
**Bryan Park Interchange
Advisory Committee (BPIAC)**

Final Report and
Recommendations

October, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of BPIAC Recommendations *Page* 3

APPENDICES

A. Proposals Recommended for Implementation.....8

B. Proposals Recommended for Further Study and Development of
New Options.....11

C. Proposals Recommended To Be Dropped.....13

D. Recommended Principles for Transportation Planning..14

E. BPIAC Members.....18

F. BPIAC Background and Purpose.....20

G. BPIAC Process.....21

H. Process Evaluation.....25

I. Meeting Summaries and Additional Copies of This Report30

J. Letters of Support.....31

Summary of BPIAC's Recommendations

The Bryan Park Interchange Advisory Committee (BPIAC)¹, comprised of 24 citizen members representing a broad range of community interests, was convened by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and facilitated by the Institute for Environmental Negotiation, University of Virginia. Operating by consensus during more than two years of monthly meetings, BPIAC worked diligently with VDOT's consultant engineering firm of Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., in a comprehensive study of the I-95/ I-64/ I-195 Interchange adjacent to Bryan Park.

BPIAC and Michael Baker worked to increase mutual understanding about the problems associated with the Bryan Park Study Area and to develop mutually acceptable proposals for feasible long-term solutions to these problems.

As a result of these discussions, the recommendations of BPIAC concur with those of Michael Baker on eight proposals, five of which relate to the imperative for developing multi-modal regional transportation and non-road solutions to problems associated with continued growth.

However, it is also important to note that BPIAC's recommendations diverge from those of Michael Baker on a number of the road construction proposals. This divergence results from the fact that BPIAC's charge differs from that of VDOT's engineering firm. While the principal task of the engineering firm was to determine feasible alternatives from an engineering standpoint, the charge of BPIAC was to place a human face on these alternatives and to determine whether the feasible alternatives adequately address community concerns and values.² BPIAC's conclusion, by consensus, is that four road construction proposals are not consistent with BPIAC's goals and need further study for the development of *new* options and that two road construction proposals should be dropped. These are detailed below.

BPIAC'S GOALS

BPIAC adopted four goals that members agreed were of primary importance to their constituencies. Members agreed that these goals should guide the development of all engineering proposals for the Bryan Park Study Area and that the merit of all proposals would be judged by the degree to which they conformed to these four goals. The goals, which were not prioritized, should be considered of equal importance.

- **To maintain the existing boundaries of Bryan Park, including the preservation of the Bellevue Avenue pedestrian and vehicular bridge.**
- **To preserve the adjoining neighborhoods by protecting them from physical, environmental, and aesthetic encroachments.**
- **To maintain a southbound access ramp and a northbound exit ramp to I-95, with the relocation of these ramps a consideration; to eliminate tractor-trailer traffic and to minimize other commercial traffic at the northbound Exit 80 ramp.**

¹ See Appendix E, page 17, for a list of BPIAC citizen and resource members.

² See Appendix F, page 19, for more information on BPIAC's background and purpose.

- **To relieve congestion in the Study Area.**

In evaluating the final proposals of Michael Baker, BPIAC reached the following conclusions based on whether or not those proposals were consistent with the above goals.

BPIAC RECOMMENDS IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS.³

BPIAC recommends implementation of five non-construction proposals:

- ◆ Concept 1: To provide enhanced bus service.
- ◆ Concept 2A: To provide commuter rail with land-use changes.
- ◆ Concept 3A: To construct light rail transit extension with land-use changes.
- ◆ Concept 5: To create incentives for carpooling/vanpooling /transit/ flextime/ telecommuting.
- ◆ Concept 6: To develop walking and bicycling facilities.

BPIAC recommends implementation of three construction proposals:

- ◆ Concept 11b(i): To relocate the I-95 northbound exit ramp from Hermitage Road to Dumbarton Road.
- ◆ Concept 11b(ii): To extend the existing northbound merge lane, from I-64 to I-95, to the present exit ramp on Wilmer Avenue at Brook Road.
- ◆ Concept 24: To construct an additional lane on I-64 eastbound from the Staples Mill Road Interchange to the I-195 exit ramp.

A majority of BPIAC members also recommends that the I-95 southbound access ramp at Hermitage Road be relocated to Dumbarton Road, subject to the constraints detailed on page 9. One member does not endorse this proposal for reasons that are also detailed on page 9.

BPIAC RECOMMENDS FURTHER STUDY OF PROBLEM AREAS AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW OPTIONS BECAUSE CURRENT PROPOSALS DO NOT MEET BPIAC'S GOALS.⁴

Four proposals address road areas in need of improvement. However, because the proposals are not consistent with BPIAC's goals, BPIAC recommends further study of these problem areas to develop options that would satisfy its four goals.

- ◆ Concept 20: To construct a collector-distributor road system at the I-95/Parham Road Interchange. BPIAC is concerned about the extensive construction proposed and its impacts on the Parham Road neighborhoods and recommends that the surrounding neighborhoods and Henrico County be involved in addressing this issue.
- ◆ Concept 30: To extend the I-95 southbound exit-only lane across the Boulevard before merging it into the mainline.
- ◆ Concept 31: To replace the left-hand access ramp from I-195 northbound to I-64 westbound with a right-hand access ramp. An I-64 flyover that would encroach upon the Bryan Park area is unacceptable, but the current hazardous situation deserves further study for the development of new options.

³ See Appendix A, page 7, for further explanation of proposals endorsed.

⁴ See Appendix B, page 10, for more explanation of proposals requiring further study.

- ◆ **Concept 39B: To reconstruct I-95 northbound/I-64 westbound as a major fork with a five-lane section south of the diverge gore.** A massive buildup of the Interchange is an unacceptable solution.

BPIAC RECOMMENDS PROPOSALS BE DROPPED.⁵

One non-construction and two construction proposals were judged by BPIAC as not acceptable because they are not consistent with BPIAC's goals. As a consequence, BPIAC recommends that these proposals be dropped:

- ◆ **Concept 4: To convert two existing through lanes to high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) 2+ lanes.** (*Michael Baker also did not recommend carrying this Concept forward for further study.*)
- ◆ **Concept 18: To replace the Hermitage Road on-ramp to I-95 southbound with a new ramp in the northwest quadrant of the Hermitage Road Interchange.**
- ◆ **Concept 29: To build an additional through lane on northbound and southbound I-95 and eastbound and westbound I-64.**

NEIGHBORHOOD AND NON-ROAD IMPERATIVES⁶

BPIAC recognizes the importance of safe, efficient transportation for our region, including interstate highways, yet is convinced that highway improvements should not be at the expense of neighborhoods and parks, commercial and civic institutions, or air and water quality. Transportation should be oriented to move people and goods, not merely to move the greatest number of vehicles at the highest attainable speed. A well-balanced regional transportation network is essential to the prosperity of the Richmond metro area if it is to sustain a quality of life superior to competing metropolitan regions.

