

CA-MPO Technical Committee Meeting

Draft Minutes, April 7, 2026

A recording of this meeting can be found here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IIDtjEsjBPk&t=27s>

VOTING MEMBERS & ALTERNATES		STAFF	
Ben Chambers, Charlottesville	x	Gretchen Thomas, TJPDC	x
Danny Yoder, Charlottesville PC	x	Gorjan Gjorgjievski, TJPDC	x
Tonya Swartzendruber, Albemarle (alternate)	x	Lucinda Shannon, TJPDC *	x
Alberic Karina-Plun, Albemarle		Taylor Jenkins, TJPDC	x
Lonnie Murray, Albemarle PC			
Charles Proctor, VDOT *	x	NON-VOTING MEMBERS	
Christine Jacobs, TJPDC *	x	Daniel Keoning, FTA	
Jason Espie, Jaunt	x	Ivan Rucker, FHWA	
Bill Palmer, UVA Ofc of Architect			
Mitch Huber, DRPT	x	GUESTS/PUBLIC	
Sara Pennington, Rideshare *	x	Peter Krebs, Piedmont Environmental Council	x
Tommy Safranek, Charlottesville *	x	Michael Barnes, Albemarle County	x
Garland Williams, CAT		Kevin McDermott, Albemarle County *	x
Sandy Shackelford, VDOT	x	Russ Martin, Cabridge Systematics *	x
Barry Herring, CAT (alternate)	x		
Jessica Dimmick, Albemarle	x		
Zoë Macomber, Charlottesville (alternate)	x		
Wood Hudson, DRPT (alternate)			

* Attended remotely

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Ben Chambers called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. Mr. Gorjan Gjorgjievski called roll.

Christine Jacobs stated that she is out of the country and could not make it in person to the meeting. Sara Pennington stated that she is travelling and could not make it to the meeting in person.

Motion/Action: Ben Chambers made a motion to allow the online members to participate remotely. The motion passed unanimously.

2. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC (MINUTE 2:55)



a. **Comments by the Public:** Peter Krebs, Piedmont Environmental Council, said he attended the last MPO Policy Board meeting and said it was good to take a step back from Smart Scale and think about it. He said Smart Scale is a funding stream and it is tempting as planners to get into the mindset to look at the funding source and its needs. He said that makes the funding source the client and not the community. He feels we are at a dead end with Smart Scale in some ways. He has heard frustration from one of the Board of Supervisors that every two years the area may get a portion of the projects that need to be done but it never solves the bigger problem. He said the community needs to start thinking about other ways to solve transportation needs besides Smart Scale, TAP and revenue sharing. He said it is time to think about solving the transportation issues by what the community needs rather than what the funding needs are. Mr. Krebs noted there is a neighborhood-level transportation problem and a region-level transportation problem and Mr. Krebs noted that both need attention. He asked to find a bridge between the block-level needs and the regional-level needs.

b. **Comments provided via email, online, web site, etc.:** None

3. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (MINUTE 6:08)

Approval of Agenda and the February 3, 2026, Minutes

Motion/Action: Ben Chambers made a motion to approve the February 3, 2026, minutes and the agenda. There was no second. The motion passed unanimously.

4. NEW BUSINESS (MINUTE 6:43)

FY24-27 TIP Amendment #14 and Adjustment #27

Gorjan Gjorgjievski presented amendment #14 to the TIP. He also briefly presented the adjustment to #27, additional funding added to the management program. He said there is a staff memo about the details in the agenda packet.

Motion/Action: Jason Espie made a motion to accept amendment #14 of the TIP. Danny Yoder seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

FY27-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Gjorgjievski presented the new draft TIP. He gave a background on the document and its process. He said the public hearing will happen at the MPO Policy Board meeting on April 27, 2026. He gave some key updates in the document including updated maps, language and funding sources. There are updated project costs and schedules for all projects. There is combination of new and existing transit projects by project category. There is a removal of completed, canceled or formally closed projects. He reviewed the numerous funding sources.

