**Background:** The Design Public Hearing for the Belmont Bridge Replacement project was held on Thursday, May 24, 2018 at City Space on the Downtown Mall. The meeting was advertised using the following methods:

1. Daily Progress Advertisement – Sunday, April 22 and Wednesday, May 16
2. Direct Mailing - 870 “Current Residents” + 270 “Owners”
3. Certified Mailing to Impacted Property Owners (as well as Invitation to Meet)
4. Emailed Citywide mailing list as well as Project mailing list
5. Updated Project Website’s Main Page
6. Installed Banner on Bridge
7. Variable Message Sign used at Community Bikes for one week before meeting
8. Posted Notices in Neighborhood Development Services’ lobby
9. Emailed first project update report after meeting noting public comment deadline of June 8th and link to posted meeting materials on website

Sixty-one persons attended the hearing. Project plans, detailed displays, environmental documents and other required project materials were available for public review and discussion from 5:00pm until 7:00pm. The displays are included as electronic links to this memorandum (Attachment E). From 7:00pm until shortly after 7:25pm public speakers shared comments that were captured by a court reporter (Attachment C). Five citizens spoke during the hearing, three provided private testimony, 17 provided comment forms and 11 provided written comments via e-mail. All public comments received between May 24, 2018 and June 8, 2018 have been included in a chart with project team responses (Attachment D). All comments have been addressed by the project team and comments and responses will be posted to the project website.

**Discussion:** After an extensive public involvement process, City Council approved a Preferred Conceptual Design for the Belmont Bridge Replacement project on October 16, 2017 and authorized commencement of final design. As a result, the project team has refined the Preferred
Conceptual Design in preparation of the Design Public Hearing. The hearing was held to solicit public comment on the major design features (bicycle and pedestrian facilities, roadway configuration, bridge) as well as anticipated temporary and permanent impacts on adjacent property owners and the completed environmental document.

No comments were received regarding the environmental document which is not surprising given the existing built environment and that this project is proposing to replace an existing structure. No additional environment impacts are expected with this project and the project team will be producing construction documents to ensure the contractor follows current requirements for proper disposal (ex. lead paint) and maintains proper site controls (ex. erosion and sediment protections).

As for major design features, the following themes emerged from the comments collected:

1) Concern over 2 lane bridge and Maintenance of Traffic during construction – Eight people commented solely on this concern with two individuals noting they liked the two lane design. Project team has used actual traffic counts of peak hour of travel in AM and PM – with a growth rate factored in for development – to design turn lanes and signal timing to roughly maintain existing level of service in opening and design year. Both vehicular and pedestrian travel will be maintained on the bridge during construction due to the distance and complexity of any possible detour.

2) Elimination of left turn out of Graves Street onto 9th/Avon Street (4) and Removal of At-Grade Crosswalk (7) – Both safety issues have been explored since Open House meeting with survey taken as well as detailed design reports. While the project team appreciates the respondent’s request for convenient/direct connections, we are unable to overcome the safety concerns due to the proximity to Levy Avenue intersection. Other alternatives have been included in the design such as new or improved pedestrian crossings (redesigned Levy Avenue signal, new pedestrian passageway, new mezzanine/stairway connection) and a pilot program of changing one-way direction of travel on Monticello Road to allow lefts onto 9th/Avon Street from Levy Avenue signal.

3) Pedestrian Tunnel – Concerns over safety of tunnel was voiced by four citizens with another supporting the idea and two others commenting on its aesthetics. The project team has designed the tunnel to be as large as possible – 10’ tall, 16’ wide, 93’ long – and will continue to focus on additional security details such as lighting. The tunnel will be one option for pedestrians to choose to use during the day or evening, but additional crossings are also included in the plan as alternatives.

4) Railroad Fencing – Nine respondents requested the removal of the upright security fencing on the bridge. Design team is attempting to negotiate removal of fencing with the railroad with the understanding it may be erected in the future (at City expense) if a documented need arises. However, the fence is a requirement of the railroad, and the railroad company(ies) are the sole decider as to whether a fence will be required. The requirement for a fence over the railroad will be determined during right of way negotiations and plan reviews by the railroad in 2019.

Several adjacent property owners also attended the hearing and provided comments:

1) Hubbard Properties, LLC – Requested pedestrian connection from building to pedestrian passageway and removal of railroad fencing.

3) 701 Water St., LLC (LexisNexis) – Narrow sidewalk/bike lanes and remove planted, buffer strip on 9th/Avon Street to reduce right of way impact/cost.

The project team appreciates all of the comments offered by the public and has responded to each comment in Attachment D. Several comments complimented the public process, overall project and expressed the feeling that participants were heard during the process.

As a result of the comments received, the project team is suggesting the following changes:

1) Re-open access point or driveway entrance to Champion Brewing Company on South Street on Parcel 003. This will result in a loss of greenery and on-street parking spaces (2). When parcel redevelops, all entrances will be re-evaluated and greenery/parking spaces could be re-established by developer along South Street.

2) Add a bicycle ramp on corner of Levy Avenue and Monticello Road to create a connection between the neighborhood street and the path leading to the pedestrian passageway.

3) Creation of a missing pedestrian path that connects the pedestrian tunnel to new public, off-street parking spaces to Old Avon Street (south of Avon/9th Street).

Alignment with City Council’s Vision Areas and Strategic Plan: Advancing the Belmont Bridge Replacement project upholds the City’s commitment to create “a connected community” by improving upon our existing transportation infrastructure. In addition, it would contribute to Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan, Beautiful Environment; 3.1 Engage in robust and context sensitive urban planning and implementation; 3.2 Provide reliable and high quality infrastructure and 3.3 Provide a variety of transportation and mobility options.

Community Engagement: This agenda item is approving the results of the latest public meeting held for Belmont Bridge Replacement project. The next step in the public process is to seek a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Board of Architectural Review. Going forward, bi-monthly reports will be issue to update the public on project status as final construction documents are produced, right of way secured and construction commences. A Citizen Information Meeting will also be held before construction to provide information on the Maintenance of Traffic plans, Phasing, Points of Contact and other useful information.

