

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on May 28, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 241, Second Floor, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22902. The meeting was called by the Chair, Mr. Jim H. Andrews, to allow a quorum of Board members to convene an open meeting for the purpose of participating in a work session, including: (1) a Call to Order; (2) Review and Discussion of the AC44: Draft Transportation Chapter; (3) From the Board: Discussion of Matters Not Listed on the Agenda; (4) From the County Executive: a Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda; and (5) Adjournment.

PRESENT: Mr. Jim H. Andrews, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, and Mr. Mike O. D. Pruitt.

ABSENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Deputy County Executive, Ann Wall; Deputy County Executive, Trevor Henry; County Attorney, Andy Herrick; and Clerk, Claudette K. Borgersen.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Jim Andrews.

Mr. Andrews introduced the Albemarle County Police Department Officers present to provide their services at the meeting, Officers Chaka Joiner and Regina Ryan.

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** AC44 - Draft Transportation Chapter

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County is updating the Comprehensive Plan through the Albemarle County 2044 (AC44) project. The project is in Phase 3: drafting language for the four-part Comprehensive Plan document and developing Plan actions.

The draft language for the Part III - Transportation chapter in Attachment B is built upon community input and reflects the Planning Commission's and Board's feedback. Multimodal transportation planning in Albemarle County aims to create safe, accessible, and efficient travel options to support the movement of people and goods. Effective transportation planning is critical to maintaining quality of life and affordability in the county, as housing and transportation costs are highly linked; combined housing and transportation costs accounted for nearly half of household expenses in Albemarle in 2024. Effective transportation planning is also critical for the achievement of County commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; the transportation sector accounted for over 40% of total county greenhouse gas emissions in 2022. Further, effective transportation planning improves safety and accessibility for road users of all ages and abilities.

Creating a robust multimodal network requires overcoming challenges created by historical trends in transportation and land use planning, such as an emphasis on moving cars quickly at the expense of other transportation modes and the need for coordinated urban design and land use planning. Other challenges include high peak-hour demand, a fragmented multimodal network, state ownership (the Virginia Department of Transportation) of public roadways within the county, an increasing proportion of older residents (especially in the Rural Area), and limited funding. This chapter acknowledges the differing challenges and priorities within the Development and Rural Areas, with distinct recommendations for each. Albemarle's transportation policies place an emphasis on developing a robust multimodal transportation system within the Development Areas while striving to maintain safe and efficient travel within the Rural Area.

In addition to the mode-specific priorities outlined in this chapter for both the Development and Rural Areas, this chapter describes the development and implementation of a Multimodal Transportation Plan to expand on the priorities, goals, and actions described in the Comprehensive Plan. The Multimodal Transportation Plan will be a strategic document that integrates land use and transportation planning to delineate modal networks and articulate a long-term strategy for transportation planning given limited resources and other constraints.

For reference, Community input themes associated with this topic are summarized in Attachment C. A summary of previous Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors feedback on Transportation is provided as Attachment D.

An updated AC44 outline is provided as Attachment A. As a reminder, the topics within the red box will be the focus of today's work session. This work session focuses on proposed comprehensive plan language within Attachment B, with particular emphasis upon the draft actions.

The Planning Commission previously held a work session on Tuesday, May 6, 2025, to discuss the draft Transportation chapter.

There is no budget impact associated with this agenda item.

Staff requests the Board review and provide feedback on the Transportation chapter.

Ms. Tonya Swartzendruber, Planning Manager, stated that she would be discussing the Transportation Chapter of the AC44 Comprehensive Plan and would begin by outlining the agenda for

this meeting. Ms. Swartzendruber said staff would review community input themes, summarize the Planning Commission feedback, and provide an overview of the chapter and upcoming schedule. She stated that the focus topics slide would be shown at the end of the presentation.

Ms. Swartzendruber said a key theme in development areas was providing safe and comfortable infrastructure for all modes of transportation, including sidewalks, paths, and bike lanes separated from cars. She said they had heard feedback that transit needed to be frequent and reliable to encourage usage, slow cars down, and reduce parking requirements to minimize the number of spaces and impervious coverage needed for parking. Ms. Swartzendruber stated that they also heard concern about traffic congestion and infrastructure keeping up with growth, as well as safety in general.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that for the rural areas, the feedback emphasized safety improvements for walking and biking, such as widening shoulders and adding signage, as well as exploring off-street paths and trails. She said they also prioritized increasing rural transit access in the rural area, particularly access to urban areas to serve daily needs and for the aging in the community, and to continue to plan for park and rides in the rural area.

Ms. Swartzendruber stated that the Planning Commission input included interest in providing better bike and pedestrian connectivity in development areas, along with eliminating cul-de-sacs and dead ends to promote vehicular movement. She said the Commission had suggested completing a study to enhance airport connections, and prioritize infrastructure investments and multimodal connections, despite funding challenges at the federal level. She noted that they also encouraged establishing a parks and trail fund to support public spaces and greenways. She said that for the rural area, the Commission suggested expansion of the road margins for safer walking and biking along major multimodal routes and avoiding placing roads in the floodplains. Ms. Swartzendruber added that the Commission felt there was an overemphasis on recreational users in the rural area, which implied they were prioritized over other users.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Deputy Director of Planning, stated that there is a notable difference in how they approach transportation in the development area versus the rural area, and this theme would be evident throughout the chapter, with distinct goals, objectives, and needs in each area. Mr. McDermott said the development area challenges were high peak-hour demand that manifested as congestion in the mornings and evenings, particularly in the development area where people were living and working. He said that the existing multimodal network was fragmented, and safety improvements were needed to address this.

Mr. McDermott said that because of their past approaches to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, there were gaps in the network; with new developments often installing these facilities but older developments lacking them, leading to a fragmented system. He said that funding was limited, and project costs were rising in Albemarle County, with the development area being particularly affected by right-of-way issues, utilities, and space constraints. He said that VDOT ownership of roadways meant they had to adhere to their strict requirements, which leads to longer approval processes and increased costs.

Mr. McDermott said that the rural area faced a different set of challenges: Safety was the primary concern, with narrow, winding roads and limited clear zones; many of these roads did not meet current standards, with wildlife collisions remaining a significant issue. He said other challenges identified for the rural area included providing transit service to an aging population and accommodating both motor vehicles and people biking or walking for recreation and exercise, which includes those who live in the rural area and those who visit for those purposes.

Mr. McDermott stated that for the development area, their transportation goals were to create safe, comfortable, and accessible options for walking, biking, and transit. He said the density of the development area made it feasible and worthwhile for building a multimodal network within the area. In contrast, he said, the rural areas focused on the movement of goods, including interstates and rural areas, and aimed to facilitate the transportation of people from rural areas to development areas while retaining the rural area feel.

Mr. McDermott stated that their overall transportation planning strategy was to support the same planning strategies outlined in the rural and development area land use chapters. He said this included acknowledging the growth management policy, which directed future growth towards the development area, and recognizing the reduced need for transportation services in rural areas. He said they would also focus on achieving a high-quality transportation network, which would require a long timeline with significant investment from both the public and private sectors. He noted that future transportation planning can build upon what is already in this chapter and provide additional guidance.