Mr. Gjorgjievski presented the transit projects currently in the TIP, including transit projects and VDOT projects.

He said the next step is to get a recommendation from the MPO Tech committee to the Policy Board to approve the TIP.

Ms. Shackelford noted that there were two numbers that were switched and she communicated that to Mr. Gjorgjievski. Mr. Gjorgjievski said there may be changes if there is feedback from the public.

Motion/Action: Jessica Dimmick made a motion to recommend the adoption of the FY27-30 TIP to the Policy Board as presented and amended by Ms. Shackelford. Danny Yoder seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

FY27 UPWP

Taylor Jenkins gave updates since the first draft of the UPWP. There were changes in Task 1 and Task 2, which she briefly detailed. She presented the updated budget table which includes the allocations received on Friday. This presentation is different than the one in the agenda packet.

She continued by presenting ongoing and upcoming activities. She also covered the numerous tasks covered by the UPWP. She said the FY27 UPWP has been opened up for public comment and review, a public notice was posted to the Daily Progress, and the draft UPWP has been shared with FHWA and FTA representatives for review and comment.

Jessica Dimmick said she liked how Ms. Jenkins has included benchmarking and best practices and feels that researching how to tie the regional funding priorities into those will be important for the future.

Motion/Action: Tonya Swartzendruber made a motion to recommend to the Policy Board that they adopt the UPWP as presented. Tommy Safranek seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Smart Scale Update (Minute 25:27)

Taylor Jenkins said the Policy Board had a special meeting to cover the projects being considered for the MPO's applications for Smart Scale. She gave background on project eligibility. She presented information about HPP eligibility and project evaluation.

She said the cost estimates shown today are the most up-to-date but are subject to change.

She continued sharing the projects under consideration. The first is the I-64/5th Street Diverging Diamond Intersection (DDI), shared-use-path connection, and sidewalk connection.

Sandy Shackelford said the average High Priority Project (HPP) is about \$25 million, but this project would have been competitive in the past in the low \$40 millions. This project is now estimated at \$44.7 million, which is more in line with potential funding.

Ms. Dimmick said that Albemarle County is looking to put a shared-use path at this intersection on the south side. She said the County is working to get other shared-use paths built from the roundabout at Old Lynchburg and 5th Street with a couple of development projects contributing as well. Ms. Shackelford said once that is built, VDOT might be more open to creating a shared-use path run through the whole project area.

Ms. Dimmick said the County is hoping to put a shared use path parallel to the interstate going west but north of the interstate. She detailed their plans and asked if VDOT would consider putting that into consideration in their design/modeling for the future. There was a continued discussion about the overall project.

The next project Ms. Jenkins reviewed was the US29/US250 eastbound on-ramp extension at Ivy Road. The project would increase the length of the on-ramp and add an additional on-ramp lane from Old Ivy Road. It would connect the Ivy Road on-ramp with the Leonard Sandridge off-ramp by an auxiliary lane. The preliminary cost is \$13.86 million. Mr. Safranek said he would prefer that this project have more bike/ped infrastructure.

The next project Ms. Jenkins reviewed was the US29/US250 westbound on-ramp extension at Ivy Road. The project increases the length of the off-ramp by approximately 600'. The preliminary cost is \$10.66 million. There were no comments on this project.

The next project Ms. Jenkins reviewed was the US29 NB/US250 EB off-ramp and pedestrian improvements at Barrack Road. The preliminary cost is \$21.3 million. There was an extended discussion about the details of this project. It was noted that the sketch presented needs to be refined before the application deadline.

Ms. Jenkins presented the goals for the Moving Toward 2025 long-range transportation plan (LRTP).

She noted the next steps include resolutions of support, OIPI/VDOT/DRPT review pre-applications and provide feedback and August 1 is the full application deadline.

