



## Transportation Work Group

### *Meeting Notes*

November 4, 2011 10:00 a.m.

#### Primary Work Group Contacts

Dan Brugh, Chair  
*Executive Director*  
BCM – MPO  
Tel: (540) 394-2145  
[brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov](mailto:brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov)

Elijah Sharp, Co-Chair  
*Regional Transportation Planner*  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[esharp@nrvpdc.org](mailto:esharp@nrvpdc.org)

Kim Thurlow  
*Livability Project Coordinator*  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[kthurlow@nrvpdc.org](mailto:kthurlow@nrvpdc.org)

#### Meeting Schedule:

November  
December  
February  
March  
April  
May

#### Meeting Location:

New River Valley  
Competitiveness Center  
6580 Valley Center Drive  
Radford, VA 24141

#### 1. Meet the Work Group Participants:

Brett Haygen, Derek Perry, Nichole Hair, Laura Pynn, William Liu, Tammy Trimble, Melanie Smith, Dan Brugh, Ted Koebel, Debby Freed, Karen Drake, Andy Alden, Adele Schirmer, Elijah Sharp

#### 2. Introduction to the Livability Project

Elijah provided an introduction to the Livability Initiative. The presentation included: the Mission Statement, how the project is funded, what the funds are being used for, project schedule, citizen feedback on transportation, and citizen feedback on housing.

#### 3. History of Transportation Planning

Elijah provided an overview of regional transportation planning in the New River Valley. In particular, how the PDC and MPO contribute to statewide plans and infrastructure programs. In addition, Elijah discussed the Rural Work Program that provides technical planning assistance, grant writing, staff funding for regional committees, and local transportation studies.

Dan provided an overview of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). In particular, how the MPO works with VDOT to allocate federal funds towards programs identified by the MPO. The MPO has the responsibility to create a Long Range Transportation Plan that specifies constrained and unconstrained needs, develop a Unified Planning Work Plan (UPWP), and annually develop the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the MPO area. Dan highlighted some of the MPO's involvements such as: the Smart Way commuter bus, Ride Solutions commuter program, and regional planning partnerships with the PDC.

#### 4. Spotlight on Housing

Ted provided an overview of Virginia Tech's housing research and how it can be used to support the Livability Initiative's planning process. In particular, how he is working with Tech students to evaluate housing data such as: affordability, aging in place, young professionals, employment growth areas, population projections, commuter patterns for workers, and population densities. Because affordability has been identified by the public and work groups, he is evaluating how the region measures with other areas in the United States. In addition, Ted and his student's are evaluating the types of housing that is needed to support different age groups and professions in our communities.

#### 5. Facilitated Discussion – Transportation and Housing

Work Group participants were given 15 minutes to provide responses to the following 3 questions:

- I. How does housing influence transportation needs in the New River Valley?
- II. Where is the common ground between housing and transportation?
- III. What scenarios (or game changers) could impact how residents of the New River Valley live and travel?

After responding to the questions independently, the group discussed their responses. The answer sheets were collected so that everyone's ideas could be recorded.

In closing, the group decided that the next meeting should be in December. Elijah will send out a poll to identify the best date for everyone.



## Transportation Work Group

### *Housing & Transportation Worksheet*

---

**Directions:** Take 15 minutes to review the questions below. Write down your ideas as they come to mind. After everyone has the opportunity to respond, the group will participate in a facilitated discussion.