Mr. McDermott said one of the primary recommendations in this plan was to do a deeper dive into a multimodal transportation plan for the County, recognizing that they did not currently have the resources or time for this level of detail in the Comprehensive Plan. He said the Comprehensive Plan provided a high-level overview of their transportation goals, but a multimodal transportation plan was necessary to develop a long-term strategy. He stated that this including prioritization of projects based on the values outlined in the comprehensive plan, integrate land use and transportation planning, and ensure that their community's transportation proposals aligned with expected land use and zoning in both rural and development areas.

Mr. McDermott said they would also define typical cross-sections for future roadway designs,

which means they can set up a standard baseline for what each of the roadways should look like. He stated that this would include a plan for pedestrian and bike facilities and necessary infrastructure based on their location. He said that this would help define their modal emphasis network, allowing them to focus on routes based on where people wanted to go and how they wanted to get there; for example, if it was likely that people would be walking to certain areas, they would prioritize pedestrian networks or transit networks in those areas. He said this would ultimately define what their network looked like and inform their prioritization process, and they would use this framework to evaluate projects based on limited funding resources and other constraints. He noted that this approach was similar to their past prioritization processes, but they wanted to make it easily replicable every three years, allowing them to review and update their transportation plans regularly.

Mr. McDermott stated that the transportation objectives outlined in the plan focused on several key areas. He said the first objective was centered on developing transportation plans, such as the multimodal transportation plan, as well as area plans and corridor plans; the second objective was focused on building out their bike and pedestrian network; the third objective aimed to improve public transit and development areas; the fourth objective focused on increasing the efficiency of vehicular use in urban areas, addressing the challenge of high peak-hour demand; the fifth objective was strengthening regional and inner-city transportation, including highways, airports, rail, and other modes of transportation; the sixth objective was focused on improving safety; and the seventh objective addressed their climate action policies.

Mr. McDermott stated that in terms of transportation objectives for the rural area, the first objective focused on addressing safety concerns for vehicular users, including preventing vehicle congestion; the second objective aimed to provide access to transit services, but this did not mean they wanted to send fixed-route transit services to rural areas where they were not needed; instead, they wanted to direct people to areas where they could access transit services. He said this would build on the concepts presented in the Afton Express, connecting routes that JAUNT operated, ensuring designated stops in rural areas to facilitate travel to urban centers, and utilizing park and ride facilities and bus stops; the third objective was the safety element in rural areas, including reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries; and the fourth objective was improving community members' access to walking and bicycle opportunities. He noted that this final objective was an effort to address the growing demand for pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in their rural roads, allowing them to plan and develop roads that accommodated these needs and potentially establish programs to enhance their use.

Ms. Swartzendruber stated that the transportation chapter intersects with several other chapters, including their Land Use chapter; Environmental Stewardship chapter, in relation to climate change and climate mitigation; the Thriving Economy chapter, where workers needed to access various destinations; and the Housing chapter, as it was essential to connect where people lived to where they worked or played.

Ms. Swartzendruber stated that they had met with Planning Commission on this topic on May 6, and they were meeting with the Board today. She said they had their last chapter presentation on Cultural Resources to the Commission the previous night, and they would be revisiting that topic with the Board on June 4. She said that a virtual lunch and learn on cultural resources was scheduled for June and would be finalizing the date in the coming weeks. She said their next set of meetings would focus on implementation and what that entailed, beginning with the Commission on June 24 and then with the Board on July 16 to discuss implementation. She stated that ways to engage with AC44 were listed on their Engage Albemarle website, which included all chapters discussed thus far. She said engagement activities and work sessions were also posted on that site, and people could sign up for the County's newsletter.

Ms. Swartzendruber presented chapter focus topics, which included questions for the Board to consider during their discussion: whether the Board agreed with the different approaches to rural and development areas and their unique challenges; whether the Board supported a program that promoted active recreation on rural roads and what those guardrails should be; and whether the Board agreed with the general approach of this multimodal transportation plan.

Mr. Andrews thanked staff for the presentation and invited questions from the Board.

Mr. Pruitt said that regarding the first chapter focus topic, he agreed with the general differentiation of rural versus development area challenges. He said that for the second question, he would like to discuss the concept of using tourism as a form of economic development and recreational tourism. He said they needed to consider how to use preserved lands to benefit the public, and in many cases, the land was privately held, so most of it was inaccessible to the public unless they owned the property. He said they should prioritize looking into discrete recreational opportunities and enhancing specific areas for recreational purposes. He said to begin, they would need to identify specific roads that could benefit from these improvements based on location, geography, natural heritage, and tourism value. He said that not every road was going to accommodate a lovely 40-mile bike ride, but they did exist.

Mr. Pruitt said that the multimodal transport plan raised a question that he had marked several times throughout this discussion, which was how they were distinguishing their work from the work of the Charlottesville Area Regional Transit Authority (CARTA). He said that this was a challenging position, which was different from other sections where they had an active planning process underway with political stakeholders, which was separate from the transportation section of the comprehensive plan. He said that ideally, these stakeholders would communicate, but they were moving at different speeds in

separate silos. He acknowledge that this was a complicated problem, and he was unclear whether the multimodal transit plan was entirely a County of Albemarle plan, designed to be codeveloped with CARTA, or thread in with CARTA's work.

Mr. McDermott responded that Mr. Pruitt's description of "threading in" regional planning was probably the most accurate. He said that they could not move forward with transit unless they were working regionally with organizations like CARTA, CAT, and other partners in that arena. He said that in turn, those entities could not independently plan for what was happening in the County. He said when discussing regional planning, a significant portion of it involved analyzing their land use planning and determining where transit was needed, and how it should serve specific areas. He said this was based on their land use and existing road network, and he envisioned getting that information and providing it through CARTA to their partners in expanding their transit.

Mr. Pruitt stated that he has commented before on the significant number of plans and documents in the County and through their regional planning partners, and he was not always confident that they did the best job of cataloging and inventorying them and making them available to the public. He said that he was thinking of some studies conducted by the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that addressed certain aspects of this issue, but not the entire scope.

Mr. McDermott asked if he was referring to the transit vision plan, which he believed was the ideal approach. He said that during that planning, representatives from the RTP worked with County staff to understand how the plan fit into their existing land use, which was a high-level, broad vision. He said CARTA was about to initiate another planning process, which was focused on implementation and how to move forward and turn the vision into reality. He said that County staff would also be involved, providing input to ensure they understood those needs.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was in favor of this, but every planning effort involved hundreds of thousands of dollars and multiple contractors. He said that in this context, there may be a valid concern that there may be duplicated effort. He said that he would leave it at that, as he did not claim to be an expert on the degree of overlap in these planning processes, and he would like the Board to consider that aspect.

