



Steering Committee Meeting #2

Attendees:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tammy Rosario (JCC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jeff Kuttesch (RK&K)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paul Holt (JCC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Melissa Manalo (RK&K)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alex Baruch (JCC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Owen Peery (RK&K)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ken Shannon (VDOT)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Leo Rutledge (RK&K)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Emmanuel Darko (VDOT)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kirkland Goddard Sr	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Glenn Carter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alan Doucet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gloria Hill
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	James Curtis (by Kevin Radcliffe)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Williams
<input type="checkbox"/>	Eric Williams	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pat McCormick
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thomas McCormick	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rob Till
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	George Drummond	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Danny Schmidt

Date: December 13, 2017

Reference: Steering Committee Meeting #2 Summary

RK&K Team presented a PowerPoint reviewing the study corridor, scope and schedule. It also provided the summary of the Public Workshop #1 top concerns, desired improvements, and build-a-street activities. Three options were presented based on the feedback from the public workshop. Points noted, comments and questions included:

- From the Public Meeting #1 the top concerns for the corridor were: Pedestrian Safety, Sufficient roadway width, and congestion/access. Drainage and lighting were also notable concerns expressed.
- From the Public Meeting #1 the most desired improvements were, in order of most comments to least: Congestion/Access, Pedestrian facilities, Roadway Conditions, providing/sustaining a neighborhood feel, and other safety issues.
- The build-a-street boards, which showed desired lane configurations, were reviewed from the four groups at Public Meeting #1. Common desired elements across the four boards were noted including 1. Center Turn Lane 2. Pedestrian Facilities on both sides

of the street **3. Buffer Space between Cars/Trucks and Other users** **4. Bus Shelters / Bus Pull-off Areas** **5. Lighting**

- Concepts that were considered included looking both on and off the corridor, where off-corridor improvements were recognized as not addressing many of the concerns on the corridor, including pedestrian safety, promoting a neighborhood feel, managing traffic flow and access to Route 60 (Pocahontas Trail), etc.
- Three concepts along the corridor were considered, including **1.** A three (3) lane option with two travel and one center shared turning lane, with a separated shared use path on one side and a sidewalk on the other, **2.** A 3-lane with bike lanes option, with two-travel lanes and one center shared turning lane, but with bike lanes in both directions adjacent to the travel lanes with no separation, and sidewalks on both sides, and **3.** A 5-lane option with two travel lanes in each direction and a center shared turning lane, as well as a separated shared use path and sidewalk on either side.
- Feedback was south from the Steering Committee on the concepts presented. A summary of the feedback provided follows:
 1. Committee members were concerned with possible property impacts for all 3 options. The Project Team explained that the alignments were selected and adjusted to attempt to minimize impacts to properties, particularly residential lots. For much of the eastern half of the corridor, impacts for the conceptual improvements are concentrated on the southern half of Pocahontas Trail, for example. In other areas, the alignment was selected to try and balance impacts between properties on both sides of road. But for all 3 options, there are impacts anticipated on a number of parcels. More specific information related to potential property impacts was requested for the next meeting. Additional refinement will be conducted to further minimize potential impacts where possible.
 2. For Option 1, it was felt the center turn lane would help with emergency response.
 3. Additionally, there was support for the separate sidewalk and shared use paths.
 4. For Option 2, members were not supportive of on-road bicycle lanes, particularly with the presence of truck traffic on Pocahontas Trail. Preferred options with a shared use path to accommodate bicycles outside the roadway. If these were used, overhead lighting would be critical to making cyclists more visible.
 5. Several committee members expressed concern that 3-lane options were not the complete answer to the congestion issues along the corridor. A 4-lane option was suggested for consideration.
 6. Committee members expressed concern with potential for water to drain from the proposed roadway towards people's homes. The Project Team indicated that the ultimate design must meet all requirements for drainage and would address this concern.
 7. For Option 3, feedback from the committee included concern with the scale of the potential impacts to property, the loss of the desired "neighborhood feel" with a 5-lane roadway, and concern with a new bottleneck forming wherever the 5-lane improvements would need to merge back to match existing conditions.

8. One committee member asked if there were studies or research available on how similar improvements may have increased property values. They thought this may be helpful in offsetting concerns due to potential property impacts.
 9. Generally, committee members viewed the 3-lane options as being more feasible for future implementation.
 10. Committee members reiterated the pedestrian improvements to complete connectivity along the corridor were a top priority.
 11. One committee member also stressed the need for a new eastbound stop near Windy Hill and the need for bus shelters at all bus stops.
- After reviewing the overall concept maps and providing feedback, the Committee members were asked (using colored stickers) to indicate their desired locations for the following elements:
 1. Bus Pulloffs and Bus Shelters
 2. New Bus Stops
 3. New Crosswalk Locations
 4. Potential Intersection Improvements

During the discussion, several citizens indicated concern with sight distance and intersection safety at several intersections, including Jackson Street, Church Street, Woodside / Magruder, and Wisteria Gardens / 7-11. Photos of marked up display maps

- After completing the review of the concepts and identifying preferred locations for spot enhancements, the Committee was asked for feedback on potential outreach strategies for the January 24, 2018 Public Workshop. The Committee suggested the following techniques may be effective:
 - Flyers to distribute at businesses and churches
 - Distributing flyers on bread days at Grove Christian Outreach
 - Posting in church bulletins
 - PTA advertisements
 - Advertisement on WATA buses

It was indicated that the refreshments at the previous workshop were well received and advertising refreshments for the next meeting would be desirable. Other possible options for outreach included the VA Gazette, which covered the first workshop and may want to continue to follow-up.

- Next steps for the study include refining the improvement concepts to reflect the feedback from the committee members and add spot improvements, as well preparing for the next Public Workshop.

Next Meeting:

- January 18, 2018 – 4 PM, Abram Frink Jr. Community Center

M:\Projects\2014\14094_VDOT_L&D_Statewide\25 Route 60 Pocahontas Trail\Admin\Minutes\Steering Meetings\Meeting #2\2017 12_13 Pocahontas Steering Committee Meeting Summary.docx