1. How does housing influence transportation needs in the New River Valley?

- We all need housing and we all need transportation
- Commuting patterns – working outside where they live
- Demands of citizens wanting access to transportation needs near homes
- Lower tax base means less money for localities to plan for transportation needs
- Live – School x 4
- Live – Shop x 3
- Live – Play x 4
- Live – Work x 4
- Right-of-Way
- Types of housing for income levels, age, orientation
- Critical concentrations – support grocery, fuel, etc.
- Relationship/dependency may have the most impact on low-income people and the elderly
- Spread out locations
- Older people can't walk or bike
- Younger people want to walk or bike
- Housing can determine what form of transportation modes will provide for the needs for the population: mass transit vs. car, etc.
- Increased solutions for those living in outlying regions; however, public transit may not be practical
- Increased clusters of homes provides for an increased opportunity for public transit and alternative transportation
- Current housing patterns make reliance on cars a necessity – lack of clusters
- Autocentric for permanent town residents
- Transit services primarily serve student populations
- VT alumni are autocentric
- The location of desirable housing can create an end point for transportation demand.
- Desirable could be settling, price, size, availability, surroundings, etc.
- Both location and density of housing influence transportation patterns, options and local distribution

November 4, 2011 10:00 a.m.

2. Where is the common ground between housing and transportation?
- Affordability
  - Accessibility
  - Live + Work in same/different location
  - Ability to attract new businesses, retain businesses with affordable housing + transportation
  - Matching the two
  - Using one to drive the other
  - Intentional development with themes in mind – green communities (example)
  - Low-income people
  - Housing on wheels such as mobile homes
  - Commuting time and cost of fuel
  - Quality of life and accessibility to services, family, and work
  - School transportation for kids + college students
  - Access to proper medical care or emergency services, fire, rescue, and police
  - New businesses consider growing vs. decaying communities
  - Financial household budget = housing closer to community center at a higher cost + transportation at a lower cost vs. housing further away from community center at a lower cost + transportation at a higher cost.
  - Place productivity – being more compact/viable
  - What’s missing to make mass-transit work?
  - Commuting
  - Transportation not usually an end in itself, it is a response to the need to link – get to and back for daily life needs.
  - Supply-demand is multi-variable, where housing is just one trip end point; other end points must be defined to understand transportation
  - Support local health
  - Options for housing and transportation are needed for various incomes, ages, and other demographics
  - Toll Stations in the New River Valley, since a Toll road can have the unintended effect of raising the cost of living in an area due to the added cost to supply chains that use freight trucks and residents in the area.
  - Any change in how our transit system is financed would be a big game changer in that it would put more pressure on the region to make up the difference to keep the roads well maintained, like a big snow event for example.
  - Emergency events can also have an effect on housing and accessibility since the average time that FEMA can be expected to respond to such events would be 72 hours as stated by Craig Fulgate, the current director of FEMA.
  - Also if the transportation route takes people through blighted areas, then they will also have the perception of driving through a disaster zone and will probably move out if they do not have a strong tie to the community.
  - The Intermodal Rail plans may have a net positive effect in the region

November 4, 2011 10:00 a.m.

3. What scenarios could impact how residents of the New River Valley live and travel?
- Gain/Loss of industry x 2
  - Aging population not able to afford transportation alternatives for citizens
  - Fuel costs as they increase/decrease x 3
  - Weather
  - Economic influences
  - Distributed services
  - Fuel varies widely – electricity costs don't
  - Immigration
  - Cultural shifts
  - Availability of regional transportation options
  - Regional bus routes would enable all citizens to acquire their needs
  - A bus service from Floyd to Montgomery County may steer people away from Roanoke
  - Train
  - Students
  - Mini vans that could move around more bikes/scooters
  - An intermodal facility that services students + community members as a transportation hub for various services
  - Improved freight transportation amenities for truckers
  - Bikeway + greenway connection amongst various regions
  - Ability to relocate housing closer to community centers - refinancing
  - Increased attendance push for VT/RU = housing +transportation needs
  - State budget cuts for higher education = decrease in students, faculty, and support
  - More plant closings has negative affects on number of jobs, transportation demand
  - Passenger Rail in Roanoke offers more options
  - Heartland Corridor expansion = increase in jobs and more housing needs
  - As older populations increase the need for senior service transit will increase
  - Higher paying jobs
  - Add BT routes to High Schools for jobs, after school activities – then home, to the mall, or parents
  - Scale and relationships are critical i.e. market
  - Alternatives to single occupancy vehicles – bus, rail, trails along high travel routes
  - Cost of travel
  - Eliminate needs for travel – work at home, deliveries, etc.