Mr. Bart Svoboda, Deputy Director of Community Development and Zoning Administrator, clarified that it was a transportation plan, not just a transit plan.

Ms. McKeel said that for chapter focus topic one, she agreed that rural and development areas had distinct challenges that required different approaches, and the devil's always in the details. She said that for item two, she generally supported investigating active recreation on some rural roads but was aware of financial constraints. She said that she understood Mr. Pruitt's concern about using these areas for economic development, but they were not yet ready for that now.

Ms. McKeel said they must prioritize their objectives, over and above recreation, such as safety and access to essential services like hospitals, jobs, and healthcare. She said that she was thinking about the bigger picture and the need for careful planning. She said that they would explore these guardrails in more detail, but in general, she would support this initiative in a limited capacity, perhaps more limited than some might suggest.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification of what is entailed in a multimodal transportation plan.

Mr. McDermott responded that it referred to all modes of transportation, such as pedestrian, vehicular, or others, and the idea of using the term "multimodal" was that all modes of transportation were viewed equally. He said that historically, their focus had been on private vehicular travel, but multimodal planning considered it as an integrated system that encompassed all modes of transportation.

Ms. McKeel said she had just wanted to ensure they had the same shared understanding of what the word "multimodal" meant. She said CARTA was an established regional transit authority, and she noticed that the pages mentioned developing a regional transit authority. She said that she was a bit hung up on the word "develop" because it implied something new was being created, whereas they already had an established authority. She said that as they reviewed and updated this, it was essential to recognize that the authority was already in place and working, and she suggested that staff reframe this as what they would like that authority to be addressing.

Ms. Mallek stated that for focus topic one, she agreed that the needs for rural versus development areas were different. She said that one thing that stood out in the earlier presentation was that rural area roads were primarily intended for connecting people to the growth area, but there were also rural area users who rarely or never visited the growth area, and their needs within the area were equally important. She said in the development area, she strongly believed that many people required more than just bikes and pedestrians; for example, seniors often relied on their cars for mobility. She said she wanted to ensure the public knew they were not solely focused on bikes and pedestrians, but rather on providing a balanced and inclusive experience for all users. She said this was partly due to the fact that the focus had been so heavily on other issues for the past 50 years, resulting in a bit of a payback effect, but by continuing to balance the needs of all users and promote education, they could help address this.

Ms. Mallek said the second focus topic highlighted that the needs of rural roads were much more complex than just recreation and tourism; for instance, people on Ridge Road used that road in multiple

ways and had concerns about traffic, speeding, and safety issues. She said that other roads also had unique issues, including speeding and parking problems; however, when the County had conducted surveys, they found that the majority of people driving on these roads were coming from outside the area, whether it was the city, urban ring, or other nearby towns. Ms. Mallek said people were parking their cars in the travel lane, which created safety concerns for law enforcement and VDOT, and they needed to develop rules that allowed for the sharing of these facilities in a safer manner.

Ms. Mallek said all types of roads in the rural area needed to be addressed, but speeding was the number one safety, accident, and maintenance issue on all rural roads. She said that this was often due to their historic layout, such as cow paths that were later paved. Ms. Mallek said she did not expect those designs to change anytime soon due to financial, practical, or desirable reasons. She said this was a non-starter, and she wasn't sure that was what staff had been suggesting, but it was one of the things that people tended to misinterpret in some of the wording.

Ms. Mallek said that for her, guardrails would be taking care to ensure that they weren't overextending themselves. She said that since every site was different, they needed to take a step-by-step approach. She said that she was hopeful that they could establish some guardrails in collaboration with VDOT and ACPD that would help improve safety features on all roads, regardless of who the user was. She commented that the fire chief navigates some of the most challenging roads in the Whitehall District on his 80-mile bike rides, including the 810 loop. She said she could only imagine how intimidating it must be to ride a bike on those roads, especially when sharing the road with cars, and she was concerned about this issue.

Ms. Mallek said "multimodal" was a new term in this plan that she was glad to see, and the confusion about duplication may stem from the fact they had different layers of planning, including the Federal Long-Range Transportation Plan, the State's plan, and their own work from the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. She said that each had its own responsibilities, and she thought they needed to focus on their own lane and do the best job they could.

Ms. Mallek said that rural roads went well beyond just the movement of goods and should not be designated just for truckers and those traveling through areas like Waynesboro, Staunton, and Harrisonburg to Charlottesville, using routes like State Route 810. She said that local users often felt overlooked, and she wanted to make sure they were addressing their concerns.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that regarding the first focus topic, she agrees with the approach, as they did need to consider different approaches for rural and development areas because they were distinct. He said that regarding the contemplation of a program to support "active recreation," she would like to know how staff is defining that.

Mr. McDermott explained that this was focused on active recreation, referring to bikers, walkers, and runners, which they dealt with a lot in rural areas. He said that as Supervisor Mallek had mentioned, this was a significant use on many of their rural roads, as people traveled there specifically to engage in those activities. He said this often created conflict, whether it was related to parking or simply choosing to use roads, which often had high volumes of vehicle traffic. He said their idea here was to identify where people were going, where it was appropriate for them to go, and what they needed to do to support that. He said that this could include signage programs, identifying places where recreational users could park, and allowing them to leave their cars for the day if they wished to do a bike ride or other activity.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if this meant something like a small parking area where people could park their vehicles then access a bike path, or a mountain bike trail on a gravel road.

Mr. McDermott said that gravel road biking had become increasingly popular, and as a result, they now manufactured bikes that were specifically designed for this type of riding, falling between a traditional mountain bike and a road bike. He said that when discussing their paving programs, they often heard that many County residents did not want them to pave these roads because they preferred riding their gravel bikes on unpaved roads.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley said she had definite concerns regarding rural roads, because they were discussing potential modifications such as widening the road for bikers or extending the side of the road. She said that in her district, widening the roads would be extremely challenging, and many cars and trucks struggled to stay within the current width. She said that if they could widen the road, it would be great to have a separate area for bikers, but she did not think it was feasible in her district except perhaps for areas like Burnley Station Road. She said that her main concern was safety, as having cars and people riding bikes on the same road without a delineated area for bikers was unsettling. She added that if the roads could not be widened, perhaps identifying safe areas for bike use, such as gravel roads in certain areas, would be a viable solution. She said "guardrails" for her would be distinguishing between auto roads and bike-only paths, as well as pedestrian areas, and the type of the road.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said for focus topic two, she supported pursuit of an active recreation plan, as the County had a lot of natural beauty and shouldn't be limited to just a few people. She stated that she liked the multimodal transportation plan, but it seemed to be heavily focused on bicycles, and she agreed with the pedestrian and bicycle aspects in the development area but had concerns about this in the rural area, as she did not want to see people walking or riding bikes along rural roads like Route 20.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked staff for clarification of cul-de-sacs having a connector to go through to another development, and she understood that to be intended for pedestrian and bike use rather than

cars.