To help guide the project, the City Council appointed a project Steering Committee composed of:
- Amy Gardner, Belmont Neighborhood
- John Harrison, Business Community
- Patrick Healy, Ridge Street Neighborhood
- Heather Danforth Hill, North Downtown Neighborhood
- Harry Holsinger, Martha Jefferson Neighborhood
- Scott Paisley, PLACE
- Tim Mohr, PLACE
- John Santoski, Planning Commission
- Lena Seville, CAT Advisory Board
- Fred Wolf, PLACE

The process also involved coordination with the following City Council appointed stakeholder
The City of Charlottesville has provided multiple opportunities for the public to provide input into the plan development process. A project website, two on-line surveys, three community events (Mobility Summit, Design Charrette, and Open House) as well as 21 stakeholder meetings occurred between February 21, 2017 and April 4, 2018. Information presented and gathered at the meetings can be found at www.BelmontBridge.org, however a summary of each event is below:

**Project Website:** The Project website (www.belmontbridge.org) contains information that has been presented to date as part of the process. Information presented includes:

- Project background
- Project schedule
- A “resource” page that provides access to the traffic analysis, project fact sheet and FAQ, information presented and gathered from community events, and information presented at the stakeholder meetings
- A contact form
- A “get involved” page

As of June 22, 2017, the project website has logged approximately 3,000 unique users, and over 8,000 page views. In the last 30 days (from July 5th), the website has had 1,996 page views.

**Community Event 1: Mobility Summit, March 11, 2017:** A Mobility Summit was held on Saturday, March 11, 2017 at the Sprint Pavilion from 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM. The event drew nearly 100 people to discuss issues and needs related to the replacement of the Belmont Bridge which resulted in 1,679 data points. Participants provided input on the original design parameters established by City Council and future design objectives/goals through a combination of 6 interactive stations, guided walking tours and biking tour of the study area, and, had an opportunity to have one-on-one conversation with the consultant team and City staff. At sign-in, participants received an information handout, a rack card with more detail on upcoming events, and a passport to guide them through various stations.

A summary document provided on www.BelmontBridge.org briefly summarizes the community input data collected at the event and offers stakeholders and community members the opportunity to see the thoughts of others in the community. In addition to data collected in person, the event served as the launch for the MetroQuest survey.
On-Line MetroQuest Survey: The MetroQuest survey was active from March 11, 2017 through April 16, 2017. The goal of the survey was to educate the public about the project and collect feedback on project priorities, tradeoffs to help direct design, and design preferences related to function and aesthetics. Following completion of the survey, an optional question requested how the participant uses the existing bridge to further illustrate the needs of the project. The survey was design to mirror the activities of the in-person activities at the Mobility Summit, and included:

- Priority Ranking
- Tradeoffs, which included categories such as Design, Role, Views, Mobility, and Parking
- Visual Preference Survey, which included categories such as Landscaping, Lighting, Public Spaces, and streets

The results for each category can be found at www.BelmontBridge.org, on the resources page. Additionally, the 771 written comments can be found on the project website as well. The amount of participation captured in the MetroQuest on-line survey is summarized as follows:

- 896 Participants
- 27,677 individual data points
- 771 written comments

Community Event 2: Design Charrette, April 17-19, 2017: Project team members held a collaborative charrette on April 17-19, 2017 at CitySpace in downtown Charlottesville. During the event, conceptual design concepts were developed based on the original City Council design directive that was supported by feedback collected at the Mobility Summit and online survey. The design process throughout the charrette was iterative, with the working studio open to the public throughout the day to encourage engagement with the project team. Pin-up sessions each evening occurred to show the day’s progress, and allowed project staff to answer questions, address concerns, and document new ideas.

Additionally, five work sessions were organized around key topics central to the bridge design – Traffic, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Parking, Community Space and Bridge Design. The outcomes of the topic discussions informed the design process and the selection of preferred alternatives throughout the remainder of the charrette process.

Overall key takeaways from the design charrette include:

- Overall corridor approach
  - New block structure
  - Closing Old Avon St. at Garrett St.
  - Creating new east/west public street at the railroad property line
- Develop a two lane, 62’ bridge section with a protected bike lane and wide sidewalks
- Additional vertical circulation (pedestrian) north of the railroad tracks on the east side
- Modern / Funky design features
- Enhanced landscape elements on approaches
- Accent lighting for pedestrian safety (not theatrical)
- Interim / shared parking solutions (in cooperation with property owners)
Minimize maintenance concerns regarding raised, planted medians

Following the design charrette, concepts were refined and alternatives were developed for various design elements. The concepts and alternatives were presented to the Steering Committee, Technical Committee, and Small Stakeholder groups on May 15\textsuperscript{th} and 16\textsuperscript{th}. A full summary of the event, including a summary of the work sessions is posted on www.belmontbridge.org.

Community Event 3: Open House, June 1, 2017: Project team members held an open house on June 1, 2017. The open house provided an opportunity for the public to provide feedback on the latest design concept for the Belmont Bridge that became the preferred Conceptual design. The design concept were developed from more than 30,000 outreach data points and 1,000 written comments provided through previous public meetings, the project website, and MetroQuest survey. At the open house, a presentation was made that provided a brief overview and the public was requested to visit stations set up with the following focus areas to provide feedback and ask questions:

- **Bridge Architecture**, which included architectural elements such as fencing, lighting, walls, vertical circulation, and overall 3-dimensional views of the concept. This station also included an interactive 3-D architectural model, giving the opportunity to see alternate views of the design.
- **Corridor**, which included the recommended corridor concept, and, a potential “future build” concept. Additionally, cross sections of the road and plan views of the intersections were a focus.
- **Traffic**, which included graphics depicting lane configuration, queue length, delay, level of service, and projected future traffic conditions in a video format.

Stakeholder Meetings: Throughout the process, individual stakeholder groups met to provide input and feedback during the design process. Stakeholder meetings were open to the public. The following groups met on the following dates in 2017 and 2018:

- Steering Committee: 2017 - February 21, March 29, May 15, June 14, August 16; 2018 – April 4
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee: 2017 - February 23, May 16, September 7
- PLACE Design Task Force: 2017 - February 22, May 16, September 14
- Downtown Business Association / Chamber of Commerce: 2017 - February 22, May 16
- Board of Architectural Review: 2017 - February 22, May 16, August 15 (BAR Meeting)
- Tree Commission: 2017 - February 23, May 16, September 5
- Planning Commission: 2018 – August 8, September 12

The ADA Advisory Committee and Planning Commission were invited to attend any of the five stakeholder group meetings. These stakeholder groups provided feedback in their specialized areas of interest and confirmed that design was progressing in keeping with the project’s purpose and need.

Meeting agendas and summaries can be found under the resources tab on the project website www.BelmontBridge.org. Additionally, a Technical committee was formed which is
comprised of representatives from appropriate City departments. The technical committee held meetings on the project on February 22, 2017, March 30, 2017, May 16, 2017, June 13, 2017 and August 16, 2017. The technical committee meetings confirmed input received from the public and stakeholder groups could be technically attained and then maintained

**Budgetary Impact:** Funded – As disclosed at the Design Public Hearing, the overall budget is $24,787,399 comprised of $6,390,524 in federal, $12,413,617 in state and $5,983,258 in local funding.