Motion/Action: Tonya Swartzendruber made a motion to recommend the resolution for the locality projects as provided. Tommy Safranek seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Motion/Action: Jessica Dimmick made a motion to recommend the Policy Board pass the resolution for the Barrack and 5th St projects as provided. Danny Yoder seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Ben Chambers presented his objections to the Old Ivy Ramp pipeline projects. See Appendix A for his full comments.

Motion/Action: Ben Chambers made a motion to not recommend the Old Ivy Road projects to the Policy Board as provided. Danny Yoder seconded. Ben Chambers, Tommy Safranek, and Danny Yoder voted yes. Jessica Dimmick, Tonya Swartzendruber, Charles Proctor, Christine Jacobs, Sara Pennington voting no. Jason Espie, Mitch Huber, Barry Herring abstaining. The motion did not pass.

Jessica Dimmick said their staff has been discussing these projects and noted that this funding only comes every two years and we need to seek a better funding strategy, but the question is do we take the projects off the table and miss out on the opportunity with nothing to back fill them with. She recommends these projects noting that she hears Mr. Chambers' concerns with the process and the study. VDOT recommended these projects because they would be competitive and she has reviewed the studies. She said there are concerns about safety in this area at this time. She noted that the intersection at Canterbury Road is one of their priorities and is one of Albemarle's Smart Scale's applications. She fears that it will not be funded. If the Canterbury project is funded, they may not need the Old Ivy ramp projects, but there is no guarantee of that or even a likely outcome. So, the backups are the Old Ivy Road ramp projects. She said she would like to find a way to come together to advocate for a regional project in the future.

Mr. Chambers concurred with the desire to work together for a mutually agreed upon project in the future.

The video recording was interrupted at 1:29:00.

Ms. Shackelford said these projects were created because they were the ones eligible to submit. There are other projects that the jurisdictions would have liked to apply for, but the eligibility criteria were not met with those projects for Smart Scale funding. She said VDOT's Culpeper District is interested in developing those projects further, but in this context, they would not be eligible for funding consideration.

It was noted that in the future that innovative intersections would be eligible for HPP funding in the future may change the strategy for moving projects up in priority.

Motion/Action: Jessica Dimmick made a motion to recommend the NB on-ramp project to the Policy Board. Tonya Swartzendruber seconded. Ben Chambers, Tommy Safranek, and Danny Yoder voted no. Jessica Dimmick, Tonya Swartzendruber, Charles Proctor, Christine Jacobs, and Sara Pennington voted yes. Jason Espie, Mitch Huber and Barry Herring abstained. The motion passed.

Motion/Action: Jessica Dimmick made a motion to defer any action on the off-ramp project until the June MPO Tech meeting. Tonya Swartzendruber seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

CA-MPO Bylaws & Public Engagement Plan Revisions (Minute 1:28:55)

Taylor Jenkins said there are some changes and updates to the bylaws that are outlined in the documents in the agenda packet.

5. VDOT PROJECT UPDATES (MINUTE 1:40:20)

STARS and Pipeline Studies

Chuck Proctor said they are getting ready for the SWG meeting for the US29 North STARS study. This study has taken more time than originally thought, but it is moving forward. He said they are getting ready to schedule the SW&E meetings to discuss advance alternatives on both applications. He said VDOT is wrapping up the final report for the City projects and it should be done in the next month. The Pipeline study at Exit 118 has been converted to a data collection study to preface for a larger regional study to make sure that the study is addressing the overall needs at the interchange as well as the connecting roads. He said the DDI project is finished. He said what was considered part of the previous 5th Street study, there are improvements that are recommended at 5th Street Station, and they will revalidate those improvements to make sure they still work.

6. STAFF UPDATES (MINUTE 1:43:03)

Mr. Gjorgjievski said there are items in the staff memo (in the agenda packet) that cover the CTB and the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A). Regarding the SS4A, the FY27 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) dropped and reminded everyone that there is \$1 billion available across the US and 30% of that is allocated for safety action plan development and the other 70% is allocated for implementation funding. There are spot-specific locations for the Safety Action Plan and there are also systemic improvements that can be applied across the entire high injury network outlined in the plan. The due date for the SS4A projects is May 26. Ms. Jacobs noted that those projects must go before the TJPDC board, so the deadline is tight given that their next meeting is May 7.