Several common themes emerged over the course of BPIAC discussions which concern the growing imperative perceived by BPIAC members to develop multi-modal regional transportation and non-road solutions as a way of protecting the quality of life in neighborhoods from further roadway encroachments:

- ◆ A priority on protecting neighborhoods, homes, parks, and businesses from negative impacts caused by interstate highways.
- ◆ The need for VDOT to seriously solicit, consider, and include neighborhood priorities in developing transportation projects.
- ◆ A preference for funding multi-modal transportation and other non-road solutions to traffic congestion.
- ◆ A view that, whatever traffic volumes are projected for the Bryan Park Interchange, building new roads may not solve the problem.
- ◆ A need for smarter land use and regional transportation planning that aims to reduce single-vehicle use.

⁵ See Appendix C, page 12, for more explanation of proposals recommended to be dropped.

⁶ See Appendix D, page 13, for BPIAC's Recommended Principles for Transportation Planning.

CONCLUSION

BPIAC members represent a broad range of community interests, including residential and business perspectives. Participants' expertise and credibility are grounded in who they are: local homeowners, business people, and residents who are impacted by the Bryan Park Interchange traffic and whose neighborhoods, parks, and businesses will be most affected by changes in the Interchange. Participants have received a significant education in transportation planning by Michael Baker and VDOT. Many came to the table with experience in community planning, and several are professional planners.

Two points are critical in evaluating this Report. First, the decisions contained in this Report were reached by **consensus**.⁷ BPIAC began as a group of citizens not only with diverse backgrounds but with different and often opposing concerns and viewpoints. Therefore, the fact that BPIAC members reached consensus reflects the integrity, the genuine goodwill, and the commitment of the participants.

Secondly, the consensus decisions were reached after **two years** of diligent work by the BPIAC members, who were educated on general aspects of transportation planning and particularly on the issues facing the I-64, I-95, and I-195 Interchange area.

What became clear to BPIAC members through this process is that transportation issues are community issues and that the voice of the community through an informed process is as important as, or even more important than, engineering and technical solutions. Building more roads is no longer the only or the best answer for the regional community.

BPIAC strongly asserts that a policy of simply widening roads and investing almost exclusively in promoting automobile use in the Richmond area will perpetuate congestion, impact neighborhoods and air and water quality, and erode the region's quality of life. BPIAC strongly urges formation of a regional transportation policy which invests in and implements multi-modal transit options (buses and vans, commuter and light rail, ridesharing, etc.). Richmond's 20-year traffic forecast demands cannot be met by continuous road expansions alone. Transportation gridlock, unhealthy air and water, and degraded neighborhoods are unacceptable consequences. Instead, a range of viable transit modes should be introduced into the Richmond region's 6-year Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) as soon as possible.

BPIAC's findings are a natural result of these shared concerns and represent the consensus views of a diverse citizen group. It is also important to note that BPIAC's findings were confirmed by the broader community, as demonstrated by the many comments received at the August 12, 1999, public meeting concerning the Feasibility Study.

BPIAC strongly urges VDOT, the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), and local government officials to respect BPIAC's findings and to incorporate them in their decisions regarding the Bryan Park Interchange.

BPIAC members thank VDOT for the opportunity to share the community's concerns and sincerely hope that VDOT and the Commonwealth Transportation Board will give strong consideration to the community's findings.

⁷ See Appendix G, page 20, for information about BPIAC's process.

Citizen Signatories

BPIAC members were asked to represent the perspectives of their communities and organizations. However, their signatures represent their individual endorsement only. Formal endorsement by citizen and civic organizations is indicated in letters attached to this Report.

Signed By (Citizen Members Listed Alphabetically)

- ◆ Sandra Balster, member of Hermitage Road Historic District _____
- ◆ Elizabeth Barrett, member of Friends of Bryan Park _____
- ◆ Roland Brierre, Jr., Concerned Citizen _____
- ◆ Gretchen Carreras, member of Hatcher Civic Association _____
- ◆ William Correll, resident of Westminster Canterbury _____
- ◆ Doris Davis, resident of Hermitage Park, Lakeside _____
- ◆ Chuck Epes, member of Bellevue Civic Association _____
- ◆ Peter Francisco, member of Lakeside Business Association _____
- ◆ Irene Jennings, member of Parks & Recreation CAP Board _____
- ◆ Tony Pelling, member of Ginter Park Residents' Association _____
- ◆ Tim Pfohl, resident of Bellevue _____
- ◆ Roland Rackett, resident of Westminster Canterbury _____
- ◆ Arthur Ratcliffe, member of the Virginia Bicycle Federation _____
- ◆ Isaac Regelson, member of Ginter Park Residents' Association _____
- ◆ Beryl Riley, resident of Hermitage Road Historic District _____
- ◆ Katie Roemer, resident of Bellevue _____
- ◆ Kent Ruffin, resident of Historic Jackson Ward _____
- ◆ Robert Stiff, member of Richmond Area Bicycling Association _____
- ◆ Bernice Strommer, member of Rosedale Civic Association _____
- ◆ Barbara Taggart, Concerned Citizen _____
- ◆ Eileen Tangle, member of Bryan Parkway Civic Association _____
- ◆ Charles Ware, Concerned Citizen _____
- ◆ Mary Ellen Williams, resident of Bellevue Park _____
- ◆ John Zeugner, member of Bryan Parkway Civic Association _____

Appendix A: Proposals Recommended For Implementation

BPIAC affirmed that the following four goals adopted in January 1998 were to be the measure by which Michael Baker's alternatives were to be objectively evaluated:

- To maintain the existing boundaries of Bryan Park, including the preservation of the Bellevue Avenue pedestrian and vehicular bridge;
- To preserve the adjoining neighborhoods by protecting them from physical, environmental, and aesthetic encroachments;
- To maintain a southbound access ramp and a northbound exit ramp to I-95, with the relocation of these ramps a consideration; to eliminate tractor-trailer traffic and to minimize other commercial traffic at the northbound Exit 80 ramp.
- To relieve congestion in the Study Area.

Concept #1: Enhanced Bus Service

By consensus, BPIAC recommends that this proposal be implemented.

This proposal calls for increasing by 30 percent the frequency of bus service along existing bus routes during peak hours. This proposal addresses one of BPIAC's goals, that of relieving congestion in the Study Area, while also directly addressing one of BPIAC's major concerns that the scope and meaning of "transportation" be broadened to include more than highway traffic. This option would provide long-term benefits to Richmond's transportation system.

Concept #2A: Commuter Rail with Land-Use Changes

By consensus, BPIAC recommends that this proposal be implemented.