**Recommendations:** Approval of the major design features as shown at the Design Public Hearing with 3 changes as a result of public hearing comments:

1) Re-open access point or driveway entrance to Champion Brewing Company on South Street on Parcel 003;
2) Add a bicycle ramp on corner of Levy Avenue and Monticello Road to create a connection between the neighborhood street and shared use path; and
3) Creation of a pedestrian path that connects the pedestrian tunnel to new public, off-street parking spaces to Old Avon Street (south of Avon/9th Street).

**Alternatives:** City Council has several alternatives:

1) By motion, take action to approve a Resolution Approving the Design Public Hearing and the major design features of the project as presented at the Hearing;
2) By motion, take action to approve the attached Resolution Approving the Design Public Hearing and the major design features of the project as presented at the Hearing with the proposed changes discussed tonight (and contained within this memo);
3) By motion, request changes to the attached Resolution Approving the Design Public Hearing and the major design features of the project as presented at the Hearing with some of the proposed changes discussed tonight (and contained within this memo) and/or new design changes resulting from public comment collected at the Hearing;
4) Deny approval of the major design features and request project team to evaluate/refine another alternative resulting in a new Design Public Hearing.
5) Deny approval of the major design features and remove bridge replacement project from the 6-Year Program.

**Attachments:**

(A) Proposed Design Resolution Approving Major Design Features
(B) Preferred Conceptual Design with Three Suggested Changes as a result of Design Public Hearing
(C) Design Public Hearing Transcript
(D) Design Public Hearing Comments
(E) Design Public Hearing Displays
BELMONT BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT
DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING APPROVAL RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, a Design Public Hearing was conducted on May 24, 2018 in the City of Charlottesville by representatives of the City of Charlottesville and the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Transportation after due and proper notice for the purpose of considering the proposed design of the Belmont Bridge Replacement project under State project number of 0020-104-101, PE-101, RW-201, C501, B-601 and Federal project number of BR-5104 (159) in the City of Charlottesville, at which hearing aerial photographs, drawings, environmental documentation and other pertinent information were made available for public inspection in accordance with state and federal requirements; and

WHEREAS, all persons and parties in attendance were afforded full opportunity to participate in said public hearing; and

WHEREAS, representatives of the City of Charlottesville were present and participated in said hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Council had previously requested the Virginia Department of Transportation to program this project; and

WHEREAS, the Council fully deliberated and considered all such matters; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Charlottesville hereby approves the major design features of the proposed project as presented at the Public Hearing with the following changes:

4) Re-open access point or driveway entrance to Champion Brewing Company on South Street on Parcel 003;

5) Add a bicycle ramp on corner of Levy Avenue and Monticello Road to create a connection between the neighborhood street and shared use path; and

6) Creation of a pedestrian path that connects the pedestrian tunnel to new public, off-street parking spaces to Old Avon Street (south of Avon/9th Street).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Charlottesville will acquire and/or furnish all right-of-way necessary for this project and certify the same to the Virginia Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration at the appropriate time.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager is hereby authorized to execute, on behalf of the City of Charlottesville, all necessary agreements required in conjunction with acquiring such rights of way, as well as all other associated standard agreements for construction activities.

Adopted this _______ day of July 2018.

City of Charlottesville, Virginia

ATTEST:

_______________________
CLERK OF COUNCIL

_______________________
MAYOR
Attachment C - Design Public Hearing Transcript
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MS. SCHATZMAN: Hi. My name is Joan Schatzman, and I would have to say that overall I'm really happy with the whole process, and I got just about everything that I wanted.

But the one thing that disturbs me is the pedestrian crossing at Graves Street. And they're replaced it with a underground tunnel. I do not want to walk in a tunnel at night. And I often go out at night and walk home.

And I have come up with a solution to solve the problem, and that was to put a traffic light coordinated with the traffic light at Levy Avenue that would say "Walk" and "Don't Walk," coordinated with the light. So if it was "Don't Walk," I would wait until it was my turn to cross and Graves at the bridge, period. I would love that if that could be re-incorporated.

MR. JEHLE: All I want to say is I've attended just about every single public event that the consultants has held in the City on the Belmont Bridge, and I like the job you guys have done.
MS. SATIRA: Hello. My name is Caroline Satira. I'm the manager of Avon Court, LC. We are concerned about the project's impact on the businesses of the tenants of Avon Court, LC. We request that the temporary easement adjacent to Old Avon Street not go through the parking lot, and instead enter from South Street.

The parking lot is not designed for through traffic like that contemplated by the temporary easement. We are concerned that it will be disruptive and pose safety issues. We would like to make sure that the two entrances from South Street that serve Downtown Family Health Care and Champion Brewing Company, respectively, be maintained. We request that traffic be maintained on South Street during the construction process so as not to disrupt the businesses that utilize that road. Thank you.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

MS. JANICZEK: All right. Good evening, everyone. Thank you very much for attending the Belmont Bridge Replacement Project public hearing.

I'm Jeanette Janiczek, the UCI Program
Manager and the project manager for this project for
the City. I just want to welcome you all. Thank you
for attending. We'd like to open the public hearing
noting that it is State Project Number 00020-104-101
UPC 75878, with a Federal Project Number of BR-5104.

We are coordinating this project with VDOT
and FHWA. So you will see state and federal funding
mixed with local funding for a total of $24 million for
this project.

We hope that you had a chance to attend the
informal plan review from 5:00 to 7:00. That's when
you had a chance to review the documents as well as ask
questions of the project team.

These materials will be placed on our
website, Belmontbridge.org after the meeting, probably
later tomorrow. If you do not have a chance to speak
here tonight you are free to submit your comments until
June 8th. We are recording all the comments, the
verbal comments, through a court reporter. We're
accepting comment forms and we're also accepting email.
You'll see the email address in the brochure that
you've been given tonight.

Again, all comments that we receive up until
June 8th are going to be compiled in one report. We
will be responding to the questions and comments that
we hear here tonight, and we will be reporting back to
City Council for their approval in July of this year.
   So we'll open up the public hearing. We ask
that you state your name and address for the record.
We request that you keep your comments to three
minutes. I'll be keeping a little stopwatch and notify
you as you're approaching your time when you're
finished. We currently have seven people that are
signed up.

   I think that is it. And, again, all the
comments we hear tonight are also going to be put on
our website, Belmontbridge.org.