7. ROUNDTABLE UPDATES (MINUTE 1:45:13)

Ben Chambers reported that the City is working with VDOT on the West Main and Ridge Street project to do additional public engagement on April 27. He said that event will be “focus group” style that will include folks from the downtown business community and residents from the downtown area. Mr. Chambers continued saying there is a repaving project on Rose Hill Drive (to be completed next year) and there will be a public engagement, open house opportunity for that on April 13. He said Tommy Safranek is gearing up for Bike Month in May and encouraged people to check out BikeCville.com for upcoming events.

Mr. Safranek thanked Tonya Swartzendruber for joining the most recent neighborhood walk. He noted that this Sunday is the next neighborhood walk through UVA North Grounds. They will be meeting at JPJ parking garage at 10:00 a.m.

Jessica Dimmick said Albemarle is in the beginning of their multi-modal transportation plan. They will be presenting that as one of five work projects for implementation of AC44. They are going to the Board on April 15 seeking board approval to take that on as a project. Following that vote, they will begin on scoping. She noted that the Board asked staff to revisit their project prioritization. She said they are looking at their 170 projects and will present the results on that on June 3 to the Board.

Ms. Dimmick said they are kicking off a traffic calming project in Crozet following VDOT's process for their study. She said they will wrap up with a survey of community stakeholders. She said she is continuing to work with Tommy Safranek and other regional partners to plan for Bike Month. Lastly, she reported that there will be eBike demos at Lakeside Middle School and the other at the County Office building. There is a volunteer opportunity for anyone who would like to help with those.

Sara Pennington shared that Rideshare is gearing up for Bike Month as well. She said they will be running their Bike Month Business Challenge through the Agile Mile app. They will be offering the Bike Month competition to both individuals and teams, there will be drawings for \$25 gift cards every week. She said the state is offering \$500 and \$250 gift cards. She said the business challenge winners will get bragging rights and there will be prizes to the winning team. She said to look for marketing soon.

Sandy Shackelford said they have had 22 pre-applications, and they are working through the screening process. She noted that most of the applications will be conditionally screened out, but that just means it is missing something, usually cost estimates, and does not mean the project is not eligible, but that it still needs something to make it complete.

Mitch Huber, DRPT, said their CHSM plan is online. He said the state rail plan underway and Virginia Breeze's 5th line kicks off on April 20.

Mr. Herring said CAT is waiting for their budget approval process to be completed.

Jason Espie said Jaunt had a demo grant to do mobility on demand pilot for Greene County. He said they have a Jaunt app for micro-transit and they are using the VIA software to do scheduling and dispatch. He said there is still circulator service in Greene County, but there is a core zone for which the micro-transit is available. He announced that on September 30 they will be having an event celebrating their 50th anniversary. He noted that their hope is to move to mobility on demand for all the jurisdictions in their region.

No report from UVA.

7. ADDITIONAL MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

Next meeting June 2, 2026.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Chambers adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

Addendum A to the April 7, 2026, CA-MPO Technical Committee Meeting Draft Minutes

Comments on the Old Ivy Rd SMART SCALE Pre-Applications – Ben Chambers

Before we vote on these two projects, I'm going to do something a little odd, and use my prerogative as the chair to share my thoughts directly with you on these projects. I want to acknowledge that I wouldn't have thought that I could do this sort of thing without watching a hero of transportation in this region, Diantha McKeel, use her time as a chair effectively to share her views and clarify how we were sharing the responsibility for achieving our regional transportation goals. Former supervisor McKeel chaired the MPO policy board, the regional transit partnership, and was the founding chair of the regional transit authority and she was unafraid to give clear direction on where she thought we could work together. We would not have made the progress we have achieved so far without that direction.

