), assign the Walk Score and the Bike Score assign the point or polygon centroid is located.
  - For a transit project, if stops have been designated, assign the average of each of the stop's Walk Scores and Bike Scores to the project. If stops have not been designated yet, average Walk Scores and Bike Scores at regular intervals along the affected transit route.
6. Calculate the length weighted average Walk Score and Bike Score for each project.
7. Average the Walk Score and Bike Score together to create a single score for the project.

#### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- WalkScore (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- BikeScore (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### *Access to Non-Work Destination for Disadvantaged Populations (L2)*

This measure combines Walk Score and Bike Score metrics with job growth to evaluate the ease of accessing non-work destinations on foot or bike at a given location. The outcome of this performance measure is the ability to access non-work destinations by bike or on foot and the potential of the project to improve network connectivity for travel by bike or pedestrian modes for disadvantaged populations.

Factors that are considered in the Walk Score include population density, block length, intersection density, and proximity to amenities. Bike Score considers existing bike facilities, hills, road connectivity, and the share of bike commuters. The Access to Non-Work destinations measure is applied to active transportation, transit, and TDM projects only.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the Walk Score, Bike Score, and the project limits layers to an ArcMap document.
2. Use the 'Buffer' tool to create a quarter mile buffer around the project limits.
3. Intersect the project limits buffers within Equity Emphasis Areas with the Walk Score and Bike Score layers.
4. Recalculate the length of each segment resulting from the intersection.
5. Calculate what proportion of each Walk Score and Bike Score zone belongs to each segment.
  - For point or polygons projects (such as park-and-ride lots), assign the Walk Score and the Bike Score assign the point or polygon centroid is located.
  - For a transit project, if stops have been designated, assign the average of each of the stop's Walk Scores and Bike Scores to the project. If stops have not been designated yet, average Walk Scores and Bike Scores at regular intervals along the affected transit route.
6. Calculate the length weighted average Walk Score and Bike Score for each project.
7. Average the Walk Score and Bike Score together to create a single score for the project.

### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- WalkScore (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- BikeScore (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- Equity Emphasis Areas (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Proximity to Activity Centers (L3)

Activity centers are defined by OIPI as “areas of regional importance that have a high density of economic and social activity”. This measure calculates the number of activity centers within a specified distance of the project based on functional classification or project type.

#### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits layer to an ArcMap document.
2. In a new ‘buffer’ field (data type Double), calculate buffer distance by functional classification with the values in the buffer size column in **Table 28**. For point or polygons projects (such as park-and-ride lots), assign the Walk Score and the Bike Score assign the point or polygon centroid is located.
3. Run the ‘Buffer’ tool, setting the buffer distance to values in the ‘Buffer’ field.

*Table 28 Functional Classification Buffer Size*

Project Type	Functional Class	Buffer Size (Miles)
Highway and Roadway Projects	Interstate Principal Arterial	10
	Minor Arterial	7.5
	Major Collector Minor Collector Local	5
Active Transportation, Transit, and TDM Projects	n/a	1

#### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- VTrans Activity Centers (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)
- Functional Classification (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)



## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### *Job Growth (L4)*

This measure calculates the change in jobs in the vicinity of a project between a base year and a horizon year (e.g., from 2021 to 2045) using data found in the regional travel demand model. The change in jobs is evaluated using Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) within a specified distance of the project based on functional classification. The outcome of this measure is expected total number of new jobs that will be served by the project.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the project limits layer to an ArcMap document.
2. In a new 'Buffer' field (data type Long), calculate buffer distance by functional classification with the values in the buffer size column in **Table 28**.
3. Run the 'Buffer' tool, setting the buffer distance to the values in the 'Buffer' field.
4. Use the 'Spatial Join' tool to join TAZs that have their center in each project limits buffer. In the tool dialogue box, sum the 2021 jobs and 2045 jobs.
5. In a new 'growth' field (data type Long), calculate the total job growth for the project area by subtracting the total 2021 jobs from the total 2045 jobs.

### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- Base Year (2021) and Horizon year (2045) total employment (source: VDOT Transportation and Modeling and Accessibility Program)
- Functional Classification (source: InteractVTrans Map Explorer)

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Prioritization Category: Environmental Impact

The performance measures in the Environmental Impact prioritization category are evaluated based on the performance measure weights in **Table 29**.

**Table 29** Environmental Impact Performance Measure Weights

Performance Measure	Weight
Sensitive Features (E1)	100%
Total	100%

### Sensitive Features (E1)

Some infrastructure projects have impacts on the natural environment, including watersheds, wetlands, and animal habits. Additionally, building areas that regularly flood can reduce the functionality of the infrastructure during severe storms. Furthermore, lands sets aside for public use, agricultural, or historic value may be impaired by nearby development. The sensitive features performance measure calculates the percentage of acres of environmentally sensitive areas, including wetlands, flood hazard zones, and conservation lands within a quarter mile of the project limits. This measure is an inverse measure which means that the project with the fewest impacts (i.e., lowest percentage of impacted land within project buffer) will receive the highest score.