This proposal calls for a commuter rail line from Ashland to downtown Richmond and is based on an assumption that housing density will be increased by a factor of three within a three-mile radius of the Ashland and Staples Mill Road stations. This proposal addresses one of BPIAC's goals, that of relieving congestion in the Study Area, while also directly addressing one of BPIAC's major concerns that the scope and meaning of "transportation" be broadened to include more than highway traffic. This option would provide long-term benefits to Richmond's transportation system.

Concept #3A: Light Rail Transit Extension with Land-Use Changes

By consensus, BPIAC recommends that this proposal be implemented.

This proposal calls for extending the planned light rail transit further out Broad Street, from the planned endpoint at the Science Museum to the proposed VA Route 288 in western Richmond. This proposal also adds a park-and-ride lot on the western end of the transit line and reduces the level of bus service along Broad Street. Underlying this proposal are the assumptions that less bus service will be needed and that housing density will be increased by a factor of three along the Broad Street corridor west of Bryan Park. This proposal addresses one of BPIAC's goals, that of relieving congestion in the Study Area, while also directly addressing one of BPIAC's major concerns that the scope and meaning of "transportation" be broadened to include more than highway traffic. This option would provide long-term benefits to Richmond's transportation system.

Concept #5: Carpooling/ Vanpooling/ Transit/ Flextime/ Telecommuting

By consensus, BPIAC recommends that this proposal be implemented.

This proposal calls for encouraging voluntary employer-based incentives for carpooling, vanpooling, the use of public transportation, flextime, and telecommuting. This proposal meets one of BPIAC's goals, that of relieving congestion in the Study Area, while also directly addressing one of BPIAC's major concerns that the scope and meaning of "transportation" be broadened to include more than highway traffic. This option would provide long-term benefits to Richmond's transportation system.

Concept #6: Walking/ Bicycling

By consensus, BPIAC recommends that this proposal be implemented.

This proposal calls for providing sidewalks in almost 100 percent of the Study Area, striping bicycle lanes along roads parallel to the interstate and providing grade-separated bicycle facilities. This proposal meets one of BPIAC's goals, that of relieving congestion in the Study Area, while also directly addressing one of BPIAC's major concerns that the scope and meaning of "transportation" be broadened to include more than highway traffic. This option would provide long-term benefits to Richmond's transportation system.

Concept #11B: Replace the Two Existing I-95 Hermitage Road Ramps with I-95 Ramps to and from Dumbarton Road, and Construct a Two-Lane On-Ramp to I-95 Northbound from I-64 Eastbound and I-195 Northbound

By consensus, BPIAC has dealt with Concept #11B in three parts, detailed below.

#11B(i): *By consensus, BPIAC recommends that the I-95 northbound exit ramp be relocated from Hermitage Road to Dumbarton Road. The existing exit ramp would be closed after the Dumbarton Road ramp is opened.*

BPIAC recognizes the importance of improving the safety of the I-64/I-95 northbound merge area, in general, and also recognizes that the Hermitage Road exit ramp creates a hazardous situation with the merge lane. However, because maintaining access to the neighborhoods and local businesses is a strong concern of BPIAC, an exit ramp somewhere in the nearby vicinity is critical. BPIAC therefore recommends that the Hermitage Road northbound exit ramp should be relocated to Dumbarton Road and that the Hermitage Road exit ramp would be closed after the Dumbarton Road ramp is opened. The exit ramp at Dumbarton Road could be designed to benefit the Azalea Mall property as well as the Lakeside business area.

#11B(ii): *By consensus, BPIAC recommends that the existing northbound merge lane be extended to the present exit ramp on Wilmer Avenue at Brook Road but does not recommend a second additional northbound merge lane.*

Michael Baker recommends extending the existing merge lane from I-64/I-195 to the present exit ramp on Wilmer Avenue at Brook Road and adding a second additional merge lane that would extend only to the proposed Dumbarton Road exit ramp. BPIAC accepts the need for an extended northbound merge lane to improve safety of the hazardous merge area from I-64/I-195 but does not recommend a second additional northbound merge lane.

#11B(iii): *A majority of BPIAC members recommends that the I-95 southbound access ramp at Hermitage Road be relocated to Dumbarton Road and that the property formerly used for this ramp be returned to Bryan Park. One member does not support this concept.*

Michael Baker recommends relocating the I-95 southbound access ramp from Hermitage Road to Dumbarton Road and creating a merge lane that would extend from Dumbarton Road to the existing Hermitage Road access ramp.

A majority of BPIAC members believes that this solution would be feasible and effective and would satisfy the BPIAC goals. However, some of them are concerned that the additional construction would be detrimental to adjacent communities, would require unnecessary acquisition of right-of-way, and is not justified by current traffic conditions. Given these concerns, a majority of BPIAC members therefore recommends the following conditions for implementation:

- Extend the merge lane by the minimum amount required by AASHTO geometric standards (currently 1,000 feet);
- Donate the land no longer needed for the Hermitage Road southbound access ramp to the City for return to Bryan Park;
- Ensure that no additional through lanes on I-95 are added (as proposed in the Michael Baker Report, Concept #29);
- Mitigate impacts of the new construction to minimize visual and noise encroachment on Bryan Park and adjacent neighborhoods;
- Conduct a revised traffic analysis at the time of construction to reflect more accurately real conditions.

One BPIAC member does not endorse the relocation of the southbound access ramp for the following reasons:

- Every loss of natural areas to hard surfacing and to other construction has a detrimental effect on the environment and impacts the quality of life for all (*i.e.*, flooding exacerbated by impermeable surfaces and droughts exacerbated by the loss of plants).
- Limiting the access ramp to 1,000 feet does not seem probable.
- An additional southbound lane would be a visual and noise encroachment on the new Spring Park Historic Site and would destroy the sylvan scenery now enjoyed along Dumbarton Road.
- The scheduled extension of the Hermitage Road bridge and other probable construction needs would limit to a minimum the amount of land that could be returned to Bryan Park; in any case, the proposed use of any returned land as a parking area would not enhance the entrance area of the Park.
- While possibly needed in the future, the relocation – involving major new construction – is not a present necessity, as the recent work seems to have improved the situation sufficiently. At any rate, an alternative southbound ramp is already provided nearby at Brook Road. (If a future need were certain, a revised traffic analysis would not be required.)
- Therefore, the destruction of natural areas and the expense of acquiring more right-of-way, of constructing massive retaining walls and perhaps sound and visual barriers, and of paving probably over 3,000 feet of new roadway do not seem warranted or justified at the present time.

Concept #24 : Provide an auxiliary lane on I-64 eastbound from Staples Mill Road Interchange to the I-195 exit ramp.

By consensus, BPIAC recommends that this proposal be implemented.

This option meets one of BPIAC's goals because it helps to relieve congestion.

Appendix B: Proposals That Do Not Meet BPIAC's Goals and Therefore Require Further Study for The Development of New Options

Concept #20 : Construct a CD road system at the I-95/ Parham Road Interchange.

