C3’s Suggested Feedback: CA-MPO
Long-Range Transportation Plan Draft

Charlottesville and Albemarle residents, your feedback is invaluable in shaping the future of transportation in our community. By giving feedback on the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CA-MPO) Long-Range Transportation Plan Draft (LRTPD), you can advocate for inclusive, sustainable, and accessible transportation solutions, creating a plan that truly serves the needs of all residents. At 115 pages, we understand that the plan’s length can be a barrier against public engagement. For that reason, C3 has compiled the following Talking Points document for community members to use as a tool for submitting feedback.

Your feedback will shape the future of transportation in our community!

Talking Points

1. Multi-modal emphasis
   - Celebrate: The plan prioritizes diverse transportation options, aligning both with community preferences and with the differing needs across societal strata. C3 strongly supports multi-modal transit options and encourages the community to demonstrate their desire for multimodal transportation availability in their neighborhood.
   - Advocate: An integrated multi-modal public transit system is strengthened by holistic planning.
     ○ While communicating your support for multi-modal transit, it is essential to underscore the need for comfortable areas for travelers to wait while awaiting onward modes of travel.

2. Community engagement
   - Celebrate: Numerous community outreach efforts - including stakeholder meetings and an extensive online survey - attempted to ensure that the plan reflects diverse perspectives and priorities. CA-MPO conducted ‘public intercepts’ to proactively engage demographic groups that were underrepresented by the online survey process.
   - Advocate: Demographic information was not reported for comments received during the public intercepts. CA-MPO needs to:
     ○ Implement strategies to proactively seek representative community involvement before publishing engagement surveys.
     ○ Report the demographic information of residents reached through engagement opportunities to ensure that marginalized communities’ self-reported needs are identified and prioritized.

3. Language barriers to providing feedback
   - Advocate: While the plan recognizes that CA-MPO serves a large Spanish-speaking population, a Spanish-language copy of the plan has not been made available to those community stakeholders.
     ○ Plans of this nature should be produced in all major local languages.

Connect with us to share your ideas!
theclimatecollaborative.org | policy@theclimatecollaborative.org
4. Disabled population oversight

- **Advocate:** The plan lacks explicit consideration or even reference to the mobility needs of individuals with disabilities, a critical aspect of inclusive transportation planning, outside of JAUNT.
  - *Equitable transit should allow people with differing mobility needs to access the same flexibility and convenience that is sought for the rest of the population.*

5. Sustainability strategies

- **Celebrate:** Initiatives to reduce GHGs and promote sustainable transportation options demonstrate a commitment to environmental stewardship. In planning for uncertainty, the TLRPD underscores the important place behavior change has in reducing community greenhouse gas emissions, as well as in ensuring the success of multimodal and reduced-emissions transportation. In the same section, on-demand mobility (microtransit) is suggested for routes with low ridership.
  - *Microtransit is a promising solution that C3 supports especially for the short-term, with the potential for long-term success in areas that will not see increased population density.*

- **Advocate:** CA-MPO’s own engagement process demonstrated that environmental concerns are a top priority for community stakeholders across demographics.
  - *Environmental and climate justice should be more boldly embedded into all parts of the document.*

6. References and methodology

- **Celebrate:** The methodology informing the plan’s findings is explained in clear terms. Limitations in data acquisition and analysis are acknowledged, with mitigation efforts also outlined. This is helpful to policy advocates such as C3 in identifying gaps in the plan’s scope.

- **Advocate:** In its transportation assessment on bike and pedestrian infrastructure, the plan’s references to accolades from the League of American Bicyclists and Walk Friendly Communities are opposed to direct community feedback. Concerningly, the Walk Friendly Communities designation references the outdated, pre-COVID 19 pandemic information that “transit is available within one-quarter-mile of 95 percent of the population seven days a week,” but there is currently no Sunday bus service. Irrespective of any third-party, non-local accolades, improvements to pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure was cited by respondents as a top priority.
  - *References to third-party accolades should be revised and updated for accuracy and relevance, and removed where they are at odds with direct community feedback prioritized.*

6. Discussion on freight movement

- **Advocate:** In its section on discrepancies, the plan should address the implications of its earlier-projected doubling of freight volume across truck and rail freight, including infrastructure needs and environmental impacts.
  - *Addressing this expansion of freight movement by 2035 requires clear differentiation between truck and rail freight, with infrastructure planning tailored to each mode’s requirements.*

**Share your feedback!**