November 4, 2011 10:00 a.m.



## Transportation Work Group

### ***Meeting Agenda***

December 1, 2011 10:00 a.m.

#### Primary Work Group Contacts

Dan Brugh, Chair  
*Executive Director*  
BCM – MPO  
Tel: (540) 394-2145  
[brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov](mailto:brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov)

Elijah Sharp, Co-Chair  
*Regional Transportation Planner*  
NRVPDC  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[esharp@nrvpdc.org](mailto:esharp@nrvpdc.org)

Kim Thurlow  
*Livability Project Coordinator*  
NRVPDC  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[kthurlow@nrvpdc.org](mailto:kthurlow@nrvpdc.org)

1. Meet the Work Group Participants
2. Livability Project Update – *Kim Thurlow*
3. Housing and Transportation Recap – *Dan Brugh & Elijah Sharp*
4. Spotlight on Energy – *John Randolph*
5. Facilitated Discussion – Transportation and Energy
  - a. Where do the elements overlap?
  - b. Are there similar needs for each?
  - c. What tools or information could benefit future planning?

#### Meeting Schedule:

December  
February  
March  
April  
May

#### Meeting Location:

New River Valley  
Competitiveness Center  
6580 Valley Center Drive  
Radford, VA 24141



## Transportation Work Group

### *Energy & Transportation Worksheet*

*December 1, 2011*

**Directions:** Take 5 minutes to review the questions below. Write down your ideas as they come to mind. Once complete, please join 2-3 other meeting participants and answer the questions as a team. After 15 minutes, the small teams will report back to the whole group and participate in a facilitated discussion.

1. How does energy influence transportation needs in the New River Valley?

- Fuel cost/use
- How far we can live from work, school, play (afford)
- No choices other than oil in NRV
- Non-essential trips consolidation
- Choice in living – certain home or certain proximity
- It can limit material and personal flow within the region if there's not enough (fuel/food/energy) to distribute to the users or vehicles.
- Prices on energy can determine behavior and actions, or where they choose to go.
- Energy costs can make transportation costs prohibitive to low income residents, especially in rural regions that lack access.
- Increased demand for public transit – stress to the system
- Lower costs increase access
- Travel mode based on fuel costs – whether to carpool or not
- Distribution system – truck deliveries
- Walk/bike vs. car trips for work, household activities
- Degree of shopping and recreation trips because of cost
- Efficiency of vehicle options – cost prohibitive
- Higher cost of energy – using fuel pricing – impact on transit service – household costs
- Cost of energy can drive vehicle purchase – where we live, and if we choose alternative means
- Controls non-essential spending (efficiency of trips – don't do)
- Can affect land development
- Energy costs dictate mode preference – frequency of automobile use vs. other means
- What energy is available vs. what transportation
- Energy costs – influences what is affordable housing
- Transportation and energy stay pretty similar in daily lives
- How the environment is impacted
- Peoples transportation needs remain somewhat stable day to day (although individuals have options to combine trips)

2. Where is the common ground between energy and transportation?

- Fundamental connection – fuel to travel, energy to supply destination
- No control over energy costs
- Cost influence vehicle purchase – home cost
- The common ground is in the work that people want done throughout the day.
- Should there be two different transportation plans (fast vs. slow)?
- Transportation + health relationship
- Cost point – when energy costs are low more VMT by passengers, more freight shipped via trucks.
- Increased traffic on roadways creates costs (maintenance and safety countermeasures)
- Affordability
- Consumption/mode choice – bus, car, non-motorized
- Infrastructure – roads vs. other ways to handle transportation demand
- Maintenance – volume over time & repair work
- Costs related to each
- Don't have much control over energy costs so transportation/travel is where you could make a personal adjustment
- Household cost if goes up, discretionary income
- As energy costs increase so does the cost of transportation
- Part of peoples life factored into budgets
- Reduce energy use and increase discretionary income
- Transportation takes energy of several types
- People now have to be aware of their costs/transportation needs
- Public transit
- Carpooling/ridesharing
- Electric car deployment
- Educational opportunities for the public – because of new understanding across general public about their transportation costs.
- Those who are living in places with the cheapest housing are also in places that are geographically inefficient for employing these strategies (except for combining trips)
- Different source of transportation doesn't happen by magic – it requires some energy source to move people and goods around.
- Energy sources come with a number of costs from individual governments, environmental, and health related