By consensus, BPIAC agrees that this proposal is beyond the scope of its mandate, although it recognizes that the proposal would have significant negative neighborhood impacts. It recommends this area to VDOT and Henrico County for further study to develop an option that would satisfy the needs of area residents.

The massive CD (collector-distributor) system proposed was similar to the original Bryan Park Interchange issue – a huge Interchange expansion proposal, with major adverse impacts on the nearby neighborhoods, businesses, air and water quality, and road networks. This proposal for Parham Road is beyond the scope of the Bryan Park Interchange Feasibility Study because the neighborhoods and businesses impacted by this Concept were not represented on BPIAC. This Concept is a matter for VDOT to explore with Henrico County and the neighborhoods.

Concept #30: Extend the I-95 southbound exit-only lane at the Boulevard exit ramp across the Boulevard, and then merge it into the mainline.

By consensus, BPIAC recommends further study to develop an option that would satisfy its goals.

Two major problem areas need better solutions: the I-64 eastbound lane-drop at the I-95 southbound merge area and the poor circulation and congestion on the I-95/ Boulevard Interchange and the city streets. BPIAC recommends that an in-depth study of the Boulevard area (land uses and traffic patterns on city streets, and the I-95 corridor entrance and exit needs) be developed to accomplish a comprehensive solution. BPIAC also recommends the need for the lane extension proposed in Alternative #30 to extend beyond Robin Hood Road.

Concept #31: Replace the left-hand access ramp from I-195 northbound to I-64 westbound with a right-hand access ramp.

By consensus, BPIAC rejects this proposal and endorses further study to develop an option that would satisfy its four goals.

This proposal violates several BPIAC goals. It would take Bryan Park land, which BPIAC agrees should be protected from further encroachment. The proposal would have tremendous noise and visual impacts on the Park, violating BPIAC's goal of protecting the Park from various negative impacts.

However, because BPIAC recognizes the current situation as hazardous and undesirable, it recommends that the entire Interchange complex just south of Bryan Park be studied to determine if it could be re-engineered and shifted further to the south. This study should address concerns about this area in a way that supports BPIAC's four goals.

Concept #39B : Reconstruct I-95 northbound/ I-64 westbound as a major fork with a five-lane section south of the diverge gore. I-64 westbound would exit toward the right, and I-95

northbound would exit to the left. Provide a left exit from I-95 northbound to I-64 westbound for traffic using the Boulevard access ramp and traveling to I-95 northbound.

By consensus, BPIAC rejects this proposal and endorses further study to develop an option that would satisfy its four goals.

This option is unacceptable because it violates several of BPIAC's goals. Specifically, the proposed new access from I-64 eastbound to I-95 would severely harm nearby neighborhoods through visual impacts, noise, and degraded air quality. This option would greatly expand the overall area consumed by massive interstate connections. As a result, BPIAC recommends that this problematic area be studied further, as noted above in Concepts 30 and 31, for the development of solutions that do not violate BPIAC's goals.

Appendix C: Proposals Recommended To Be Dropped

Concept #4: Conversion of an existing through lane to HOV 2+ lane

By consensus, BPIAC recommends that this proposal be dropped. (Michael Baker also did not recommend carrying this Concept forward for further study.)

This proposal calls for converting two *existing* interstate through lanes, from Gaskins Road to downtown and from Parham Road to downtown, to High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes. Only vehicles with 2 or more occupants would be able to use the lane during peak hours. Based on the experience with HOV lanes in other areas, BPIAC members do not endorse this proposal.

Concept #18 : Replace the Hermitage Road access ramp to I-95 southbound with a new ramp in the northwest quadrant of the Hermitage Road Interchange.

By consensus, BPIAC rejects this proposal as unacceptable.

This option would have considerable impact on Upham Brook, the Spring Park Historical Site, and the Bryan Park neighborhoods, violating BPIAC's goal concerning the protection of neighborhoods from encroachment.

Concept #29 : Provide an additional through lane on I-95 and I-64.

By consensus, BPIAC rejects this proposal as unacceptable.

This option violates several of BPIAC's goals. First, additional through lanes would negatively impact Bryan Park, which BPIAC strongly feels should be protected from further encroachment. Secondly, additional through lanes would negatively impact nearby neighborhoods and businesses, degrade air and water quality, and intensify transportation problems. Additional through lanes also contravene BPIAC's ongoing concern that the meaning of "transportation" be broadened to include more than highway traffic and that other modes of transportation be developed and encouraged.

Appendix D: Recommended Principles and Concepts For Transportation Planning

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS

At the heart of BPIAC's concerns about the future of the transportation system in the Study Area is its core goal of *Preserving the adjoining park land and neighborhoods by protecting them from physical, environmental, and aesthetic encroachments.*

Through two years of deliberations, it has become clear that the transportation needs of the Study Area, and more broadly those of the region, will be addressed successfully and cost-effectively only through concerted and coordinated action at *multiple levels of government and with substantial citizen participation.*

Principle #1: To maintain the quality of life of parks and neighborhoods impacted by actions taken within the Study Area, all entities involved in transportation planning must establish a *primary* decision criterion for transportation projects that addresses the impacts of the proposed project on neighborhood quality of life.

Specifically, the decision criterion should establish that projects that create increased noise, air, or light pollution, increased traffic on residential streets, or other environmental impacts on neighborhoods be given a significant negative weighting that would be factored into the ultimate decision.

Decisions made purely on the basis of improving traffic flow will continue to produce more roads and outcomes that seriously degrade residential quality of life. Such outcomes are considered unacceptable by BPIAC.

LAND USE AND PLANNING TO MAKE LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Principle #2: Regional decision-making bodies, including the Commonwealth Transportation Board, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Richmond Area Planning District Commission, Richmond City Council, area Boards of Supervisors, and VDOT, need to create improved ways of working together to plan and coordinate land-use planning.

As is evident from decades of roadway construction, road construction does not necessarily mean less congestion in the long term, although there may be some short term relief. The main factors driving congestion are population growth and suburban sprawl. Highway construction and expansion is primarily a product of land development and land-use demands.

Furthermore, while some efforts are made to plan regionally, these efforts are currently insufficient to deal with anticipated growth. Even if all the roadway options were implemented – an unlikely scenario given the costs and other impacts – traffic congestion will continue to be a problem in the Study Area.

Principle #3: To plan for the anticipated increase in population and traffic in the next fifty years, land-use planning by the city and counties should have as a clear goal the facilitation of methods of travel that will help minimize car commuter traffic and maximize other modes such as bus, rail, car and van pools, bicycles, and telecommuting.

Family needs, such as schools, jobs, and stores, can be geographically clustered in neighborhoods to decrease the number of trips people make from their homes to these services.

