



MEETING NOTES

To: Jeanette Janiczek
City of Charlottesville

From: Sal Musarra
Kimley-Horn

Date/Time: February 23, 2017 / 8:00-9:30

Subject: Belmont Bridge Replacement Project (VDOT Project #0020-104-101 / UPC #75878)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Attendees	Melissa Wender	Charlottesville Community Bikes
	Peter Ohlms	BPAC
	Amanda Poncy	City of Charlottesville – Bike/Ped Coordinator
	Jake Fox	BPAC/Bike UVA
	Eberhard Jehle	BPAC/Streets That Work
	Peter Krebs	BPAC
	Frank Deviney	BPAC
	Stephen Bach	BPAC
	Josh Mamzano	Charlottesville Police Department
	Tito Dorrette	Charlottesville Police Department
	Sal Musarra	Kimley-Horn
	Stephen Stansbury	Kimley-Horn
	Jonathan Whitehurst	Kimley-Horn
	Keith Aimone	Kimley-Horn
	Brian McPeters	Kimley-Horn
	Jeanette Janiczek	NDS – UCI Program Manager
	Tony Edwards	NDS - Development Services Manager
	Alexander Ikefuna	NDS - Director of NDS

PURPOSE

At the first meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting participants discussed previous design efforts and learned more about their role in the current effort. The committee also learned about project constraints and discussed the importance of various design considerations.

A similar meeting process will occur with each of the five stakeholder groups.

AGENDA

8:00 to 8:30 *Presentation*

Introduction and Overview

- Our team/our approach
- Project process and schedule
- Role of the Steering Committee (and how others will be involved)
- Understanding project constraints

8:30 to 9:00 *Facilitated Activities*

Previous Design Processes

- What went well?
- What did not go well?
- What can we learn?

Design Considerations

- Performance of the proposed bridge program endorsed by City Council design and relative importance of the various considerations.

9:00 to 9:10 *Presentation*

Next Steps

- MetroQuest Survey
- March 11th Mobility Fair

9:10 to 9:30 *Public Comment*

SUMMARY

This was the first in the series of meetings between the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the project team for the Belmont Bridge replacement project. Members of the BPAC, City staff, consultant team, and the public were present for the discussion. Below is a brief description of the items discussed.

Summary of Discussion

Introduction and Overview

Jeanette Janiczek, project manager for the City, read elements from the RFP to the group, which laid out the general expectations for the project. The RFP included details of the enhanced bridge concept as approved by City Council, which is the starting point for the design effort. Following brief introductions, Sal Musarra (Kimley-Horn) gave a background presentation, which included the following:

- Target design timeline of 15 months
- Multiple public engagement meetings and stakeholder interaction for the first 6 months of the timeline includes
- A list of stakeholders including the Downtown Business Association, PLACE Design Task Force, Board of Architectural Review, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and the Tree Commission. Members of the Planning Commission and the ADA Advisory Committee were also invited to attend one of the five small stakeholder groups
- In addition to the stakeholders, the City has formed a Steering Committee to guide the overall process and a Technical Committee, which is comprised of City staff from across many departments
- Meetings and discussions with the stakeholders, as well as the public and Steering Committee will serve as a guide for the design process where the goal of the project team is to obtain informed decisions, rather than consensus. Every step will build upon the previous step of the process through the selection of the preferred concept
- Initial project constraints include vertical clearance over the railroad, clearance over Avon and Water Street, project budget, bridge piers and supports, and intersection touch points
- A project website will be established, and will be located at www.BelmontBridge.org. Meeting materials, notes, and notices will be posted to the website
- BPAC members introduced themselves and noted the specific groups they represent

Facilitated Activities

Previous Design Processes

Three questions were asked to encourage discussion and inform the consultant team about the previous design process. Below are the three questions and typical responses to each.

- *What went well?*
 - The previous design process shed light on a vision for multimodal design
 - It elevated existing bicycle and pedestrian issues in and around the bridge
 - It exposed a level of sophistication of urban design expectations within the City
- *What did not go well?*
 - The previous design did not look at what could happen surrounding the bridge and the issues of connectivity
 - Did not address the existing limited bike/pedestrian infrastructure
 - Poor overall connectivity was not addressed by the proposed design

- Did not have a method to consider future considerations and impacts of growth in the corridor
- *What can we learn?*
 - It is important to focus on key issues such as:
 - The railroad is a barrier, both physically and socially
 - There is currently a gap in the transportation network accentuated by the density of the trips in the area
 - Basic safety is a must
 - Need to consider all categories of cyclists ranging from casual bicyclists to daily cyclists
 - The intersections at each end are natural barriers and the primary reason for traffic congestion

Design Considerations

With the understanding that project constraints (e.g., space, money, time, etc.) will require tradeoffs to occur, BPAC members were asked to weigh in on design priorities. Attendees were given a worksheet that organized the design considerations endorsed by City Council into 10 categories:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| ● Community Gateway | ● Lighting | ● Spans, Piers, and Abutments |
| ● Improved Approaches | ● Multimodal Design | ● Travel Speeds |
| ● Innovative Design | ● Scenic Viewsheds | ● Other |
| ● Landscaping | | |

Attendees were asked to rate the importance of each category on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high). Then, they were asked to rank the considerations 1 to 9 (or 10 if they added an additional category). Each member was asked to discuss their top three selections. The most important categories identified by the committee were Multimodal Design, Approaches, and Traffic/Speeds.

Next Steps

The community engagement process will include 12 total committee meetings (six steering/six technical), 15 stakeholder meetings (three meetings with five different stakeholder groups), and three community events. Additionally, an on-line survey will be available. The BPAC was encouraged to bring up any pertinent information they may not already know. This includes other potential projects, existing studies, or anything that could potentially affect decisions regarding the bridge.

Several upcoming events were featured:

- Mobility Summit: Saturday, March 11th, 9 a.m. – 1 p.m.
- Online Survey: March 11th – April 16th
- Design Charrette: April 17th – 19th
- Website Launch: www.BelmontBridge.org (includes digital comment form)

Questions/Comments (from BPAC)

- Is this the only opportunity to discuss the project? *No, there will be multiple touch points where the BPAC will be involved with providing input.*
- In previous designs, an independent flyover was incorporated, will that still be an option? *Currently as part of the City Council approved design program, this element is not an option. If it is a desired outcome of this process, an independent bridge for bicycles and pedestrians will be considered a future project.*
- The experience of the bridge should appeal to ages between 8 and 80.
- Both pedestrian and bicycle connections to the bridge should be part of the solution.

MEETING NOTES

- There is a potential to organize a group ride on the day of the mobility summit, organized by the BPAC.
- Approaches to the bridge should be focused on as part of solutions moving forward.