3. What scenarios could create opportunities/challenges for residents of the New River Valley?

Opportunity	Benefit/Potential Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Services for aging</li> <li>○ National incentives for improvements</li> <li>○ Bike choices, destinations &lt; 10 miles</li> <li>○ Walking choices in downtown communities</li> <li>○ Transit choices connecting popular locations</li> <li>○ Breaking point for mode choice?</li> <li>○ Improving aesthetics of meeting points</li> <li>○ Employer transportation incentives</li> <li>○ New energy sources for vehicles</li> <li>○ Periodic fuel spikes</li> <li>○ Learn from other communities that have integrated transportation facilities</li> <li>○ Increased access to alternative energy scenarios (charging stations, natural gas, fueling stations).</li> <li>○ Mini-village development</li> <li>○ Community development (in mode shifts)</li> <li>○ Alternative energy choice</li> <li>○ Carpooling/ride share</li> <li>○ Alternative transportation options</li> <li>○ Regional connectivity</li> <li>○ Small bus/van pool services to/from rural areas to employment and retail centers</li> <li>○ Carpool lots at natural meeting points</li> <li>○ Serve as a model for other rural regions/captiolize on sustainable communities grant and DOT interest to make previous 2 listings happen.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Models from other communities</li> <li>○ Increased access to alternative energy sources/increased awareness</li> <li>○ Convenience</li> <li>○ Opens conversations</li> <li>○ May not be feasible</li> <li>○ Walkable community – less energy – dependant on transportation</li> <li>○ Building sense of community</li> <li>○ Destination for rural needs “one stop”</li> <li>○ Affordability of efficient vehicle choices</li> <li>○ Location of transportation options</li> <li>○ Commitment of local governments of participate in programs promoting efficiency</li> <li>○ Reduce dollars</li> <li>○ Fuel costs – create incentives through major employers</li> <li>○ Mini village development – walkable, less energy</li> <li>○ Combining trips – opportunities for economic growth for retail centers</li> <li>○ Decreased energy costs = increase personal income</li> <li>○ Communities may not be prepared for new transportation options – dangerous to certain community types</li> <li>○ Affordable community</li> <li>○ High cost of operation</li> <li>○ Safety</li> </ul>

Opportunity	Benefit/Potential Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ looking at extending public transportation service to aging populations</li> <li>○ Education – need criteria for who can access existing services</li> <li>○ Models for hubs/rural transit facilities best practices – mixed modes/mixed use</li> <li>○ Increased access to fuel stations – drive demand</li> <li>○ Scooters (more on the road) – opportunities to look at corridors max 35 mph</li> <li>○ Incentives/ordnances – reduce parking lot size in exchange for bus stop</li> <li>○ Changing price structure/where you park</li> <li>○ Increased pedestrian + bike infrastructure</li> <li>○ Opportunities for all modes</li> <li>○ Use natural meeting points</li> <li>○ Park once</li> <li>○ Land development options</li> <li>○ Evaluate Transportation patterns</li> <li>○ Incentives for good</li> <li>○ Periodic spikes in fuel costs – increased motor scooters, bike shares</li> <li>○ Rural transit routes</li> <li>○ Widen Route 114</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May lose transit riders if trip becomes faster/easier with widening</li> </ul>



## Transportation Work Group

### ***Meeting Agenda***

January 24, 2012 10:00 a.m.