The development of "transportation corridors" where future growth can be channeled would increase the cost-effectiveness of less polluting and congestion-causing transportation, such as bus, rail, and car or van pooling.

Incentives for "infill," redevelopment, and mixed use could also help alleviate pressures for suburban growth and increased commuting.

MULTI-MODAL STRATEGY TO REDUCE CONGESTION

Principle #4: Multi-modal strategies, including those already being planned, to address the transportation concerns of the Richmond metropolitan area must be supported so that, if transportation is not improved by one mode of transportation, other modes will be available to help address the problem.

General Concepts:

Non-highway options need to be explored and developed. Examples include mass transit, light rail, and pedal vehicles.

The continued addition of interstate lanes is not a viable option for improving transportation in the Study Area because of the impacts on neighborhood quality of life and on Bryan Park.

Lastly, the downtown Richmond area needs to function as a transit hub, where various modes of transportation become linked and integrated.

Buses

The current bus system needs to be maintained and improved. In addition to big buses running on main commuter routes, smaller and more comfortable buses and vans (carrying from 15 to 30 people) should have routes in neighborhoods.

More frequent and more diverse bus routes, with quick and easy transfers, need to be provided in order to increase efficiency, convenience, and use.

Buses need to be made aesthetically attractive, quieter, and equipped with bicycle racks.

The possibility of developing shuttle service from the airport to people's homes should be explored, as should the possibility of expanding the bus system to include van pooling, Ride-finders, private sector initiatives, and quasi-public initiatives.

Rail

The possibility of using railroad rights-of-way for commuter rail and/or light rail should be explored. A variety of incentives to use rail needs to be created, such as free parking at transportation hubs and subsidized fares.

Growth needs to be directed near rail stations in order to attain the population density necessary to support rail.

Principle #5: The scope and meaning of "transportation" must be broadened to include more than traditional highway transportation.

Bicycles

In order to create a safer environment for bicyclists, "Bike Only" lanes should be created on city and county roads.

Car and van pools

Incentives to encourage car and van pools need to be created, such as tax breaks for employers who provide incentives to employees.

Telecommuting

Telecommuting, especially for state employees, needs to be encouraged so that the number of commuters on the roads is reduced. The creation of several telecommuting centers in the Richmond area should be explored.

Infrastructure needs

Several infrastructure needs must be met in order for people to reduce their dependence on cars and to rely instead on other modes of transportation. Secure parking at transit points, including such facilities as racks and shelters for bicycles, needs to be provided. Additionally, employers need to be encouraged to provide bike racks and other facilities for employees.

Parking downtown by commuters should be discouraged while still providing for the convenience of those living, working, and visiting in Richmond. Potential ways to do so include creating a commuter tax and providing cash and other incentives for people to take other modes of transportation. To compensate for the loss of downtown parking, parking lots at multi-modal transportation hubs should be constructed.

Education and political action

Along with actions that should be taken to address the physical concerns related to these transportation strategies, educational and political action is also needed. Decreasing the dependency on the highway and automobile will require a change of mindset as well as careful and comprehensive planning.

Breaking out of the "highway only" mode will require political lobbying. Efforts to market non-highway modes of transportation need to be made, recognizing that public and private financial incentives to reduce traffic, such as the price of gas and corporate parking facilities, affect the choice of transportation.

Likewise, a consumer/public campaign to encourage people to consolidate and reduce car trips should be developed. On the private level, employers should be encouraged to implement restricted flextime policies and to provide on-site daycare. Ultimately, employers and residents need to be educated to adjust behaviors to the capacity of the highways.

ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Principle #6: Because truck traffic has significant negative impacts on neighborhood quality of life, truck use of exits into or through residential neighborhoods should be curtailed.

While providing needed services, large trucks also have significant impacts on neighborhoods. Much truck traffic could be diverted to appropriate roads while saving truck drivers time. Trucks should be directed to use Exit 81 instead of Exit 80. Additionally, through trucks travelling on I-95 need to be encouraged to use I-295 instead.

Principle #7: Improved signage must be developed throughout the Study Area to direct drivers to their desired route and to alert drivers to traffic delays. This improved signage might include the use of technology such as electric signboards.

The amount of traffic congestion that could be reduced by improved signage is unknown; however, anecdotal evidence suggests that significant additional travel could be prevented by better

informing drivers of their options. In addition, delays caused by heavy use, roadwork, or accidents could be mitigated by informing drivers, who might then be able to choose better options.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Principle #8: When planning for local or regional transportation needs, authorities should incorporate public involvement early in the decision process, utilizing citizen advisory committees where feasible.

BPIAC applauds VDOT's decision to convene a citizen advisory committee in the early phases of its decision process about 20-year transportation needs in the Study Area. It encourages the continued use of citizen advisory committees in transportation planning as a way of securing meaningful public input. To be most effective, the citizen advisory committee should be representative of all community sectors and should be provided access to high quality information. Decision makers must participate actively and commit support and resources for the process.

CONTINUING ISSUES AND CONCERNS: ACCESS , ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, AESTHETICS

Principle #9: Access to Bryan Park should be improved so that it is easily accessible to all metro residents.

Pedestrian and bicycle access to and throughout Bryan Park needs to be maintained. Where made possible by the closing of ramps or adjustments to other roadways, VDOT should consider returning to Bryan Park land no longer used for roadways.

Principle #10: Significant measures need to be taken to eliminate, minimize, or mitigate negative environmental impacts.

Everything possible should be done to reduce negative environmental impacts. Wetlands should be avoided. Sound barriers, berms, plantings, and other measures should be implemented to mitigate the effect of noise, lights, highway run-off, impaired air and water quality from vehicle emissions, construction, and other traffic impacts in the Study Area.

Clean-air compliance requirements in the next twenty years may facilitate the acceptance of and the need for non-highway transportation modes. Efforts to encourage and enforce the use of emission-compliant vehicles will need to be made. Use of electrical vehicles, ranging from cars to buses and trolleys, should be encouraged through a variety of measures.

Principle #11: The aesthetics of highway design should reflect the special characteristics of the locality.

Richmond is a city of rich history and unique character that requires a design approach different from the status quo. To reflect these special qualities of our community, we recommend that the physical design of all new highway construction incorporate elements that will respect this character. BPIAC's goal is that all users of the highway be presented with construction methods and features, such as bridge abutments, railings, guardrails, and lighting, that continue the Richmond tradition of quality architecture. While BPIAC understands that improved design quality may require greater resources, it believes that experience has demonstrated that the economic and social benefits of good design would make this effort worthwhile.