Ms. Swartzendruber said she was referring to comments made by the Planning Commission, which had not made it into the chapter yet, and they had suggested focusing on potentially adjusting regulations to eliminate cul-de-sacs and dead ends for new subdivisions.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that new subdivisions were all including connectors, and it seemed like every development was including a pedestrian and bike connection, such as Holly Hills.

Mr. Andrews said that for focus topic one, he agreed that different approaches were required, but he thought some aspects were potentially missing; for example, the development area content mentioned greenhouse gas reduction, but it did not say that for rural areas. He stated that it should be a priority for both areas, and he would like to see that included.

Mr. Andrews said that in terms of supporting active recreation on rural roads, he thought it was a good idea to build upon existing initiatives, such as designated parking areas like the one at White Hall for Sugar Hollow. He also recognized the importance of the Three Notch'd Trail discussions, which he thought were a high priority and may replace some of these other opportunities. He said by offering new opportunities, they could make them more popular than existing ones, and he would prefer that they focus on getting those done rather than identifying new places to support active recreation on rural roads.

Mr. Andrews said he would like to be sensitive to the impact on existing users, particularly those who lived on those roads and may be affected by increased traffic. He said he also wanted to acknowledge the potential for imposition on rural roads, where some users park up and down the road and make it difficult for others. He said that he thought a multimodal transportation plan could help flesh out some of these concepts and perhaps replace this document, and other references such as Move Safely Blue Ridge and Safe Routes to Schools already exist and could be incorporated into this transportation chapter.

Mr. Andrews said he shared Supervisor Pruitt's concern that they may be focusing too much on planning and not enough on getting things done. He noted the mention of "low-plan, no-plan" projects, which sounded efficient if they were in the right place, but he would like to understand that better. He also suggested that they focus on one area at a time, such as the development area and then the rural area, to keep things organized.

Ms. Swartzendruber explained that "low-plan, no-plan" was a program that had been successful in Henrico County, and Fairfax or Loudoun also use this for small, simple construction projects, such as installing a handrail. She said these were low-cost, low-plan type projects that could be executed quickly and efficiently for a relatively small amount of money, rather than a large sum. She said that they were exploring a program that existed elsewhere, although they did not yet know the specifics of how it would function in their context.

Mr. Andrews said he would like the Board to go through their order again, this time focusing on the development area, including both the objectives and actions, as well as the comments. He said they could successfully address both the text and the development area simultaneously, given the overlap between the two.

Mr. Pruitt asked if 1.2 was a truly distinct action from 1.1, because it seemed to just reference a modal emphasis map for the multimodal transit plan.

Mr. McDermott agreed that a modal emphasis map would part of a multimodal transportation plan, and they could be combined instead of considered separate components.

Ms. Swartzendruber explained that the modal emphasis map may be one of the first components of the plan that they focused on, serving as a foundation for making informed decisions about where to allocate their investments and how to evaluate projects proposed by VDOT.

Mr. Pruitt asked if this was to serve as an initial, descriptive document to inform a normative document that follows.

Ms. Swartzendruber responded that she considered it to be like a map that illustrated the allocation of limited right-of-way on a given street or road, and when considering a particular road, they must weigh competing priorities such as bike lanes, sidewalks, and other uses. She said this allocation of right-of-way was often a difficult decision, and it was this kind of prioritization that should be guided by their modal emphasis.

Mr. Bart Svoboda noted that this emphasis was what was meant by "guardrails."

Mr. Pruitt said that when they discussed micromobility, as mentioned in section 2.11, this brought to mind scooters.

Ms. Swartzendruber agreed and said that staff was also thinking about scooters, as well as e-bikes.

Mr. Pruitt said that he wanted to raise a concern about e-bikes and their potential impacts. He said that having previously lived in the suburbs of D.C., he was familiar with robust microtransit

infrastructure and the many private actors involved. He said that his experience with micromobility had been negative, and he believed that this issue could be seen in the further-out suburban edges of their development area because privately led operations would do collections in the higher-density areas, resulting in the accumulation of litter in less affluent communities. He said that these communities were often those that were less able to afford living in the urban core, whereas those who could afford it tended to live closer to the city. He said that he was not suggesting any drastic changes, but he wanted to bring this to their attention, as it was an intersection of government and private actors that could be challenging to plan around. He said it was important to consider economic factors and the potential destructive effects were something to consider.

Mr. McDermott responded that the County had a regulatory framework for micromobility, which they had established a number of years ago when it was becoming increasingly popular. He said that the framework was a permit system, whereby companies had to obtain a permit to deploy their micromobility devices throughout the County. He said this allowed them to strictly control what the permit allowed and ensure they have safeguards in place to mitigate potential risks.

Mr. Pruitt said that was additional context he hadn't previously known.

Mr. Pruitt also stated that the constituent actions could be more specific and conduct more front-end thinking on how to delineate responsibility between regional planning organizations and the County. He said that upon reviewing the document, he did not find any reference to regional planning organizations until Section 4.2, which seemed to be a significant omission.

Mr. Pruitt said that he did not have a specific recommendation for objective three, as it appeared to be a more in-depth discussion. He said he hoped there would be overlap between different entities, and he thought it was essential to identify and deconflict these overlaps on the front end.

Mr. Pruitt stated that one thing he had flagged during their previous discussion was the lack of consideration for active recreation, and he had not previously considered "rambling" as a form of active recreation. He said that constituent concerns he hears about active recreation and road safety often came from individuals who were walking or biking in their own residential areas, whether in rural or urban settings. For example, he said, people in Mill Creek were concerned about the school's traffic routing and its impact on local intersections. He said that others were concerned about the speed of traffic on James River Road, particularly for those who wanted to take a leisurely walk or bike ride. He said that these concerns were distinct and required separate consideration. He said that to address this, they may need to establish a framework for identifying and classifying these concerns as distinct problem sets. He added that this would involve recognizing the differences in time and context between a residential area with walking paths and a long stretch of isolated road used by endurance athletes and tourists.

Ms. McKeel said upon reviewing her notes, one of her overarching concerns was the disconnect between Crozet, Pantops, 29 North, and the areas to the airport, as they needed to establish ways to get people to the airport. She also noted that she did not see much in this document about collaboration with the City and UVA, particularly when it came to working with the City at their entrance corridors. She said that if they did not find a way with VDOT and the City to make their entrance corridors work, they risk being gridlocked by 2025, as reported by the TJPDC in 2012.

Ms. McKeel said that she recently had a citizen contact her about a gridlock on Pantops, and she called Carrie Shephard, VDOT resident engineer, to investigate. However, Ms. McKeel said VDOT's person took 45 minutes to arrive, only to find that the City had shut down the intersection without notifying VDOT, and this highlighted the need for better collaboration between their agencies. She suggested buying VDOT a helicopter and said that she was not blaming the City, as she was sure VDOT made mistakes too. She emphasized that if they did not work better together with their partners, especially where they had intersections and connectivity, they would continue to face these issues. Ms. McKeel said that synchronized lights came to mind, and she thought about how their traffic would move better if the City and County worked together to synchronize lights on their respective sides of the intersection.