#### Primary Work Group Contacts

Dan Brugh, Chair  
Executive Director  
BCM – MPO  
Tel: (540) 394-2145  
[brughid@montgomerycountyva.gov](mailto:brughid@montgomerycountyva.gov)

Elijah Sharp, Co-Chair  
Regional Transportation Planner  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[esharp@nrvpdc.org](mailto:esharp@nrvpdc.org)

Kim Thurlow  
Livability Project Coordinator  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[kthurlow@nrvpdc.org](mailto:kthurlow@nrvpdc.org)

#### Meeting Schedule:

February  
March  
April  
May

#### Meeting Location:

New River Valley  
Competitiveness Center  
6580 Valley Center Drive  
Radford, VA 24141

1. Meet the Work Group Participants
2. Livability Project Update – *Kim Thurlow & Carol Davis*
3. Energy and Transportation Recap – *Dan Brugh & Elijah Sharp*
4. Spotlight on Economic Development – *Aric Bopp & Brian Hamilton*
5. Facilitated Discussion – Transportation and Economic Development
  - a. Where do the elements overlap?
  - b. Are there similar needs for each?
  - c. What tools or information could benefit future planning?



## Transportation Work Group

### ***Meeting Notes***

December 1, 2011 10:00 a.m.

#### Primary Work Group Contacts

Dan Brugh, Chair  
Executive Director  
BCM – MPO  
Tel: (540) 394-2145  
[brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov](mailto:brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov)

Elijah Sharp, Co-Chair  
Regional Transportation Planner  
NRVPDC  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[esharp@nrvpdc.org](mailto:esharp@nrvpdc.org)

Kim Thurlow  
Livability Project Coordinator  
NRVPDC  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[kthurlow@nrvpdc.org](mailto:kthurlow@nrvpdc.org)

#### Meeting Schedule:

February  
March  
April  
May

#### Meeting Location:

New River Valley  
Competitiveness Center  
6580 Valley Center Drive  
Radford, VA 24141

### 1. Meet the Work Group Participants:

Dan Brugh welcomed everyone and asked the participants to introduce themselves.

Meeting participants included: Brad Mecham, Carol Davis, Tammy Trimble, Debby Freed, Steve Sandy, Aric Bopp, Brian Hamilton, Christy Straight, Dan Brugh, and Elijah Sharp

### 2. Livability Project Update

Carol provided an overview of the Livability Project status, and presented citizen feedback on economic Development themes and priorities. The public identified that more public/alternative transportation options were needed. Closely following intersecting issues included: transportation infrastructure and economy, development patterns and commute time/\$, bike/ped safety/suitability, transportation insecurity /special populations, convenience/proximity to shopping/services, and transportation costs.

Carol also discussed the next phase of outreach targeted towards increasing dialog between the public and local government decision making. One of the methods for exploring this idea was a game called "Built." Participants are asked to develop their ideal community and then work with a group to develop a community together – the activity reinforces the idea of working together to make decisions.

### 3. Energy and Transportation Recap

Dan announced that the previous meeting notes were available online and encouraged the work group participants to reference the provided summary sheet of transportation/energy feedback. Elijah highlighted some of the responses provided on the energy and transportation worksheet.

#### 4. Spotlight on Economic Development

Aric shared a presentation on Economic Development for the New River Valley. Aric identified the NRV's target industries as: advance manufacturing, automotive suppliers, biotech & life sciences, data centers, food & natural products, government defense, heavy truck industry, home building products, information technology, nanotechnology, power generation/renewable energy, plastics/polymers/chemicals, and warehouse distribution. Aric also shared some of the accolades that the NRV had received in the past.

Since January, 2012 the NRV had announced 1,713 new jobs and over \$109 million in new investment in the region. Of that, 986 new jobs and over \$75 million in new investment has come from "new" companies, successfully recruited in the NRV. During that same time, the unemployment rate has dropped from 9.6% in January 2010 to 6.0% in November 2011. The workforce has grown from 85,849 to 90,429 and the number of people employed is 85,042 (almost at pre-recession peak).