Appendix E: BPIAC Membership

Advisory Committee Citizen Members

- Sandra Balster, Member of Hermitage Road Historic District
- Elizabeth Barrett, Member of Friends of Bryan Park
- Roland Brierre, Jr., Concerned Citizen
- Gretchen Carreras, Member of Hatcher Civic Association
- William Correll, Resident of Westminster Canterbury
- Doris Davis, Resident of Hermitage Park, Lakeside
- Chuck Epes, Member of Bellevue Civic Association
- Peter Francisco, Member of Lakeside Business Association
- Irene Jennings, Member of Parks and Recreation CAP Board
- Tony Pelling, Member of Ginter Park Residents' Association
- Tim Pfohl, Resident of Bellevue
- Roland Rackett, Resident of Westminster Canterbury
- Arthur Ratcliffe, Member of the Virginia Bicycle Federation
- Isaac Regelson, Member of Ginter Park Residents' Association
- Beryl Riley, Resident of Hermitage Road Historic District
- Katie Roemer, Resident of Bellevue
- Kent Ruffin, Resident of Historic Jackson Ward
- Robert Stiff, Member of Richmond Area Bicycling Association
- Bernice Strommer, Member of Rosedale Civic Association
- Barbara Taggart, Concerned Citizen
- Eileen Tangley, Member of Bryan Parkway Civic Association
- Charles Ware, Concerned Citizen
- Mary Ellen Williams, Resident of Bellevue Park
- John Zeugner, Member of Bryan Parkway Civic Association

Original Members of BPIAC who did not participate or who withdrew early in BPIAC's two years of work:

- ◆ *Martha Anusbigian, Concerned Citizen*
- ◆ *Jeff Burns, Concerned Citizen*
- ◆ *Lisa Clemmer, Concerned Citizen*
- ◆ *Mort Herrick, Resident of Imperial Plaza*
- ◆ *Janis Jackson, Concerned Citizen*
- ◆ *Holly Anna Jones, Alternate for Chuck Epes, Bellevue Civic Association*
- ◆ *Ann McRee, Concerned Citizen*
- ◆ *Stan Preston, Concerned Citizen*
- ◆ *Rob Tate, Resident of Imperial Plaza*
- ◆ *Nancy Porthress, Alternate to John Zeugner, Bryan Parkway Civic Association*

RESOURCE MEMBERS

Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

- Patsy Napier
- John Neal
- Bob Riley
- Connie Sorrell

Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., Consulting Engineering Firm

- Craig Eddy
- Kenneth Mobley
- Paul Prideaux
- Carla Santoro

City of Richmond

- Steve Kane, Parks and Recreation, City of Richmond
- M.S. Khara, Trafficways Coordinator
- Ralph Rhudy, Public Works

Henrico County

- Eric Millirons, Transportation Development Engineer

Richmond Area Planning District Commission

- Brad Shelton
- Todd Steiss

MEDIATORS

- Tanya L. Denckla, UVA Institute for Environmental Negotiation
- E. Franklin Dukes, UVA Institute for Environmental Negotiation

Research Associates, UVA Institute for Environmental Negotiation

- Catherine Cox
- Karen Firehock
- Hanh Le
- David Tipson

Appendix F: BPIAC Background and Purpose

The Bryan Park Interchange Advisory Committee (BPIAC) was convened by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) in 1997 to seek consensus among citizens concerned about traffic congestion, safety, and the impacts of interstate traffic on Bryan Park and adjacent neighborhoods.

The precipitating issue was an "in-house" proposal in 1996 by a VDOT engineer to construct a "fly-over" on I-95 which would entail the removal of the Bellevue Avenue bridge and would encroach on the Azalea Gardens in Bryan Park, a 285-acre public park in Richmond's northside. The proposal aroused significant concern among area residents that the project would harm the park and nearby neighborhoods. VDOT contended that growing concern about traffic congestion and safety prompted the proposal.

Several meetings between VDOT officials and citizens made it clear that a more intensive and deliberate effort was needed to exchange views, to analyze information, and to identify needs, concerns, and options. In Spring 1997, VDOT initiated a formal public involvement process by inviting concerned citizens and organizations to create a Bryan Park Interchange Advisory Committee (BPIAC). A group of about 35 citizens, representing a variety of park advocacy, civic, and business groups, began meeting in September 1997, mediated by the Institute for Environmental Negotiation (IEN) of the University of Virginia. This public involvement process was developed in conjunction with a Feasibility Study for the I-95/I-195/I-64 Study Area conducted by a transportation engineering firm, Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

PURPOSE OF BPIAC

BPIAC was charged by VDOT with the following purposes:

- 1) To represent the communities and organizations impacted by the Bryan Park Interchange Study Area.
- 2) To identify issues that impacted communities and organizations feel are important and present those issues to VDOT and its consulting engineering firm, Michael Baker.
- 3) To determine if the community's issues were adequately addressed by VDOT and Michael Baker.
- 4) To provide advice to community members, elected and appointed officials, and VDOT concerning options identified and recommended by the study.

Appendix G: BPIAC Process

BPIAC completed its four phases of facilitated work over the course of two years, from September 1997 through October 1999, in a total of 24 facilitated meetings and three citizen meetings of about three hours each.

Decision Rule: BPIAC members decided at the outset that they would operate on a consensus basis. They recognized that, while consensus would be a more difficult goal, consensus recommendations would carry more weight with local and regional decision makers. Consensus was defined as a decision that could be supported by *all* members of the group, with the understanding that on any given decision a member might have reservations or hesitations but must at least be able to go along with and support the decision. If one person could not live with the decision, then that would block consensus.

Phase One: In its first phase of work, from September 1997 through January 1998, BPIAC members achieved consensus on their overall purpose, on group protocols, and on guidelines for group behavior. Members then created a detailed list of concerns and a detailed list of information needs, both of which were provided to the Feasibility Study's engineering firm, Michael Baker. Lastly, members developed four goals that they would later use to evaluate options and to guide their final recommendations.

Phase Two: BPIAC's second phase of work, from February 1998 through July 1998, involved intensive learning about the complexities of the transportation planning process, about multi-modal transportation, and about design and aesthetic considerations. Members also received detailed information about current and projected traffic conditions in the Interchange area.

Phase Three: The third phase of work, in September and October 1998, generated potential ideas for study by the Michael Baker consultants which would possibly resolve or ameliorate the previously identified issues and problems. In this phase BPIAC participated in a "Traffic Diet Exercise," conceived by Hannah Twaddell of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. The exercise included an educational component, that familiarized BPIAC members with costs, benefits, and considerations of various traffic reduction options, and an active decision component, that engaged citizens in identifying viable ways of meeting specific traffic reduction goals. A second "brainstorming" session was held to ensure that all possible ideas had been elicited and could be forwarded for consideration to the Baker consultants. An additional method of gathering ideas was added in January 1999 with a Public Meeting held by VDOT to solicit public feedback and concerns. These ideas were also forwarded for consideration to the Baker consultants. Lastly, the Michael Baker consultants completed the idea-generation phase by adding a number of their own ideas.