   So let's get started with Mr. Martin, if
you'd like to come up.

MR. MARTIN: My name Jehu Martin. What
else am I supposed to say?

MS. JANICZEK: Your address, please.

MR. MARTIN: Oh, 333 2nd Street, S.E.

Okay. I received a letter, a lot of my friends
received it also on the 21st of April inviting us to
fill out a survey online that closed the 15th of April,
so it was a little hard to do that. But that happened
when they re-bricked the Downtown Mall, too, so I guess
we should be used to it.
I just question why the plans are for a single lane in each direction. The current bridge is inadequate. And one of the City reports that came out several years ago indicated that 27,000 more cars would be using it in the future. That number is probably way higher now because there's about six construction projects that are going to be done in the Downtown Mall area in the next couple years. They're starting already. And the amount of traffic that's going to generate once that's finished, you're going to cut down half the Belmont Bridge for two years. And then when you're finished it's going to be a single lane in each direction, which is totally inadequate for what it's going to need to do, I think.

You have the Commonwealth Center's going to be rebuilt. The Omni's going to expand. The Ice Park and Escafe are going to be replaced by new buildings. The Dewberry Hotel will be done if the City stops sabotaging it. And that will go ahead. And that will be beautiful and create a lot of jobs.

You also have this very large upscale office building that's going to go on 4th Street. It's going to have about 400 parking spaces and a lot of other rooms. All this is going on. All this will create jobs, bring stuff downtown. But this bridge, which is
inadequate as it is now. It's like a two lane bridge, but you can only use one lane. I've always liked that. And you're going to say it only feeds into a single lane road. Of course. But if you look at cities like Houston and others that put those type of highways in the middle of their neighborhoods, you can have turning lanes and other lanes that feed out and spread the traffic out as it moves away from the bridge.

I know the study area is this. But I know why that's limited, because you have to take into account the entire flow of traffic. Right now if you were driving around town today, any day, try to take Preston Avenue from Downtown to Barracks Road and see if you don't hit every single red light and there's no other traffic. We have a traffic system that's from 1950. Algorithms and computers do exist. And cities run by grownups actually have them and the traffic flows. We don't have a traffic problem. We have a traffic management problem. And this bridge -- this bridge, I think, should be postponed. I think it should be put off for a couple of years, wait until a lot of that construction is done, and revisit it and make it more -- a larger capacity instead of less. Because it makes no sense the way it is now.

And once we build it we're stuck with it for
generations to come, or maybe like the last bridge, 40 years. Maybe it's just a 40 year bridge. Somebody said that in a comment online. And that's it, and I have 30 seconds left. That's all I have to say. I just wanted to complain, because I want it to be better. I want the town to be better, you know. Thank you.

MS. JANICZEK: All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: Jeff Hall, 1121 Dryden Lane. I'm here -- I work for a company here in town, Manchester Capital Management. I run their real estate advisory practice. Five years ago I acquired -- I didn't acquire, but I acquired on behalf of a client this building, 701 East Water Street, also known as the LexisNexis Building.

So with this new plan in terms of, you know, taking of land and easements, I'm impacted the most. And I mean generally we support, you know, this bridge needs to be rebuilt. And that's very important. But I do have some design concerns I would point out.

But I just want to talk a little bit. When we bought this building it was in really bad shape.
And over the past five years we've re-tenanted it. We've brought in great tenants and we've rebuilt the entire inside.

At the moment we've actually designed and are going to make a very substantial investment in redoing the lobby. And the client of my who owns the building daughter's an artist, and she's involved in the project, and we're going to create sort of an art gallery there where we hope to have local artists, you know, display their art and have events there and things like that, because we really want to pull --

You know, with all the development going on down here we really want to pull this building into the Mall. Now the second phase, and what's been my vision, and I've done a lot of this. I actually do most of my work in West Coast cities like Seattle and San Francisco. The longer term -- I mean, this area, I don't know if any of you have walked through that. I mean it's awful. It's awful. And I admit that.

So the next phase for me, I was going to focus on this and try to create a really sense of place where there's a real connection into the Mall. And I've had some thoughts about getting more trees in there, you know, there's no shade in there whatsoever, but really create a nice connection. And with what's
going on with the project, you know, my hope is for
doing that.

And so as I look at this plan, you know,
we're going to have very generous sidewalks, very
generous sidewalks. From an urban planning viewpoint I
don't think that's good planning. You know, the reason
this Mall works is because of the density of people.
You know we have six foot sidewalks on here now and
they're cavernous. So I don't think -- You know, I
really think we'd want to create something here. And I
guess it's the point about the roads that are a little
narrower and have a little more sense of place and are
inviting to people. So that would be a more general
comment.

But I'm going to -- I think the comments I'm
going make to the City, I need some relief in here.
And I know that there's like -- For example, there's
this bunch of trees in here where they have to poke the
-- you know, the road and the sidewalk out into my
property. And I just think in terms -- As I look at
this long term and what the ownership wants to do with
the property -- I've got 30 seconds -- You know, I
really would hope when we make our comments that we
could get some support from the community, because I
really think long term this needs to really -- Oh, my
time's up. It needs to integrate better than what this plan shows. So thank you.

MS. JANICZEK: Thank you.

Mr. Tim Freilich. I'm sorry if I'm mispronounced it.

MR. FREILICH: That's all right. Good evening everyone. My name is Tim Freilich. I live at 719 Levy Avenue, right there where Levy Avenue and Monticello Road come together. I wanted to thank the committees and the planners for their excellent work, particularly with the bicycle facilities. As a bike commuter I'm really excited about what's shaping up there. So thank you for that work.

I also appreciate the focus on safety. I have my two daughters here, six and seven years old. And so that's really important to me. I worry though that the focus on safety on the bridge is shifting some of the danger into our immediate neighborhood, particularly with regard to the left turn out of Graves onto southbound 9th Street. I think right now that's - - you can go either way. I understand the current design is to close off the left turn and reroute traffic up Monticello Road changing direction of flow and then back on Levy Avenue to get people going to the
light. That's about 13 houses in a residential area. Routing extra traffic through a residential area. We would much rather have it exiting immediately onto the bridge.

I think that there are a bunch of improvements in the design, including the fewer lanes of travel in each direction, that are going the make the bridge much more safer than it currently is. And that will allow those left turns in a more safer manner than you currently can.