Ms. McKeel said that under 2.5, she had questions regarding "investigate the cost of a County-funded program to supply local businesses with bike parking infrastructure siting and installation upon request." She said that she is concerned about the cost of these programs and whether they are feasible, and perhaps there is a cost-sharing option, but she has questions about this.

Ms. McKeel stated that the County needs to work better with UVA to understand what they're planning so the County doesn't have to react after they are done, typically finding out after the Board of Visitors has already approved something. She stated that regarding the objective "improve transit stops by enhancing safety, comfort, accessibility, and addressing the needs of low-income and underserved areas," that is part of the regional transit work, and one of the biggest complaints she hears in her district is regarding snow removal at CAT stops. She said that she thinks it would be practical to encourage CAT to handle their own snow removal, especially if it means that people can safely reach the bus stop.

Ms. McKeel said that in terms of requiring connected developments, this brings her back to the cul-de-sac item previously discussed. She said she thought they encouraged connections throughout the community; however, the citizens will often say they don't have to have a connection, and they often did not even want bicycle and pedestrian connections. She said if they could somehow make connections a requirement, as Fairfax County has done to the point that they will not even consider proposals without them. She said perhaps they wouldn't want to say that if they were vehicular, but certainly for bike and pedestrian connections.

Ms. McKeel said that for 6.5, prioritize the safety of students traveling to safer areas, she had noticed that students were now walking in urban areas on the road because there were no sidewalks, or it was like with bicycles: you walked or biked and suddenly the connection was gone, and you were out in the street. She said she especially thought Safe Routes to School was a good approach, as some students were now required to walk to school.

Ms. McKeel said that 6.7, collaborating with police and VDOT to refine the County's process to respond to speeding complaints and proactively reduce speeds to improve safety, posed interesting conundrum because she heard people saying they wanted to reduce speeds, but when speeds were reduced, they came back and said it didn't make a difference. She said that VDOT had a specific rationale for setting speed limits, and she didn't want to delve into that right now, but she wasn't sure just reducing those speeds really got at the issue.

Mr. McDermott acknowledged that they could be more specific about what this meant. He explained that it was not that they were planning to change the sign to reduce the speed limit, but rather to reduce the actual speed of the vehicles. He said what's being referred to here were things like traffic-calming measures.

Ms. McKeel said she would love to see them take a holistic approach to traffic calming in areas where speeding was a problem, but it didn't mean they had to take away a whole lane. She said there were alternative solutions; for example, some states and communities had used art to calm traffic. She said that she didn't see anything about art in this document, but she may have missed it. She said that even at the federal level, the Department of Transportation had approved using art on roads and in different areas, such as crosswalks. Ms. McKeel recalled speaking with Mr. McDermott a few years ago about Solomon Road and Englewood, as the wide road there was a safety concern. She said that if they had a pedestrian area with art, it could provide both traffic calming and a safer space for pedestrians, and she would like to explore this idea further.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed with developing a long-term maintenance plan for street trees and rights-of-way; for example, at 29 North, the trees that were planted years ago had either died or been removed due to traffic fumes. She said that she thought it would be wonderful to develop a tree program, including street trees and possibly extending it to other roads in their urban area, and this would address the need for shade, cooling, and urban greenery. She said she also agreed with the idea of incorporating public art installations, such as the one at bus stops.

Ms. Mallek said that for 2.1, staff were already aware of numerous instances in neighborhoods such as Park and Tabor, Hilltop, and other areas that had suffered 20 years of drive-through trucks getting through to new subdivisions built on interior land without their own street access. She emphasized that it was really important to address this.

Ms. Mallek stated that under 2.5, people could secure a business grant to do that and she was very concerned about using tax money for initiatives like e-bike vouchers. She said that even \$1,000 voucher required someone to come up with the rest, and this applied to a limited number of people.

Ms. Mallek said that under 2.8 regarding UVA participation, for the past 10 years, the County has repeatedly allowed the University to avoid paying for infrastructure such as the sidewalk in front of Old Ivy Road, which UVA had promised to do when they tore down the Kluge Hospital. She said they also promised to do it for the Fontaine Research Park rezoning, and now the County was stuck using their own dollars for it. She emphasized that the County could use some "sturdiness" in standing up to this.

Ms. Mallek said that under 2.11, she was very concerned about the scooter situation on roads that were not designed for 15 miles an hour. She said she was worried about the safety of drivers, especially when bicycles were present, and she was concerned about the lack of safety measures on scooters, which could be difficult to control. She said she was also frustrated by the litter of abandoned scooters throughout the County. Ms. Mallek said she appreciated CARTA's success, and she thought that as they developed more governance involvement for the County, their dollars could be better represented.

Ms. Mallek said that under 3.2, she felt that fees should be associated with this service, and she did not think they could continue supporting the MicroCAT without any means testing, as it cost millions of dollars a year for a limited number of people. She said that she believed those who could afford a ride should be able to pay for their ride, as she saw a significant amount of ridership, but she was concerned that the program may not be benefiting those who truly needed it, such as individuals attending PVCC for training and job skills. She said that they had attempted to link people with this program at the Workforce Center to facilitate easier access to job training.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated the improvements to the transit stops, including the ice and snow, sun, and shade; however, she found it debilitating to have no shade at many of these locations during the summer, and there was no place to stand except under overgrown brambles. She said that she looked forward to those kinds of improvements.

Ms. Mallek said that she had noted under 4.1 that synchronized lights were included in the 29 Solutions, but somehow, the funds were not utilized for this purpose.

Ms. Mallek said that 6.1 and 6.7 were related. She said that traffic calming has been a long-

standing issue. She said that the County often points fingers at VDOT, saying they won't allow it, while VDOT claims it's a matter of filling out the process. She said that this has been incredibly frustrating, even on Park Ridge Road, which has a 25 mph speed limit. She said that animals have been killed, and children have narrowly escaped being hit at the bus stops, and a Western Albemarle roundabout was estimated at \$10 million. She said that they need to find a better solution, and they have adequate right-of-way to accomplish structural changes. She said that perhaps in the fourth year, they can implement speed cameras, but in the meantime, they must use their collective brainpower to figure out a way to make structural changes to these roadways and make people care more about their own safety or that of others.

Ms., Mallek said she has seen data on bicycle and running software that generates information on road usage, and she believes they can incorporate this data into their planning process without hiring a consultant, they just need to access and use the existing public data.

Ms. Mallek said that under 6.5, this was going to cause issues in the oldest part of Crozet, with a 12-foot-wide road built in the 1700s and 1800s. She said that there was a 20-foot diameter kaleidoscope painted on the road that did slow people down, but VDOT painted it over, citing that it didn't meet their requirements, which was devastating.

Ms. Mallek said that at St. George's crossing, VDOT refused to protect the existing crosswalk, which had been in place for 50 years, because there was no ramp on the other side. As a result, she said, people have been crossing the road without a sidewalk on the other side. She said this issue had been lingering for 10 years, and they had had numerous meetings with delegates and stakeholders, yet they had made little progress, so it was clear they needed to reevaluate their approach. She said that this was just one example of the many small items that needed to be addressed in the growth areas.