This will be one of the more unusual votes we take together as a group. It is very rare that we, this technical committee, have a difference of opinion that is so strong that it registers as opposing votes, rather than compromise. It is even rarer for the opposing votes to come from the chair, and so I feel an obligation to explain my decision to you. I do not think any of what I will say will sound new to many of you, but I hope through this final attempt at clarifying my position on these projects, it will be clear where our opportunities lie as a region and as partners with the state to address shared priorities.

Defining our shared priorities as a region and delivering a strategy for addressing them is the job of the MPO and particularly for us, as the technical experts. We have done great work in creating a long-range plan that de-emphasized congestion mitigation as a priority and raised up safety and operational enhancements for all users as the focus of the investments we would make in the region. In the constrained project list of Moving Toward 2050, the Ivy Road Corridor project is ranked low in terms of overall prioritization and its project description mentions both the improvements at the interchange and the multimodal improvements along Old Ivy Road that would come out of the VDOT Pipeline study in 2024. The Pipeline study is where these two Old Ivy ramp improvements were identified. The final report for that study does not identify any VTrans need for safety in this area. The VTrans needs shown in the study are for Congestion Mitigation, which is listed as High priority, and Transit Access, Transit Access for Equity Emphasis Areas, and Transportation Demand Management, all of which are listed as Very High needs identified by the state. Indeed, when VDOT was reviewing the existing conditions in 2024 with myself, staff from UVA's Office of the Architect, and from the county, we identified the Old Ivy Road underpass as the bottleneck impacting all users and the key priority for the Pipeline study to solve. The recommendations of the Pipeline study did not end up doing that.

The Pipeline study final report does not stress the need for projects on the Old Ivy ramps. It states that the ramps "experience moderate traffic congestion" due to high volume. In its assessment of the extension of the southbound off ramp, the study states: "The overall deceleration lane is satisfactory; the Build conditions improve on the No Build scenario which has LOS B and C during the AM and PM peak periods". These are not the failing conditions that we are now being told we must prioritize and fix. No safety need is even identified with these ramps.

Most surprisingly is that the study never concluded with any preferred alternative. Only the work of the first two phases of the study is shared in the final report. No preferred alternative was ever costed or evaluated by this study. There never was a final alternative from that study that was brought to the MPO or

the City. I understand County staff shared a presentation on a draft set of recommendations with their Board, but none of those recommendations were shared with the MPO or the City. Feedback from City staff, most loudly me, has been consistent that the recommendations that were under development in the Pipeline study, which are now whittled down to these Old Ivy ramp projects, do not address our needs as a City or as a region, in this corridor. This project is strictly between the County and VDOT. The City and its association with the MPO should not be playing a part in it with its SMART SCALE application allotment. Instead, we are being asked as technical experts for the City to allow these projects to proceed because of the dire need for roadway safety. There is an implication that the City does not care about safety and will not advance obvious solutions to address serious safety concerns. To those of you harboring that opinion, I must challenge you to look at the record of the City in our region's planning efforts. The City and my team in particular has been advocating for the strongest safety goals we can possibly set and want our infrastructure priorities to align with meeting those goals. We have pushed annually to set the highest aspirations for our regional safety targets. We were an active partner in the development of our regional safety action plan, Move Safely Blue Ridge, and set the most aggressive targets of any partner in the region, aiming to eliminate roadway fatalities in the City by 2050.

Looking at the Move Safely Blue Ridge plan, these projects aren't in there. This area wasn't identified as a location where we, as a region, have agreed there is a safety need. There are several other needs that do show up in the plan that are part of VDOT studies that are underway. But for each of these needs we were all agree, we have no projects to advance.

In the 5th Street project, the study was supposed to include recommendations for the intersection at 5th Street Station. This is one of the most dangerous intersections in the City and a barrier to extending bicycle facilities into the County. A person died in that intersection just last month. Where is the urgency from our regional and state partners to address this safety issue? Why isn't there a project application that addresses it?