Similarly the at-grade crosswalk at Graves I believe should be preserved in addition to the underpass to give folks the option. I think people will have a really good sense, particularly at night, of whether they would rather remain above the bridge rather than heading through an underpass. I don't really care how well lit an underpass is at night, I just know from my own experience I would much rather be above the surface rather than heading underneath anything at night, regardless of how well lit it is. And I'm sure other people feel that way as well. So I urge that both of those be preserved, the crosswalk and the addition of a nice underpass. That's all.

I just -- The main focus is please recognize that the safety improvements that are being put in
place will allow for that crosswalk and will allow for
those left turns out of Graves. Don't shift those into
the neighborhood. And I understand it's outside of the
scope, the pilot project that's being considered to
reverse flow on Monticello Road, but it's clearly part
of the project. It's the overflow impact from the
project. So please don't just shift the danger into
our residential neighborhood. Thank you.

MS. JANICZEK: Wendy or Tom Hubbard? You
both can speak, or one of you can speak.
(No response.)
Wendy or Tom Hubbard? I believe he left.
So now we're to Barbara --

MS. GOEBEL: Goebel. Barbara Goebel, 705
Graves Street. And I also want to go the same
direction as my neighbor.
First of all I want to thank you to actually
cut the traffic down to one lane in each direction,
because I think that will make the whole bridge a lot
safer, and I think it's a little more forward-looking
to changing transportation concepts. I think overall
the City needs a better public transport concept and
bike path concept for the future with all the density
we're increasing.
I also think the underpass is a waste because I don't think pedestrian underpasses are safe at night. And I don't think this will be used very much. I would urge you to at least give it a try to have the crossing on Graves Street and see how it goes with the traffic -- with the one lane traffic. And I share the same concerns with the -- because the intersection is really steep with the whole change of traffic going down -- going up Monticello and down Levy. But other than that I want to compliment you all for a good public engagement process, and I look forward to having these wide sidewalks, wide bike paths, and have this thing built ASAP. Thank you.

MS. JANICZEK: All right. Thank you.

Tomas Rahal.

MR. RAHAL: Hi. I'm Tomas Rahal, 404 Commerce. I'm also a business owner at Quality Pie on the corner of Avon and Graves.

A couple notes. I mean obviously this is going to be a long process. I would disagree with Jehu about the Dewberry project. I think the quicker we reduce that to rubble and we start all over again the better and the safer.

Also I would just preface all of this by
saying that while we are eager to get on with this
project and produce something that is better than what
exists there, I think fundamentally the density and the
increasing traffic patterns I think should cause us to
pump the brakes here and think about a more
comprehensive and integrated pedestrian, bike, running,
walk, business concept, because this is going to be
very disruptive, even in the abbreviated time that
you've assigned for it. And I feel like most of the
time during these type of projects the businesses that
are most impacted are the ones adjacent to it, which
would be my business, which would be Lampo, which would
be Champion, Fox's, and the bridge, not to mention the
two bigger businesses behind us, Tom and Wendy Hubbard
mainly representing those.

So I would look for a more integrated and
profound concept that sought to address reducing the
traffic. Shortening or limiting the lanes isn't going
to really change those habits for people. I think we
need to take people maybe along Monticello Avenue more
frequently and turn that into the gateway, rather than
taking them over this bridge, if we're not going to
consider this bridge a gateway and give it the due that
it richly deserves.

I would also say that repairing while we
process this redesign would not be a bad idea at this point, since the side that's crumbling is still just sort of boarded off or fenced off, and people still try to transgress that. I watch people every single morning try and cross that at-grade crossing at great peril, including with children in carriages, on bicycles. It's not a good crossing. I think we need to rethink that. And I think that Levy Street intersection is the natural place to do that. But I'm obviously open for anything that people can think of, including why don't we have a more enhanced satellite parking project where we can bring commuters into town either through jitneys or small buses and drop them off. We're headed in that direction anyhow with parking lots and parking garages attached to buildings. Why not do it just a little bit further out down the road and then bring them in without having to bring in a single person in a SUV or a pickup truck or wherever they're coming from whatever vehicle they bring with them and all the problems with that.

So narrowing the bridge isn't going to change those habits for people. And we need clearly more safe pedestrian and bike and running paths in the Downtown core as we bring more people into the neighborhood. That's all I have to say. Thank you.
MS. JANICZEK: That's all that we have signed up for talking or giving comment. Does anyone else want to speak? Does anyone else that I gave three minutes to want more time up here to provide comments?

MR. RAHAL: I would just add that with Barbara and Peter and several of the other people here, you have so many great talented designers in the neighborhood, right in the footprint. And I just wonder what kind of feedback you've been eliciting from them as well. Not that you guys aren't doing a great job. But I just feel like that really is missing maybe.

MS. JANICZEK: Okay. And all of the comments we've received to-date, all of the comments that you give us here tonight whether they're written, verbal, et cetera, it's all going to be on Belmontbridge.org. So you can see the history. You can see a brochure, et cetera.

So we were here to listen to you all tonight. And thank you very much for sharing your comments. Again, all of these comments are going to be complied and reported back to you. Please stay tuned. If you leave me your contact information you'll be included in the project mailing list.

So, again, thank you all very much.
MR. FREILICH: Jeanette, I'm sorry. Can I add one more piece? And that is -- Tim Freilich, 719 Levy Avenue. Just to stress again the topography of Levy Avenue and the turn that would be hairpin turn if the pilot project to reverse Monticello Road is put in place. That's the first part. The second part is actually the huge hump that is Levy Avenue. It's not a straight sight line down to the intersection. So there are other safety issues being raised with the topography of Levy Avenue as well. Thank you.

MS. JANICZEK: All right, great.

MS. GOEBEL: And I have one more comment?

MS. JANICZEK: Yes.

MS. GOEBEL: I think before -- is whether the fence could actually be horizontal I think it would have to span for the cantilever, and even if it had to expand 15 feet I think that the eight foot high railroad fence is just horrible. And I know a lot of bridges throughout the country have these horizontal fences for suicide prevention, and I think that would be a lot more aesthetically pleasing. So please bring that up with the railroad and the engineers.

MS. JANICZEK: Okay, great. Thank you. Is there any other comment?

MR. MARTIN: Just that an example of
narrowing down the roadway is that fiasco called the
John Warner Parkway. We built the parkway, a single
lane parkway, 35 mile an hour speed limit. No
shoulder. And it's a lovely ride for a bike. It's a
nice ride for a car. And it takes you to Cville Coffee
and Circa's. If you want a used piece of furniture
it's your highway. And it creates traffic jams at the
very end of it, three or four of them by the lights. I
don't know where it was supposed to bring anybody, but
it's not bringing anybody to downtown. And then to
balance that they put these stop lights on Park Street.
So in the middle of the afternoon there's a six block -
- four to six block backup. So we created artificial
traffic jams. I don't know what the purpose of that
was. I don't know why somebody -- If I still lived
there I'd be screaming because there's no reason for
that.