Ms. Mallek stated that for 6.7, she suggested removing "where appropriate," as design changes were needed and there was no place where it was appropriate to speed. She noted that she was surprised when the pop-outs were installed at Park Street, they really work. Ms. Mallek commented that they needed to have some elements of shade if they wanted people to use sidewalks. She said that under 7.7, she wanted the language to say grant-funded only.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she understood that MicroCAT had been a very successful program, and her understanding was that they had enough grant money for another year.

Ms. McKeel confirmed this and said it then had to come back to the Board for a decision on what would be done.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley also stated that as far as Ms. Mallek's suggestions, some of them were limited by VDOT, but she appreciated her perspective. She said that perhaps they can work in conjunction with the State to advance traffic-calming measures, as VDOT did not always seem up to date on the latest effective techniques.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that signal synchronization was vital, especially at the bridges such as Free Bridge, and it was important to work with the City of Charlottesville to synchronize their signals at locations like Route 20, which would help with congestion. She said that the County should press the City to address their side of things to help with the overall traffic flow.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley stated that 2.3 describes a "steady funding stream," and she asked staff for clarification.

Ms. Swartzendruber explained that they were considering a fund that could be added to on a regular basis such as annually, potentially allowing them to undertake some low-plan, no-plan projects.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she appreciated the idea of an annual contribution, but she didn't want to tie their hands and become bound to a steady stream of funding, as they may end up having to raise taxes to meet their obligation. She added that she did think it was worth exploring.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that under 2.5, rather than a County-funded program to supply local businesses with infrastructure, they should work with the businesses, especially new ones, to have bike parking and infrastructure as part of their development.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley stated that under 6.1, design place-making streets with activity centers and appropriate design and speed, VDOT does this, and the County has on numerous occasions asked VDOT to reduce speed on certain roads. She said that they do not have control over VDOT's decisions on this matter and asked staff to clarify this.

Mr. McDermott responded that they could work to design streets that would naturally reduce speeds from the outset with things such as traffic-calming measures and placemaking, including landscaping and other elements to make a street more inviting to pedestrians and reduced the speed of traffic.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that under 7.2, she loved having street trees, but she had also received complaints about the line of sight at intersections, particularly on 29. She said that given the tragic accident that had occurred in the past, she wanted to ensure there was a clear line of sight at intersections, which would prevent them from having to remove trees in the future. She also said that

when designing commercial areas, such as retail and restaurants, it was essential to consider the placement of trees to ensure that they did not block the visibility of businesses.

Mr. Andrews stated that while this document was focused on development areas, the words “in the development area” appeared in only two out of the entire list of seven objectives. He said that he was curious to understand why this was the case. He said that in one instance, it was because the microtransit project was located in a development area, not elsewhere. He said that in the other instance, it was because of a specific funding mechanism and opportunities for traffic-calming programs in development area roads, which was not the case in other areas.

Mr. Andrews said he had also noticed inconsistencies within the document; for example, action 1.2 had developed a modal emphasis map to identify bicycle facilities linking the County, City, and UVA, but 2.8 specifically mentioned an industrial network between the County, City, and UVA along major corridors. He said that he was trying to understand the difference between these actions and why they had a separate action except for the modal emphasis map. He said that he agreed with many comments about incentivizing bike parking infrastructure rather than relying solely on County funding. He added that when it came to micromobility, he hoped they could learn from others’ mistakes and avoid creating hazards.

Mr. Andrews said that under 4.4 regarding collaboration on improvements for major corridors, 29, 250, and 64, he would like the document to reflect local alternatives to these roads. He said he also noticed a comment about adding lanes not reducing congestion, which he found curious. He said that while adding lanes created additional barriers, the document recognized that finding alternative ways to manage traffic was more effective. He said that it was interesting to note that expansion could actually make traffic worse in the long term, but prioritizing alternative solutions could help.

Mr. Andrews said that a constituent had raised an issue with the language in objective seven, “reduce greenhouse gas emissions partially through a reduction in vehicle miles traveled,” and he suggested changing “partially” to “particularly” because the County would not be able to reduce greenhouse gasses locally without reducing the use of single-occupant vehicles.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she had forgotten to mention the possibility of red-light cameras in urban areas such as the 29 corridor and 250. She said that she thought that red light cameras could be a valuable tool in reducing accidents, and she would like to see more of them installed. She recalled that they had one at the 29 intersection on Rio, but it was removed after the grade change. She said that addressing Mr. Andrews’ concern about lane expansion not reducing traffic, California’s 401 freeway had 16 lanes, and it was clear that expansion alone was not enough to reduce traffic congestion.

Ms. McKeel commented that VDOT tended to be quite conservative in its decision-making, and DOTs in other states were more progressive. She said that one successful example was the that they had replaced the through-truck road restriction route numbers with signs that had the actual road name, such as Georgetown Road. She said that she believed that with more effort, they could encourage VDOT to adopt similar approaches.

Mr. Pruitt commented that there were two different actions related to street trees but not to climate and heat islands, although street trees alone were a sufficient solution to address these issues. He said that two examples that came to mind were the City’s new Avon Bridge project, which he found beautiful, but it currently presented an onerous task to cross that bridge in the summer. He said that although the trees would eventually provide shade, it was not a solution for the immediate issue. He said that on the other hand, naturally planning around preexisting shade and climate concerns could be seen in the proposed Biscuit Run greenway, which utilized natural cooling from the riverbed and shade, and it connected an employment center to a residential center. He said that it was also vulnerable to flooding, as seen in December and January. He said that concerns around climate and environment needed to be proactive, and they needed to actively plan around the real experiences of climate and weather, rather than just capturing buzzwords.

Mr. Pruitt said when discussing multimodal transit, Chair Andrews had already touched on the need to prioritize and emphasize planning around safety concerns in the rural area, and this was reflected mostly in 1.1, but it did not capture the resident concerns he heard most often related to safety in the rural area. He said these concerns were centered around intersections that VDOT had deemed unworthy of investment, citing lack of traffic and incident data. He mentioned the intersections on Secretary’s Sand, James River Road, and the Warren Ferry intersection. He said that VDOT had stated that they did not care about investing in these areas due to the lack of data, despite frequent complaints from residents. He suggested that if they decided to prioritize safety concerns related to rural transit, he wasn’t sure they had a tool in their toolkit to manage those concerns.

Mr. Pruitt said that perhaps the answer lay in acknowledging that they didn’t have one, and he didn’t see that kind of concern being contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan currently; the draft before them didn’t address this issue. He said that he had heard this concern frequently, and it was especially relevant if they were trying to energize rural areas for service delivery or key services, so that people didn’t have to exclusively drive into development areas to live their lives. He said that in that case, having a transportation toolkit that could handle complex intersections, like the one at Keene, would be essential. He said that the existing roads were not equipped to deal with that level of traffic, and it was already a concern. He said that the response to discussing crossroads communities often was that their roads weren’t equipped to handle that level of traffic, and it was indeed a safety concern.