### Calculation Steps

1. Add the environmentally sensitive area layers and the project limits layer to an ArcMap document. Add a field named "tier" to the project limits attribute table. Project tier is determined by the type of environmental document required: a Categorical Exclusion (Tier 1), an Environmental Assessment (Tier 2), or an Environmental Impact Statement (Tier 3).
2. Use the 'Dissolve' tool to dissolve environmentally sensitive areas into one feature (DCR conservation lands, 'AE' Flood Hazard Zone, DCR Conservation Lands, Wetlands).
3. Use the 'Buffer' tool to create a quarter mile buffer around the project limits.
4. Run the 'Intersect' tool on the buffered project limits layer and the dissolved environmentally sensitive areas layer to determine the areas of overlap between the two layers.
5. Calculate the total areas of the quarter mile buffer layer around the project and the intersect layer with environmentally sensitive and conservation areas by adding a field named "SqMi" to the

attribute tables of both layers. Then use 'Calculate Geometry' to calculate square mileage for all features of both layers

6. Adjust the intersect layer based on the following adjustment factors and the formula:
  - Tier 1 (Categorical Exclusion) - 10%
  - Tier 2 (Environmental Assessment) - 30%
  - Tier 3 (Environmental Impact Statement - 50%

$$\text{Impact Area} = \text{Overlap Area (mi}^2\text{)} \times \text{Adjustment Factor}$$

7. Sum the weighted intersection areas and divide the impact area by the project buffer to get the impacted percentage of land within the project limits.

### Data Requirements

- Project limits
- Conservation Lands (source: Department of Conservation and Recreation. Retrieve from: <https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/natural-heritage/cldownload>)
- Wetlands (source: Virginia Fish and Wildlife Service. Retrieve from: <https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/>)
- Flood Hazard Zones (source: Federal Emergency Management Agency. Retrieve from: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/advanceSearch>). To download Flood Hazard Zones:
  1. Enter product IDs and download flood hazard zones for Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville ('NFHL\_51003C').
  2. Export 'AE' flood zones to a new shapefile or polygon feature class in a file geodatabase. Zone 'AE' designates areas subject to inundation by the 100-year flood (i.e., a flood that statistically has a 1% chance of occurring in any given year).

## 4 – PROCESS FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

### Project Scoring

1. Calculate the raw value for all performance measures within the five prioritization category for each project.
2. Normalize raw scores by performance measure (PM) to compare scores across multiple projects. The normalization procedure results in an unweighted project benefit score of 0 to 100. Use the following equation:

$$\text{Normalized Score} = \frac{\text{Raw Score}_i - \text{RawScore}_{\min}}{\text{Raw Score}_{\max} - \text{RawScore}_{\min}}$$

Where,

$\text{RawScore}_i$  = Raw score for project i in each performance measure

$\text{RawScore}_{\min}$  = Minimum raw score for each performance measure

$\text{RawScore}_{\max}$  = Maximum raw score for each performance measure

3. Multiply the normalized performance measure score by their respective measure weights.
4. Sum the weighted normalize performance measure scores within each performance measure to produce the scoring value for each prioritization category.
5. Multiply the total prioritization category score by its respective weight to produce the weighted prioritization category scoring value. Choose one scenario weighting scheme from **Table 30** to determine the appropriate weights for each prioritization

category. The Safety prioritization category weight is equivalent in the 'accessibility' and 'mobility' scenarios in recognition of the importance of safety throughout all scenarios

- The 'Accessibility' scenario prioritizes projects that increase access to jobs, non-work destinations, and multimodal choices for bicycling, walking, and transit.
  - The 'Balanced' scenario prioritized each prioritization equally with an increased emphasis on limiting environmental impacts
  - The 'mobility' scenario prioritizes highway and roadway projects that reduce vehicular delay.
6. Sum the weighted prioritization category scoring value to produce the project benefit score.
  7. If cost information is available for every project, divide each project's benefit score by its total project cost (per \$10 million) to produce the project score. If cost is not available, record the project's benefit score as its project score.
  8. Rank projects by project score in descending order (the project receiving the highest score will be ranked first).

**Table 30** Project Prioritization Category Weights

Prioritization Category	Prioritization Scenarios		
	Accessibility	Balance	Mobility
Safety	25%	20%	25%
Accessibility and Equity	30%	20%	20%
Mobility and System Efficiency	10%	20%	30%
Land Use and Economic Development	25%	20%	10%
Environmental Impact	10%	20%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%