And so narrowing roadways -- The way you
take care of traffic is you give it an easy smooth way
to move on its way and get out of your way.
Restricting it and cutting it down just creates traffic
jams. With all the construction that's going to go on
we're going to have a bit of a nightmare for a couple
of years to come.

And your project says two years. But I
don't know any construction project that ever finished
-- you know, it's not your fault. That's the nature of
the business. So that should be more like -- probably
be more like four.

MS. JANICZEK: Okay. Tomas.

MR. RAHAL: Well, I just -- I'm sort of
catching up. But what dialogue do you have with the
railroad as far as transgressing their tracks with a
foot bridge or a pedestrian bridge?

MS. JANICZEK: We are going to have to go
through the right-of-way phase with them already with
an easement. So adding an additional crossing would be
quite difficult. You all are pushing me into
responding and getting into Q and A, and we're trying
to keep this to a public hearing.

So you can keep asking me questions, but
could we -- But I reserve the right to not answer at a
later date so we can close this meeting.

Are there any other comments or questions?
(No response.)

MS. JANICZEK: All right. I want to thank
you very much. Please, if you haven't submitted a
comment, please do so by June 8th. If you know anyone
that's interested or you could interest them, let them
know that June 8th is the deadline and to go to
Belmontbridge.org for more information. Thank you again.

(Hearing concluded, 7:25 p.m.)
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### Question #1 - Do the design features adequately address the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explain Why:**

- Too much width is allocated to the pedestrian and bicycle paths, a total of 40 feet. 1
- Concerns with only one lane in each direction bridge. 4
- Consider passageway portals being scalloped versus flush with wall face. 1
- Maintain at grade crossing of 9th Street north of Gravel. 1
- Make the staircase north of the passageway smooth, elegant and intuitive 1

### Question #2 - Do you agree that the following project features are attractive while appropriately connect the Downtown Mall and surrounding neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a - Landscaping</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b - Lighting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c - Surf. Treatment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d - Public Spaces</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question #2A - Concerns/Comments on Landscaping**

- A little basic suggest more landscaping 1
- Use a variety of tree species native to the area 2
- Separate walkway to Downtown Mall from Pavilion 1
- Obtain a variance from BBRR for no fence on the bridge. 1
- Concerned about losing street trees on Water Street due to Knuckle Plaza 1

**Question #2B - Concerns/Comments on Lighting**

- Less is more in regards to lighting except in the passageways. Don't uplight or downlight bridge. 2
- Create a skylight in median of 9th Street for the pedestrian passageway. 1
- Ensure adequate and safe lighting in the passageways and beneath the bridge. 1
- Do not agree with use of W. Main lighting and street furniture (benches, racks, etc.) on project. 1

**Question #2C - Surface Treatments (sidewalk, crosswalks, walls)**

- A lot of concrete 3
- Bridge rail looks like a highway rail. 1
- Simple and easy to maintain. 1
- Add stone veneer like retaining walls to bridge piers 1

**Question #2D - Public Spaces**

- Knuckle plaza is unnecessary and detrimental to street trees and street scene on Water Street 1
- Old Avon Plaza area is a good repurposing of closed street. 1
- Need more benches 1

### Question #3 - Did the visual information (typical sections, plans, etc.) on display at the hearing help your understanding of the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question #3 - If No, why?**

### Question #4 - Do you have any comments on the draft environmental document or comments regarding potential environmental issues?

**None**

### Question #5 - Please use the following space for any additional comments.

- Add crosswalk on Monticello Road (private) at 209+75 RT. 1
- Convert public parking on Monticello Road (private) to be angled in SB. 1
- Do not include a fence or the selected fence design is inadequate. 4
- Do not agree with use of W. Main lighting and street furniture (benches, racks, etc.) on project. 1
- Pedestrian passageway will not be used. 2
- Design does not improve access during Pavilion events to the Downtown Mall. 2
- Provide more roadway capacity/travel lanes 2
- Preserve the parking lot under the existing bridge 1
Sean Miller
(No Address Specified)
The project team has been conducting traffic analysis and presenting their findings at various public meetings. You may review these materials at https://www.belmontbridge.org/resources/ for the Design Charrette and Open House. A Traffic Analysis Report can also be found at https://www.belmontbridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Belmont-Bridge-Traffic-Report_032618_ADA.pdf.

Based on the latest (2015) published VDOT traffic data, the approximate annual average daily traffic (AADT) on Avon Street between Monticello Avenue and E. Market Street is 14,000 vehicles per day. The City has provided a growth rate of future vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian activity to account for redevelopment which increased the AADT to 14,700 in 2041. However, level of service or delay analysis has not been performed for this scenario.

The design team has recommended standard maintenance of traffic. Only two candidate options were identified: 1) maintenance of a sidewalk and one lane of traffic in each direction or 2) full closure of the bridge.

Potential detours were previously explored that extended to Monticello Avenue to either Ridge Street or Carlton Road to travel over the railroad, but rejected due to their length and complexity of rerouting. Input from the steering committee and City stakeholders led to the decision that access across the bridge must be maintained throughout construction.

E-mail

athleen Mair
(No Address Specified)
Yes, the Belmont Bridge Replacement project team is proposing a two-vehicular-lane bridge (one lane in each direction). The project team has been conducting traffic analysis and presenting their findings at various public meetings. You may review these materials at https://www.belmontbridge.org/resources/ for the Design Charrette and Open House. A Traffic Analysis Report can be found at https://www.belmontbridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Belmont-Bridge-Traffic-Report_032618_ADA.pdf.

In summary, the project area is surrounded and being fed by a series of two-lane streets. Avon Street/9th Street is two-lane divided with a 12-foot width. The proposed bridge would have a single lane in each direction. By focusing on the length and configuration of the turning lanes on both ends of the bridge, the efficiency, or amount of vehicles proceeding through the signs, can be maximized making traffic slightly better in the short-term and the same or slightly worse in the long-term. By maximizing the efficiency of the signals, previous vehicle lane width that was used for queuing vehicles can be repurposed to encourage and enhance bicyclist and pedestrian facilities. Since the project area is urban in nature, we provided a growth rate of future vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian activity to account for redevelopment.