Mr. Pruitt said that 1.7 was unique to the Rural Areas chapter and he wasn't sure why, as it talked about the need for an equity lens in evaluating transportation infrastructure projects. He said that there were two aspects to consider: first, it seemed to also apply to the Development Area chapter, although he may have missed it; secondly, he thought it was essential to flag equity in the context of transit transportation, not just concerning disability. Mr. Pruitt said that an equity lens could also consider how transit planning disrupted or preserved historic communities and whether it had negative externality effects on protected classes, and he wasn't sure that was fully captured in the current discussion. He added that he was excited every time he saw mention of the Three Notch'd Trail shared-use path, and he looked forward to seeing it completed.

Ms. McKeel said that in reviewing the action items listed under the current projects, one of the proposed changes was wider shoulders, and recalled being told in the past that there was an agreement with VDOT that they would add asphalt as much as possible to the edge of the road whenever possible when paving. She said that her understanding was they would widen the road as much as possible, and it seemed they went further out with the paving of Garth Road. She said it's possible that the substructure underneath may not be suitable for such modifications, and VDOT would argue that it would lead to cracking, in addition to being extremely costly.

Ms. McKeel said that with 1.3, she marked the statement that said new roads should be for agriculture and forestry purposes, and she wondered if this was related to the fact they had pushback with some of the logging trucks.

Mr. McDermott explained that the idea behind this was to distinguish between building roads for future residential development and building roads for rural activity purposes such as ag and forestry. He said that by separating these uses, they could better enable future residential growth and preserve the rural character of the area.

Ms. McKeel said that regarding collaboration with the Albemarle County Police Department and VDOT to refine the County's process and respond to speeding complaints, it was a priority to proactively reduce speeds. She said that they were aware of the speeding issues on rural roads, particularly on Garth Road and roads in Free Union, and the friction between cars and bicycles, especially on weekends, was a significant concern. She said that as they moved forward with economic development and tourism, they needed to address this issue. She said that Albemarle County Police Department had said it is difficult to enforce speed limits on rural roads due to the lack of safe pull-over areas.

Ms. McKeel stated that creating safe routes to school, safe wildlife crossing areas, and reducing conflicts between cars and bicycles were all important goals. She said that the Research Council's work on Afton, which involved identifying conflict areas and fencing them off, had shown promising results. She said that she was wondering if the Transportation Research Council could help them identify similar areas and develop strategies to mitigate conflicts. She said that as a state agency, they often collaborated with governmental agencies and had a track record of producing valuable research.

Mr. McDermott responded that the County had collaborated with the Research Council on that matter. He said that Bridget Donaldson was the individual who completed that program and installed the fence on the I-64 section up to Afton. He said the main difference there was that there were fewer existing crossings, making it significantly more challenging. He said that in contrast, the section they fenced had numerous locations where the animals could be directed. He agreed that working with them was a great suggestion.

Ms. Mallek said that during the early 2000s chart process, she first became aware of VDOT's widening plans, and Garth Road was the primary example. She said they have a special machine to pack stone under the outside edge and then pave over the top of it, rather than just placing it in the air, to help build up a base. She said it stopped around 2009 during the recession, and they needed to revitalize that. She said it was incredibly helpful and fell within the right-of-way, as many rural roads had restricted rights-of-way that left only a few feet of space from the center of the road. She said that with 1.1, she had concerns about the content related to congestion on regional routes, which was fine for major highways, but not for rural roads.

Staff confirmed that it was referring to the major highways.

Ms. Mallek asked for clarification of 1.3 and discouraging new roads, as it seemed to refer to private roads.

Mr. McDermott said this was really looking at paving existing gravel roads and discouraging road-building for residential, which relates to their land use policy and growth management policy.

Ms. Mallek expressed concern about the limited mention of JAUNT and its door-to-door service for rural area residents, particularly those with disabilities, and this was much more vital in the rural areas than getting people to a bus stop.

Ms. Mallek said that under 3.3, there was great concern about cyclists on roads like Garth Road, particularly with the sun in the morning heading east and the afternoon going west. She said she hears about this at her town halls, with a lot of hostility surfacing, and education and collaboration among various groups would be helpful in addressing this concern.

Ms. Mallek stated that the General Assembly had passed a bill last year that allocated nearly

\$500,000 for Wild Virginia for wildlife crossings to be developed in Virginia, with projects on this side of the mountain and in the valley. She said this was another positive development, in addition to the Research Council's efforts, which included detailed maps of high-volume crossing areas.

Ms. Mallek stated that under 4.2, the TJPDC has been working for years on rerouting 76 off of 250, so many people had found alternative routes such as coming through Batesville and taking Dick Woods Road and then up the mountain. She said that Newtown Road posed significant challenges for bicycle commuters traveling from Greenwood, and additional support for this would be well-received by the cycling community.

Ms. Mallek noted that under 4.4, many people commuted to work by bicycle, in addition to those cycling for recreational purposes, and addressing a few logistical hurdles would enable people to bike to work.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked for clarification on 1.2 referring to "access management strategies" in terms of planning improvements to a rural road.

Mr. McDermott explained that this was an opportunity to examine how frequent access points on rural roads were handled and potentially address sight distance issues. He said that when there were multiple access points on a rural road where cars were not expected to enter another major road, they developed a process to manage all those access points.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said it was quite unlikely that they would be able to ensure line-of-sight access points for every single road in the rural area.

Mr. McDermott said that this was specific to when they were working on projects involving rural roads.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley stated that when a winery sought to expand into a wedding venue, a line of sight was required, and the winery was situated on a curve, so they had to cut down four or five large trees. She said that they were not pleased with this decision, but it was necessary to meet VDOT's requirements for widening the entrance and achieving a line of sight. She said that she believed the line of sight was crucial, but she was disappointed to see the trees removed.

Mr. LaPisto-Kirtley said that regarding 1.4, wider shoulders may be implemented to provide space for recreational walking and biking, but she can't think of anywhere in her district where the roads could be widened to accommodate this. She added that she did not recommend widening for walking or biking in these situations.

Mr. McDermott responded that it was a tool in their toolbox to use when appropriate.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that under 1.5 that references significant transportation improvements for goods movement, she asked if they were referring to trucks, and if they were collaborating with Economic Development to identify primary priority routes, as in telling trucks what roads to use.

Mr. McDermott said the focus was primarily on their primary routes that were already being used, such as those on 29 and 250 and access to I-64. He explained that they had previously discussed with Economic Development the importance of considering road improvements, such as those on Route 29, they factored in how they were utilized by companies that shipped goods.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it would be beneficial to establish a relationship with companies to inform them about roads that should be avoided. She said there were areas in the County that restricted oversized trucks on heavily traveled roads, which was particularly concerning.

Mr. McDermott said that they have continually discussed this issue, and addressing it had proven to be a significant challenge.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley mentioned service to the airport and asked if MicroCAT served the airport.