Phase Four: In its fourth phase of work, from February 1999 through September 1999, BPIAC worked closely with Michael Baker in its evaluation of the ideas generated. As a first step, the engineering firm narrowed the list of ideas to those which they could quantify. Next, the engineering firm conducted an initial analysis of the ideas and alternatives to determine which were worthy of more in-depth study and which should be dropped because they either created more problems than they solved or because they were not feasible. The consultants next conducted a cost-benefit analysis of this last remaining set of ideas/alternatives. Lastly, the consultants used this cost-benefit analysis along with the decision criteria established by VDOT to determine which ideas it felt

would best resolve the traffic problems in the Study Area. Throughout this entire fourth phase, BPIAC provided Michael Baker with its views and recommendations. Michael Baker staff members report that these views were taken into consideration to the extent possible in the development of the firm's final recommendations and Report. As the last step in the process, BPIAC both evaluated the firm's recommendations and developed its own complementary set of recommendations, which have been set forth above in Appendices A-D.

**BRYAN PARK INTERCHANGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PROTOCOLS and GROUND RULES**

The following protocols were developed and adopted by consensus by BPIAC and were used to guide its work.

<p>Purpose and Scope of Process</p>	<p>The Bryan Park Interchange Advisory Committee asserts the following as its purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To represent the views and concerns of the communities and organizations impacted by the Bryan Park Interchange Study Area. 2. To identify issues that affected communities and organizations feel are important and to present those issues to VDOT for consideration in the Feasibility Study. 3. To determine if the issues were adequately addressed in the Feasibility Study. 4. To provide advice to community members, elected and appointed officials, and VDOT concerning options identified in the Feasibility Study.
<p>Participation</p>	<p>BPIAC Membership: See attached list of members. Civic groups and organizations and interested citizens who initially responded to VDOT's calls for interest and participation via newspaper advertisements, Summer 1997, and have continued to participate, constitute the BPIAC voting membership.</p> <p>Additions and Withdrawals: No new individuals or groups will be allowed to participate, as of the end of the December 8, 1997 meeting, unless admitted by consensus of the BPIAC. Civic associations, organizations, and interested citizens that have participated in the BPIAC meetings from the onset shall participate in the entire BPIAC process. Members may withdraw at any time from the BPIAC by written notice; if they represent an organization, they agree to seek a replacement member from their organization. A Subcommittee will meet to request withdrawal of members who have not attended a majority of the meetings.</p> <p>Official Resource Agencies: VDOT, Henrico County Public Works, City of Richmond Public Works and Department of Parks and Recreation will serve as resource members of BPIAC. They will participate fully in the discussions and will share information about issues, constraints, and possible impediments to implementation. They are expected to be candid in their views. If the representatives of VDOT and the City of Richmond are able to sign the final document without its being legally binding on their agencies and if they individually endorse the recommendations of the final document, they will sign the final document.</p>

	<p>Observers, Other Interested Parties: Meetings are open to observers. Comments by observers may be offered in writing or orally at the end of each session. Observer comments may also be invited during the session.</p> <p>Media: No consensus exists about whether and how any news media might be included or excluded from meetings.</p> <p>Alternates: Alternates may be appointed by representatives of civic groups and organizations. Alternates may participate in discussion and consensus decisions only in the absence of the official BPIAC member.</p> <p>Note: Some notice of official BPIAC representation (and alternates) may be required of participating civic groups and organizations.</p>
<p>Roles and Responsibilities</p>	<p>All members shall have equal voice and status. Other participants in the BPIAC work can serve in an advisory and advocacy position.</p> <p>Participant responsibilities to constituents: Members agree to obtain guidance from their constituents and communities so that they can accurately represent the views and interests of their constituents and communities. They will communicate information learned at meetings and will present BPIAC decisions to their constituents for endorsement.</p> <p>BPIAC members who speak outside of the meetings will speak for themselves and express their own views. They will not represent an official committee point of view. BPIAC members will refer inquiries for official reports to the facilitators. BPIAC facilitators may describe the group process and share materials with the media and prepare press releases as directed by the group.</p>
<p>Sharing Information During and After Meetings</p>	<p>Members are encouraged to discuss issues raised during the meetings with their constituents without attributing positions and attitudes to specific people. Members will be open and candid in their views and will speak with focus and brevity so that everyone may have an opportunity to speak.</p>
<p>Decision-making</p>	<p>Consensus: BPIAC will make decisions by consensus. This means that all members can live with and support the decision. If one member cannot live with the decision, consensus is blocked, in which case the group will continue to work on the issue.</p>
<p>Implementation</p>	<p>The final Report and recommendations of BPIAC will be incorporated into the final Feasibility Study by the VDOT consultants (Michael Baker). BPIAC may also use its final recommendations to provide advice to community members and to elected or appointed officials.</p>
<p>Meeting Organization and Administration</p>	<p>VDOT will arrange and pay for meeting rooms, refreshments, facilitation, special speakers, and research or other informational needs. The facilitators will prepare meeting summaries and agendas and will work with BPIAC and VDOT to prepare and facilitate the process. BPIAC members will come to meetings prepared to speak on behalf of their constituencies. Subcommittees, if formed, will be responsible for their own meeting scheduling, minutes, and other matters.</p>

Timetable	See projected work schedule.
Facilitator: Selection, Goals, Responsibility	<p>A selection subcommittee of BPIAC was responsible for interviewing and selecting the facilitators.</p> <p>Facilitator goals are to help BPIAC members identify and increase their understanding of each other’s issues and concerns; to develop, explore, and understand their options; and to engage in productive and civil discourse to reach consensus decisions that best address BPIAC’s concerns.</p> <p>By contract, the facilitators are responsible for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing the meeting agendas for distribution at the meeting and providing facilitation materials such as flip charts and markers; • Keeping the discussion focused; • Helping the group resolve differences and disputes that arise in a way that is acceptable to participants and assisting in developing consensus where agreement is possible; • Keeping a record of meeting discussions (<i>i.e.</i>, issues raised, information presented, requests for information, specific agreements and resolutions reached during the meetings, and agenda items for next meetings); • Preparing a summary of each meeting and distributing this “sense of the meeting” to BPIAC members and VDOT; • Arranging for speakers requested by BPIAC as appropriate; • Helping BPIAC set up its own meeting schedule for meetings and meetings of subcommittees or work groups; • Maintaining contact with BPIAC members and VDOT as necessary between meetings by telephone, regular mail, or electronic mail; • Serving, should BPIAC so desire, as principal media contact for its work and, in any event, responding as appropriate to media and other inquiries concerning BPIAC’s work; • Providing at least two IEN staff for each meeting of BPIAC; • Preparing a summary Report that captures the highlights of the meetings and other discussions and that offers BPIAC’s final recommendations, one draft to be submitted to BPIAC for revisions before a final Report is submitted to VDOT; • Discussing with VDOT future actions that may be recommended. <p>At any time, if further discussion does not appear likely to be productive, the facilitators will so indicate to BPIAC and VDOT.</p>

Appendix H: Process Evaluation

ASSESSMENT OF BPIAC PROCESS BY BPIAC MEMBERS

Compilation of 13 Evaluations

Process Quality

1. Were the objectives of the BPIAC public involvement process made clear to you early in the process?

1	2	3 (2)	4 (6)	5 (5)
No		Unsure		Yes

2. Was BPIAC membership representative of the community and stakeholder interests?

Yes 9 No 2 (1 "Somewhat" and "I Don't Know")

If no, what other interests should have been represented or what changes would you have suggested?