Email

N/A

Joan Chilson
100 Red Street, S.E  Charlottesville, VA 22902

The project team has been conducting traffic analysis and presenting their findings at various public meetings. You may review these materials at https://www.belmontbridge.org/resources/ for the Design Charrette and Open House. A Traffic Analysis Report can be found at https://www.belmontbridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Belmont-Bridge-Traffic-Report_032618_ADA.pdf

The design team has recommended standard maintenance of traffic. Only two candidate options were identified: 1) maintenance of a sidewalk and one lane of traffic in each direction or 2) full closure of the bridge.

Potential detours were previously explored that extended to Monticello Avenue to either Ridge Street or Carlton Road to travel over the railroad, but rejected due to their length and complexity of rerouting. Input from the steering committee and City stakeholders led to the decision that access across the bridge must be maintained throughout construction. This is the Belmont Bridge Replacement project intent to creating a new elevated one lane bridge (one lane in each direction). The project team has been conducting traffic analysis and presenting their findings at various public meetings. You may review these materials at https://www.belmontbridge.org/resources/ for the Design Charrette and Open House. A Traffic Analysis Report can be found at https://www.belmontbridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Belmont-Bridge-Traffic-Report_032618_ADA.pdf

In summary, the project area is surrounded and being fed by a series of two-lane streets. Avon Street/9th Street is two-lane divided with a 12-foot width. The proposed bridge would have a single lane in each direction. By focusing on the length and configuration of the turning lanes on both ends of the bridge, the efficiency, or amount of vehicles proceeding through the signals, can be maximized making traffic slightly better in the short-term and the same or slightly worse in the long-term. By maximizing the efficiency of the signals, previous vehicle lane width that was used for queuing vehicles can be repurposed to encourage and enhance bicyclist and pedestrian facilities. Since the project area is urban in nature, we provided a growth rate of future vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian activity to account for redevelopment.

Email

N/A

Jean Miller
(Battleground Realty Group)

The project team has been conducting traffic analysis and presenting their findings at various public meetings. You may review these materials at https://www.belmontbridge.org/resources/ for the Design Charrette and Open House. A Traffic Analysis Report can be found at https://www.belmontbridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Belmont-Bridge-Traffic-Report_032618_ADA.pdf.

Based on the latest (2015) published VDOT traffic data, the approximate annual average daily traffic (AADT) on Avon Street between Monticello Avenue and E. Market Street is 14,000 vehicles per day. The City has provided a growth rate of future vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian activity to account for redevelopment which increased the AADT to 14,700 in 2041. However, level of service or delay analysis has not been performed for this scenario.

The design team has recommended standard maintenance of traffic. Only two candidate options were identified: 1) maintenance of a sidewalk and one lane of traffic in each direction or 2) full closure of the bridge.

Potential detours were previously explored that extended to Monticello Avenue to either Ridge Street or Carlton Road to travel over the railroad, but rejected due to their length and complexity of rerouting. Input from the steering committee and City stakeholders led to the decision that access across the bridge must be maintained throughout construction. This is the Belmont Bridge Replacement project intent to creating a new elevated one lane bridge (one lane in each direction). The project team has been conducting traffic analysis and presenting their findings at various public meetings. You may review these materials at https://www.belmontbridge.org/resources/ for the Design Charrette and Open House. A Traffic Analysis Report can be found at https://www.belmontbridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Belmont-Bridge-Traffic-Report_032618_ADA.pdf.

In summary, the project area is surrounded and being fed by a series of two-lane streets. Avon Street/9th Street is two-lane divided with a 12-foot width. The proposed bridge would have a single lane in each direction. By focusing on the length and configuration of the turning lanes on both ends of the bridge, the efficiency, or amount of vehicles proceeding through the signals, can be maximized making traffic slightly better in the short-term and the same or slightly worse in the long-term. By maximizing the efficiency of the signals, previous vehicle lane width that was used for queuing vehicles can be repurposed to encourage and enhance bicyclist and pedestrian facilities. Since the project area is urban in nature, we provided a growth rate of future vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian activity to account for redevelopment.

Email

N/A

Katie Martin
33 2nd Street, S.E  Charlottesville, VA 22902
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hubbard</td>
<td>Hubbard Properties, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Krovetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stoudt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Parcel Support</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Access Locations

The current design could not be more nonsense. It’s the axis of evil! It’s worse than the worst. It seems this is a political, not architectural, decision. In my opinion, the design team has done a disservice to the project and the City. The City’s challenge is that the current retention ridge of the red is not sufficiently wide and would not otherwise be compatible with the existing sidewalk features unless some significant changes are made to allow for pedestrian access. Based on the current pedestrian access points and existing sidewalk, the City will need to address this in order to maintain the sidewalk and to ensure pedestrian access.

### Fence Height

I am concerned by the addition of a 4’ high fence along the parapets of the bridge as shown on 5/24 drawings. Because several other bridges over the railroad do not have this, it looks odd and out of place. The elimination of the fence as proposed by others is a good move. It seems to me that the design team should be more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Height

The current design of the bridge is too high and will result in a large reduction in the sidewalk area. The City should not allow this to happen. The City should insist on a lower bridge height. The design team should be more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Width

The current design of the bridge is too narrow and will result in a large reduction in the sidewalk area. The City should not allow this to happen. The City should insist on a wider bridge width. The design team should be more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Ramps

The design team is reviewing how to best add a bicycle ramp in the middle of the radius at Monticello and Graves Street to allow cyclists to access the pedestrian passageway without crossing a curb or planted median. The City should insist on this being done. The City should insist on the design team being more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Reconfiguration

The parking layout of the perpendicular lot on Monticello Road was reviewed. The current design maximizes the number of spaces and allows for utilization by both northbound and southbound traffic. The City should insist on this being done. The City should insist on the design team being more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Accessibility

The area along private Monticello Road (from 9th Street station 208 to 210) that has a public access easement will be redesigned to include a walkway to connect the new public parking spaces to the pedestrian area. The City should insist on this being done. The City should insist on the design team being more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Safety

The new design of the bridge is too high and will result in a large reduction in the sidewalk area. The City should not allow this to happen. The City should insist on a lower bridge height. The design team should be more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Efficiency

The efficiency, or amount of vehicles proceeding through the signals, can be maximized making traffic slightly better in the City. The City should insist on this being done. The City should insist on the design team being more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Noise

The noise level at the bridge is too high and will result in a large reduction in the sidewalk area. The City should not allow this to happen. The City should insist on a lower bridge height. The design team should be more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Aesthetics

The designers have selected various materials – landscaped beds, mowed areas with trees, planted stormwater basin, contemporary street furnishings and lights, sleek railing, concrete stamping/staining as well as cladding for the bridge walls – in an attempt to create visual interest. The City should insist on this being done. The City should insist on the design team being more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Construction

The construction of the bridge is too high and will result in a large reduction in the sidewalk area. The City should not allow this to happen. The City should insist on a lower bridge height. The design team should be more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.