Brian Hamilton provided an overview of Montgomery County's recent economic development success. In addition, he explained some of the incentives that localities have to develop in order to successfully compete for new companies. Companies often take several years before making a final move or new location decision.

#### 5. Facilitated Discussion – Transportation and Energy

Work Group participants were given 5 minutes to review to review a series of questions:

- I. How does economic development influence transportation needs in the New River Valley?
- II. Are there certain types of businesses that may be attracted to certain types of transportation resources?
- III. Are there opportunities in the transportation world that could benefit economic development in the New River Valley?

After working independently on the questions, everyone shared their ideas with the group. The answer sheets were collected so that everyone's ideas could be recorded.

In closing, the group decided that the next meeting should be in late February – early March and that the focus of the meeting would be on economic development. Elijah will send out a poll to identify the best date for everyone.



## Transportation Work Group

### *Economic Development & Transportation Worksheet*

*January 24, 2012*

**Directions:** Take 5 minutes to review the questions below. Write down your ideas as they come to mind. Once complete, please join 2-3 other meeting participants and answer the questions as a team. After 15 minutes, each small team will report back to the whole group and participate in a facilitated discussion.

1. How does economic development influence transportation needs in the New River Valley?
  - I think rather transportation influences economic development.
  - We need better “inner-connectedness” for the region (4-lane roads such as Rt. 100, 114, and add an East/West Connector road from 460 to 100.
  - No tolls on I-81
  - Determines employee travel to work location (volume & routes used)
  - Access for product delivery to/from manufacturers
  - Wages impact housing employees can afford/distance from job (more or less VMT)
  - Logistics – specifically air and rail
  - Jobs/workers influence public transit
  - Quality of life – traffic flow, trails/recreation
  - Creates demand for transit services
  - Highlights gaps in current services
  - Moving goods
  - Connecting workers to work/affordability
  - Public private partnerships need to be expanded
  - Helps generate improvements/enhancements to existing transportation through road construction, airport expansion, transit expansion and/or development
  - Bus service to corporate parks – provide low income with more options
  - Rail is a big deal, but greenway, transit/bus is needed for low income
  - Can help shape the public perception of transit

2. Are there certain types of businesses that may be attracted to certain types of transportation resources?

- Yes – warehouses/distribution to intermodal and/or I-81
- Heavy manufacturing to rail served sites/buildings
- Character of workforce drives this: high-tech intellectual property businesses look for multi-option/less car; whereas, manufacturing wants affordable access for employees (road capacity/transit)
- Distribution centers
- Import/export – businesses that are highly involved
- Tourism business
- Industry – rail, public transit
- Higher wage = research/quality of life
- Commuting/transit = lower income?
- Commercial – transit for employees/customers, interstates for shipment
- Alternative businesses/green focused – walking, biking, boating
- Family owned businesses tend to want quality of life resources such as trails
- Fulfillment centers want direct access to trucking and air freight
- Call centers will utilize public transportation resources
- High-tech usually wants access to trails and other recreational opportunities
- Call centers and manufacturing need bus service to area
- Alternative choice need to be reliable