Mr. McDermott said someone could take MicroCAT to the airport if they lived in the MicroCAT zone.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it would be good to expand the service to include CAT or a small or a regular route. She said that for instance, a bus could run as early as 6 or 7 a.m., when traffic was typically lighter, making it an ideal time for such a service.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley stated that under 3.3, she hoped legislative action for photo speed cameras would pass in the next session.

Mr. Andrews said that he noticed a lack of discussion about the dangers associated with flooding, which was becoming a more frequent issue due to climate change. He said they needed to consider alternative solutions to rerouting roads that flooded, such as identifying areas prone to flooding and installing warning signs. He said that this was particularly important during severe storms, when roads could become impassable and hazardous to drive on at high speeds. He said that he thought it would be beneficial to address the grading around roads, particularly in areas like Moore's Creek, to prevent further flooding, which could be done at a lower cost than repairing the roads themselves. He said that he was

also concerned about the impact of debris from these storms on their roads, and they needed to work on identifying and clearing debris more efficiently. He said that they should also consider the rights of way in rural areas, where debris issues could be particularly challenging.

Mr. Andrews said the language around the Rural Rustic Roads program was confusing, as the program went beyond determining whether roads were eligible for paving. He said that he thought they needed to encourage VDOT to count more than just vehicles on their roads, as they were often used for multiple purposes, including recreational activities. He said he would like to see them work with VDOT to develop a more comprehensive approach to road paving that took into account these various uses. He also mentioned the issue of non-local heavy vehicle traffic, particularly through-truck restrictions, which may be necessary to mitigate the impact of frequent heavy vehicle traffic.

Mr. Andrews also said that a general concern raised in multiple places was recognizing the need for traffic-calming measures in crossroads communities as a priority, particularly for constituents living in these areas. He stated that he would also like to see more attention to reducing greenhouse gas emissions within the objectives.

Ms. Mallek said that with the low-plan/no-plan projects, she wanted to note for staff that Henrico and Arlington are the two counties that handle their own roads. She said that the airport has refused to have buses for 20 years, which is something they can discuss with their County Executive and their Airport Commission appointees. She said that parking for cars is a significant revenue source for the airport, and she had encountered this hurdle before, and each time she had attempted to address it, she had been met with resistance.

Ms. Mallek commented that she disagreed with the idea that they shouldn't have trees to allow people to see the signs on the buildings, as she would rather have drivers focus on the road than search for signs on the buildings. She said that the pedestal signs and those used during the 29 Solutions project were successful in providing clear directions, and she would prefer an approach that promotes visibility, rather than obstructing it.

Ms. Mallek said that under 1.3, related to access points, when she previously expressed concerns about VDOT's permission for a rural driveway, she sat in the situation to demonstrate the danger. She said that the time interval between seeing the approaching school bus and pulling out was only three seconds. She said that she was told that if the Community Development Department (CDD) approved a subdivision, VDOT could not deny access, and she would push this burden back on the CDD to emphasize the importance of considering safety when approving rural lots, especially given the fewer planning requirements compared to urban projects.

Ms. Mallek also mentioned that people had called about losing mirrors due to the trees cut off at the edge of the pavement, which can be pushed over by a truck and result in the mirror being lost on the right-hand side. She said that this issue had been ongoing for three years, and she believed it was essential to address it, and they all needed to push for a cleanup crew.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding 1.5 related to transportation routes, they had a significant problem with 18-wheelers servicing grocery stores and convenience stores in the rural area. She said she was most familiar with the northern and western parts of the County, but she had seen firsthand the damage caused by these large trucks, particularly on the northern and western part of the County. She noted that the issue wasn't limited to main roads, as the trucks would continue to use these roads, causing further damage. She said that the only saving grace in the Advance Mills area was the bridge's 90-degree turn, which allowed trucks to navigate the area without causing significant damage; however, even with this design, trailers still got stuck on the bridge, requiring tow trucks to lift them onto the high level.

Ms. Mallek said this was another example of the need for improved signage, particularly at locations where 18-wheelers couldn't safely navigate. She said that she believed they could make an official request to post signs at these locations, warning drivers not to attempt to service their vehicles on these roads, as they would not be able to do it safely.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said regarding trees in front of businesses, they needed to be flexible in this regard. She said that if the business was not successful, they wouldn't receive their full commercial value, but if they removed one tree, they could still maintain some greenery. She said the goal was to keep the business open, so she thought it was essential to strike a balance between preserving the business and maintaining some foliage. She added that by being flexible, they could find a solution that benefited both the business and the aesthetic appeal of the area.

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. McKeel said that she was pleased to learn that Andrea Copeland had been named the permanent CEO of the Chamber, replacing an acting or interim position, and this was great news for the Chamber. Ms. McKeel said she had heard from some Chamber businesses that their employees were struggling to get to work or were having difficulty commuting, and she wondered if the County reached out to the Chamber for inclusion in focus groups.

Ms. Abbey Stumpf, Communications and Public Engagement (CAPE) Director, said she felt this was a great approach and something they had been considering, and as they entered the final stretch of the AC44 engagement process, they could refine their strategy to focus on a more targeted approach.

She said that currently, they may not be contacting stakeholders as hyper-targeted as they could be, as they had been using a broader net approach. She said that the Chamber and other stakeholders, as well as community groups, would be on their list of targeted outreach efforts over the next couple of months.

Ms. Mallek said that VDACS (Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services) was scheduled to treat the fire ants in Hollymead, but due to the heavy rain, it was possible that this treatment may be postponed again. She said that she would like to bring up this point again, as she believed it was still relevant. She said for those who had not seen the pictures, the Virginia Cooperative Extension office had a wealth of information about this topic, and she knew that the details were documented in their meeting minutes from the past couple of sessions, which included photographs and other relevant information.

Ms. Mallek reported that the Albemarle Amateur Radio Club would be participating in a National Amateur Radio Field Day, taking place from noon to noon on June 28th and 29th at the Earlysville Volunteer Fire Department. She said this event had been a decade-long tradition and was a wonderful, family-oriented experience, especially for kids, who enjoyed communicating with people in other countries.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she had the pleasure of attending a ballet recital at Stony Point Elementary School the previous morning. She said that the children, grades K–6, presented a wonderful play that they had developed, with the help of Sarah Clayborne, the wife of Planning Commissioner Corey Clayborne, who was involved with Charlottesville Ballet. She said that the children’s behavior was exemplary, and she appreciated how they tied in the ballet with preservation and the importance of conservation.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she had notified the Hollymead HOA, Forest Lakes HOA, and Bentivar HOA, so they could inform their residents about the fire ant situation. She said that she had also informed their delegate, Amy Laufer, who was aware of the issue.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley reiterated the importance of traffic calming, whether in development or rural areas.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was no report from the County Executive.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn.

At 4:25 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to June 4, 2025, 1:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA, 22902. Mr. Andrews said information on how to participate in the meeting would be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 11/19/2025
Initials: CKB