### Bridge Maintenance

The maintenance of the bridge is too high and will result in a large reduction in the sidewalk area. The City should not allow this to happen. The City should insist on a lower bridge height. The design team should be more considerate of what is being designed and how it will impact the surrounding environment.
The area along private Monticello Road (from 9th Street station 208 to 210) that has a public access easement will be redesigned to include a walkway to connect the new public parking spaces to the pedestrian tunnel along Old Avon Street.

The parking layout of the perpendicular lot on Monticello Road was reviewed. The current design maximizes the number of spaces while allowing for circulation by both northbound and southbound traffic.

However, Buckingham Branch Railroad/CSX Transportation standards require fencing. The design team is actively working with the railroad to obtain a waiver for the fence to be installed with construction of the project. However, the decision of whether there is a fence or no fence is at the sole discretion of the railroad. If fencing is required, the fence was designed to minimize disruption from the views from the walkways.
Two entrances currently exist on South Street to the Avon Court, LC parcel – one was proposed to remain and another removed. The entrance to be removed serves a parking lot where Champion Brewing Company is located. This parking lot does not currently have a parking lot apron. The selection of which entrance to retain was based on two criteria: future driveway access to the parking lot apron and whether the entrance would alter/close access to the temporary construction easement. A new entrance on Levy Avenue will be proposed to the Steering Committee at their September meeting. In addition to the parking lot access, the current parking lot on South Street is used for temporary access to the South Street Bridge. We would like to make sure that the two entrances from South Street will be maintained; however, some interruption to through-traffic on South Street will be required.

Left turn prohibitions during peak periods was also considered versus access control; however, it was determined that this would create a potential enforcement issue and not improve safety. Based on public feedback, the steering committee recommends that the two entrances from South Street will be maintained; however, some interruption to through-traffic on South Street will be required.

The design team's recommendation for not including an at-grade crosswalk is due to safety and it not being in conformance to the City's Streets Work Design Standards due to its close proximity to the crosswalk at Levy Avenue and Avon Street. As noted in the above link memorandum, significantly more pedestrian volume would be expected in the long-term.

Additionally, Buckingham Branch Railroad/CSX Transportation standards require fencing. The design team is actively working on solutions for this location and in the weeks ahead will present these solutions to the steering committee for review and consideration. We will continue to work closely with the City of Charlottesville to address these concerns.

The design team has considered two main alternative designs that could be built in this context. The first alternative design includes a pedestrian tunnel to provide a connection to the existing pedestrian crossing near the bridge. The second alternative design includes a pedestrian bridge that would be built near the exiting pedestrian crossing to provide a connection to the existing pedestrian crossing. The steering committee will consider the long-term costs and benefits of each alternative to help determine the final design.

Private property access to and from South Street will be maintained; however, some interruption to through-traffic on South Street will be required.

A solution similar to the one suggested of a traffic light coordinated with the signal at Levy Avenue was discussed with the Steering Committee; however, this design could not be implemented without constructing utility poles on South Street. The Steering committee recommends that the City consider an alternative to the temporary bridge which is being considered for construction.

Private property access to and from South Street will be maintained; however, some interruption to through-traffic on South Street will be required.

A traffic signal on South Street at its intersection with Park Street was proposed to be extended. This project will be reviewed at the Steering Committee's next meeting. The City of Charlottesville has reviewed and approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans. The City of Charlottesville has also approved the traffic signal's cost estimate and construction plans.
Jeff Hall As a real estate advisor from properties located around the country, an advocate for affordable housing, the incumbent chair of the safety committee, and a resident of our local community, I am extremely disappointed with the design you are proposing for the Belmont Bridge Replacement project.

There are a number of important safety issues that must be addressed:

1. **Topography of Levy Avenue:** The huge hump that is Levy Avenue is not a safe intersection. It is a straight sight line down to the intersection. So there are other safety issues being raised with the topography of Levy Avenue.
2. **Levy Avenue and Avon Street:** Two options were presented at the Open House meeting – eliminating both lefts in and out of Graves Street or eliminating only lefts out of Graves Street. Under both options, all others would turn right. If either were chosen, there would be a great impact on the ability to use this area as a shopping area.
3. **Safety Crosswalks:** The City will be conducting a trial run of reversing the flow on Monticello Road. It is an important part of this discussion to understand it's outside of the scope, the pilot project that's being considered to reverse flow on Monticello Road, but it is a very important part of what we're looking at.
4. **City Responsibilities:** It's the overflow impact from the project. So please don't just shift the danger into our residential neighborhood.

Additionally, there are a number of other important design elements of the requested "more comprehensive and integrated pedestrian, bike, running, walk, business concept." Some of these elements include:

1. **Grade Crossings:** The separation of Avon/9th Street north of the railroad.
2. **Traffic Count Adjustments:** The point in time that you are talking about with the topography of Levy Avenue.
3. **Pedestrian Passageway:** The new pedestrian passageway beneath 9th Street can be used to cross 9th Street near Graves Street without crossing the road.

Lastly, I would also say that repairing while we process this redesign would not be a bad idea at this point, although I think that the most significant part of this redesign could be the visual impact of the bridge and the greenway.

Thank you.
Attachment E - Design Public Hearing Displays

All of the below materials are linked to the project website, www.belmontbridge.org, and are available under the Resources tab in an accessible format using the following links:

- **Notice**
  - Design Public Hearing Notice May 24, 2018 (PDF)

- **Meeting Material**
  - Environmental Documentation (PDF)
  - Stage 1 Report (PDF)
  - **Boards**
    - Public Hearing Plan (PDF)
    - Roadway Typical Sections (PDF)
    - Roadway Furnishings (PDF)
    - Pedestrian Access (PDF)
    - Pedestrian Access in Construction Board (PDF)
    - Bridge Architecture: Walls and Railings (PDF)
    - Bridge Architecture: Fencing (PDF)
    - Lighting (PDF)
    - Pedestrian Passageway/Plaza (PDF)
    - Present and Future Aerial Rendering (PDF)
    - Environmental Findings (PDF)
    - Getting Involved (PDF)
    - Traffic Queue and Delay (PDF)
    - Lane Configuration Scrolls (PDF)
    - Budget Breakdown (PDF)
    - Public Hearing Brochure and Comment Form (PDF)
    - Project Funding Summary (PDF)