3. Are there opportunities in the transportation world that could benefit economic development in the New River Valley?

Opportunity	Benefit/Potential Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4-lane Route 8</li> <li>- 4-lane Route 11, 100, and 114</li> <li>- Widen I-81</li> <li>- Intermodal</li> <li>- Rail service to NRV Commerce Park</li> <li>- Reinforce runway at NRV airport</li> <li>- Clover leaf to VT CRC</li> <li>- High employee #'s @ work centers</li> <li>- More mode choice for mitigating traffic</li> <li>- Housing/jobs imbalance in NRV</li> <li>- Commuting/transit for rural areas</li> <li>- Rail infrastructure spurs</li> <li>- Public transit between population cntrs</li> <li>- Passenger rail</li> <li>- Commercial rail</li> <li>- Transit</li> <li>- Local government support</li> <li>- Trails to research parks/universities</li> <li>- Establish/expand carpooling</li> <li>- Identify housing in range to jobs</li> <li>- Expanded bus services</li> <li>- Increase rail opportunity</li> <li>- Bus service</li> <li>- Rail</li> <li>- Bike and pedestrian trails</li> <li>- Education about transit</li> <li>- Amenities with grants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easier access to Blue Ridge Parkway</li> <li>- easier commutes and access to retail/commercial</li> <li>- more industry</li> <li>- more industry</li> <li>- more industry</li> <li>- more air cargo = more jobs/industry</li> <li>- more jobs</li> <li>- expanding transit to destination could add users</li> <li>- skip over congestion issues due to growth/service</li> <li>- improve marketability and retain young prof.</li> <li>- improve H+T costs/imbalance</li> <li>- increase industrial interest in NRV</li> <li>- connect jobs and people</li> <li>- improve attractiveness – tied to urban centers</li> <li>- increased access to shipping options</li> <li>- increased workforce mobility options</li> <li>- funding for transportation options</li> <li>- accommodate quality of life</li> <li>- lower wage \$12/hr or less job support</li> <li>- recommend quality living areas to new workers</li> <li>- choices to get to work – not have to drive</li> <li>- allow more shipping opportunities</li> <li>- provide LMI more opportunities</li> <li>- attract manufacturing to area</li> <li>- quality of life for high tech companies</li> </ul>



## Transportation Work Group

### ***Meeting Agenda***

April 23, 2012 3:00 p.m.

#### Primary Work Group Contacts

Dan Brugh, Chair  
Executive Director  
BCM – MPO  
Tel: (540) 394-2145  
[brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov](mailto:brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov)

Elijah Sharp, Co-Chair  
Regional Transportation Planner  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[esharp@nrvpdc.org](mailto:esharp@nrvpdc.org)

Kim Thurlow  
Livability Project Coordinator  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[kthurlow@nrvpdc.org](mailto:kthurlow@nrvpdc.org)

#### Meeting Schedule:

April 30, 2012

#### Meeting Location:

New River Valley  
Competitiveness Center  
6580 Valley Center Drive  
Radford, VA 24141

1. Meet the Work Group Participants
2. Livability Project Update – *Carol Davis*
3. Local Transportation Planning – *Dan Brugh*
4. MPO Long-Range Transportation Plan – *Dan Brugh*
5. Rural Long-Range Transportation Plan – *Elijah Sharp*
6. Statewide Transportation Plan – *Elijah Sharp*
- 5 Minute Break-----
7. Developing Goals and Indicators - *Elijah Sharp & Carol Davis*
  - Defining “livability” in transportation
  - Livability Principals
  - Tying strategies into Federal Programs
  - Citizen Feedback
8. Create a Vision for Transportation in the NRV – *Work Group*

## Transportation - Livability Project Vision

*Create a transportation system that matches local community's needs, connects people to the places they need to go, that is accessible and affordable for everyone, supports an eco-friendly and physically healthy environment, that enables smarter public investments and maintains existing assets, protects rural landscapes, and revitalizes existing community cores.*

- access for demographic and economic
- smarter public investments
  
- connecting people to the places they need to go
- person trips vs. vehicle trips
- appropriate mode - the appropriate need
  
- affordability
- create options for those with the least (less capable, economic, health, mobility)
- Vulnerable populations - others will be able to access
- how to include disadvantaged into planning
  
- opportunities for collaboration
- maintaining the existing investments, building on them in a fiscally responsible way
- build on existing plans, past efforts, regional assets
- take advantage of things that already exist
  
- reduced car dependency
- models for rural areas that provide options
  
- healthy, health promoting - bicycling
- reduced pollution
- cardio dependency
- fostering neighborhood and community development
- protect rural landscapes while revitalizing community cores



## Transportation Work Group

### ***Meeting Agenda***

April 30, 2012 3:00 p.m.