We had a fatality on US 29 North in the Meadows area of the City last October. This corridor is an area of persistent concern and a place of agreement between the City, County, and the state as a priority for addressing safety, access, and operational needs. The County submitted multiple Reconnecting Communities grant applications with the City's support to get federal assistance in studying and recommending improvements to connect users along the corridor. When those federal grant opportunities didn't pan out, VDOT stepped in with a pair of STARS studies covering the same study area. However, there hasn't been an update on potential design options since last Fall. We have no clue why this pair of projects stalled out, but we lost a valuable opportunity to advance a SMART SCALE application to address some of our biggest shared priorities. Now with the notice of funding available under the federal Safer Streets program, we are again at risk of losing an opportunity to address the issues in the US 29 corridor because we have no solutions in hand.

And yet, design and engineering resources have continued to flow into these Old Ivy projects instead. Where we have obvious needs, VDOT has not provided any answers. And where there is no obvious need, VDOT is asking us as local technical experts to disregard our local and regional priorities in order to align with uncertain state funding opportunities and invest our time and resources in projects we do not have confidence in. This does not seem like a process we can rely on in the future to achieve what we envisioned in Moving Toward 2050.

Some of you may vote for these projects because your agency or department expects you to, not because it is based on your technical assessment of whether these projects are a good idea. You are expected to vote for them to maintain the existing relationships. I have heard concern that the opposing vote that I will take, likely along with my colleagues representing the City, will change the nature of the relationship between the City, the County, and VDOT. I will tell you this: I am not concerned, because I am welcoming that change. I expect this difficult process to highlight a need for us to return together as a community to focusing on our priorities, instead of chasing dollars for the least necessary improvements.

Some of you may vote for these projects because you are committed to delivering projects for your jurisdiction. And I understand that. I want the 1 project in my jurisdiction to perform well in the competitive process and be delivered successfully too. But I don't want it to be competing in the high-priority pool with a similarly priced highway project that doesn't do anything to help the City or the region. Especially when I know the scoring process is weighted in favor of highway improvements and against mode shift opportunities. It would be technically foolish for me to recommend so.

And so, we'll vote on these projects and I'll oppose them. But it didn't have to come to this. I've asked for multimodal improvements to be considered along every step of the process, since the earliest days of the Pipeline study. I've expressed how unfavorable I viewed these kinds of improvements and how low of priority they were for us as a City and region at every chance. I have offered compromises and trades and offers of support for other County projects. Instead, VDOT has returned over and over to limit our application choices to adding more highway pavement and to tell us we don't have a regional strategy.

I will tell you the strategy we have been sticking to the whole time: pair roadway improvements that will get us good SMART SCALE scores with multimodal investments we need state assistance to afford to make more mode options available to anyone. That's it. And neither of these projects fits that strategy. There is nothing that indicates they will get a good score and no multimodal improvements have been offered. They will only have a negative impact on our region achieving its shared priorities and goals, as these projects would induce additional demand for vehicles and create additional congestion and safety issues in the future.

Following the MPO policy board's vote to endorse the MPO's project applications, I will be taking the City's single application, along with the MPO applications to Council on July 20th to obtain their support head of the August deadline. If these Old Ivy Road projects are included, I would not be offering the staff recommendation that they pass the resolutions to support these two applications. I cannot anticipate how they might vote, but I cannot imagine that City Council will find it easy to support applications that did not have the support of its staff and may not have the support of its policy board appointees.

I do not see a path forward for the Old Ivy ramp projects. We can avoid continuing to drive these projects into a dead end today. I will be voting to oppose them if there is a motion to recommend them to the MPO policy board as our region's project applications. Before I open it to the floor for that motion, I would offer my own motion: to table these projects from consideration during this round of SMART SCALE. I will take a second to this motion, if anyone wishes to hold a vote affirming that strategy, rather than advancing the proposed resolution.