#### Primary Work Group Contacts

Dan Brugh, Chair  
Executive Director  
BCM – MPO  
Tel: (540) 394-2145  
[brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov](mailto:brughjd@montgomerycountyva.gov)

Elijah Sharp, Co-Chair  
Regional Transportation Planner  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[esharp@nrvpdc.org](mailto:esharp@nrvpdc.org)

Kim Thurlow  
Livability Project Coordinator  
NRVPCD  
Tel: (540) 639-9313  
[kthurlow@nrvpdc.org](mailto:kthurlow@nrvpdc.org)

#### Meeting Schedule:

TBD

#### Meeting Location:

New River Valley  
Competitiveness Center  
6580 Valley Center Drive  
Radford, VA 24141

1. Meet the Work Group Participants
2. Create a Vision for Transportation in the NRV – *Work Group*
  - a. Review input from April 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting
  - b. Finalize vision statement
3. Identify Transportation Goals – *Work Group*
4. Develop Strategies that Support Goals – *Work Group*

**April 30, 2012**

## **Transportation Vision:**

Create a transportation system that matches local community's needs, connects people to the places they need to go, that is accessible and affordable for everyone, supports an eco-friendly and physically healthy environment, that enables smarter public investments and maintains existing assets, protects rural landscapes, and revitalizes existing community cores.

## **Goals Brainstorm**

### Economic Vitality

- Land access- existing employment centers
- Community/ jobs centers- multi-modal, sidewalks (co-location)
- More transit/smart growth/carpooling (ex. smartway)
- Proportional investment to benefit (balance)
- Transport as an economic tool- advertising on buses, use of technology, public private partnerships sponsoring shelters
- Aging population- indirect savings to local governments (more expensive to pay for institutional care than providing ability to stay in their own homes)

### Safety and Security

- Walking on 114
- Night-time driving
- Scooters (eliminate or accommodate)

### Accessibility

- Is person able to use transportation that exists?
- Routes not timed properly around work hours or to accommodate 'catching another route', currently more around student schedules than workforce.
- Capacity of existing services
- Bus fear
- Lines to shopping, medical, work
- Rural community
- Knowledge of existing resources, make them understandable, simple format available on internet and paper and in multiple languages.
- Pre-paid card per month to ride that allow you to ride every transit system
- Vouchers for low-income
- Vulnerable populations use could serve as an indicator of access.

## Connectivity

- Rural areas accommodating for 1) work live 2) older residents 3) urban rural connections 4) medical 5) schools/afterschool programs 6) freight/rail/airport
- Molding modes together- car to bike to bus, etc.
- Last mile connection
- Vanpool system
- Bike kitchen (bike to bus)
- Better collaboration among partners (employers, NGO's providing transit, government, MPO)
- VT vanpool (take van home...need to learn more about specifics of program and why this isn't as successful), VT to Christiansburg scheduled run which is successful
- Convenience of existing services
- Cheaper private options (taxis)

## Preservation

- Community character
- Enhancement to entrance ways, road signs, way finding
- 16 blocks, farmers market
- Not building new roads and being aware of other land types
- Protecting rural landscapes
- Roads as a driver of natural and cultural based tourism

## Health

- Medical trips
- Moving food around, coordination and food access
- Improving connections with existing trails, bikeways
- Safe routes to schools
- Rural access to bike/pedways

## Quality of Life

- Minimizing times
- Why should someone without a car have to ride such a long time on public transport (need greater efficiency to attract riders)
- Make walking somewhere enjoyable
- Quality of life means different things to different people (people want to be able to walk to town or people want to live in the country and drive to town, park in one location and take care of all their needs).

Populations needing special attention:

- Low income
- Children
- Teenagers to afternoon programs and lack physical exercise outlets
- Aging 65+
- Disabled
- Legal no license
- Night shift

#### Other comments

- County buses not typically at table
- How to use school buses in middle of the day
- Car share/bike share programs
- Virginia Community Capital as funder to provide vehicle loans
- Sharing car with neighbor