- "Very good for area around Bryan Park, but not enough members from Parham Road or even Staples Mill area. However, the early meetings were widely advertised – people cannot be made to take part. The boundaries of the study may not have been understood – it was always referred to as Bryan Park Interchange. This is a "VDOT" term, not a general-public-use term."

3. Was the information shared by the VDOT consultants and other presenters credible?

1	2 (1)	3 (1)	4 (6)	5 (5)
No		Unsure		Yes

- *Comment following "5" response:* "except for accident record"
- *Comment following "4" response:* "I am a road user, not an engineer, and it took some time to see things from the builder's perspective – I am not sure some VDOT people ever saw things from the perspective of the residents of neighborhoods through which they build roads. Other presenters were knowledgeable and articulate. Michael Baker people were knowledgeable and articulate, knew federal and state rules we needed for us to understand why some of our wishes were impossible."
- *Comments following "2" response:* "VDOT has little credibility – have been to several meetings where they will say anything (no matter how absurd or untruthful) to get their way. Other presenters were credible."

4. Were the resource members of BPIAC knowledgeable?

1	2	3 (2)	4 (5)	5 (5)	(1 "Who they?")
No		Unsure		Yes	

- *Comment following "3":* "We knew our side of the issue."

5. Do you have a greater understanding of the issues?

1 (1)	2	3	4 (1)	5 (11)
No		Unsure		Yes

6. Do you have a greater understanding of the constraints or factors influencing the decision-making?

1 (1)	2	3	4 (5)	5 (7)
No		Unsure		Yes

- *Comment following "5":* "But I do wish VDOT could think more in terms of transportation by means other than road building."

11. Would you participate in another similar public participation process?

1	2	3 (5)	4 (2)	5 (6)
No		Unsure		Yes

Why or Why not?

Following "5":

- "After I recover from this one! We developed enough trust in each other to really listen to the other viewpoints, be willing to really try to compromise. Sometimes the compromise was better than my original thoughts on the problem."
- "I believe in involving as many citizens as possible in solving our problems."
- "I appreciate meeting others, learning new things, discussing important issues, and, hopefully, influencing decisions for the betterment of the community."
- "It is necessary to continue to try to improve VDOT's integration of public participation into planning process."
- "Very positive experience."

Following "4":

- "If the format could be revised so that the purpose could be accomplished without so much waste of time."
- "Because the public should be consulted. Long-time residents of the area sometimes have knowledge that is not known by the experts."

Following "3":

- "Time."
- "Not sure whether VDOT will respect findings."
- Very draining and long process – but if it was an issue I felt passionate about, probably."
- "Very time consuming. Am doubtful VDOT takes citizen participation seriously."

12. Would you recommend this kind of public participation process for other issues in the future?

1	2 (1)	3 (1)	4 (2)	5 (9)
No		Unsure		Yes

If not, why not? And what recommendations do you have?

Following "5":

- "If some way could be developed to limit the members of the group to people actually involved in the situation, it would help. For example, if roads are the subject under discussion, members should drive on the roads at least occasionally."
- "An evaluation at 1/2 point to allow those people who have not kept up to drop out and to make sure everyone makes a verbal statement why consensus and why (sic)."
- "If possible, yes. I think the approach could be improved and shortened."
- "Yes, very strongly."

Following "4": "Yes, if all parties genuinely buy into process – not sure VDOT does."

Following "3": "Remains to be seen whether VDOT follows committee's recommendations."

Following "2": "Too extended a time frame."

13. Do you feel the Committee achieved its objectives?

1	2	3 (4)	4 (5)	5 (4)
No		Unsure		Yes

Following "5": "Yes, but I'm not sure if it will make any difference."

Following "4": "With the exception of 11B."

Following "3": "We don't know the outcome."

- "Much remains to be seen."
- "The BPIAC met some of them but had little influence on alternatives recommended by BAKER."

14. Do you feel the Committee influenced the outcome of the Bryan Park study?

1	2 (2)	3 (6)	4 (1)	5 (4)
No		Unsure		Yes

Following "3": "Only time will tell."

- "We cannot have that assurance until it goes before board."
- "We don't know the outcome."

Following "2": "Somewhat, but there are 2 reports, with too little in common."

Participant Satisfaction

15. Did you feel heard by:

Other members of the committee?	No	Sometimes (3)	Yes (10)	Not Sure
By city and regional representatives?	No (2)	Sometimes (4)	Yes (5)	Not Sure (2)
By VDOT?	No (2)	Sometimes (3)	Yes (6)	Not Sure (2)
By Michael Baker, Jr., Inc.?	No	Sometimes (2)	Yes (10)	Not Sure (1)
By the mediators?	No	Sometimes (1)	Yes (11)	Not Sure (1)

16. Did you contribute to the discussion as much as you wanted?

No	Sometimes (2)	Yes (10)	Not Sure
----	---------------	----------	----------

If not, why not?

- "I was usually interrupted in the middle of a sentence."
- "Some of my views were not popular with many of the group and they were not interested in listening."
- "Often not able to attend meetings due to conflicting pressures."

17. How satisfied are you with this final BPIAC report?

1	2 (1)	3	4 (9)	5 (3)
Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Unsure	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied

If dissatisfied, why are you dissatisfied?

- "Not really dissatisfied, but do wish we could have reached real consensus."
- "Local objections to engineering decisions were given too much weight. I think it is a step in the right direction, if not considered the final word (work?)"
- "Not sure VDOT will heed/use report."
- "Because consensus was not reached between BPIAC and Baker – VDOT."
- "While I am not fully satisfied with each individual piece of the report, I am very pleased that we came up with a consensus report."

18. Can you identify aspects of this process that went particularly well?

- "It was gratifying when we could come to agreement on a point on which we started at opposite ends."
- "The open discussion that allowed us to understand each neighborhood's problems and the willingness to compromise."
- "The consensus process. The suppers."
- "The presentations by the Michael Baker representatives."
- "The mediators (in my opinion) made all the difference in facilitating the meetings and kept us on track most of the time."
- "Information and education."

- "The finding of common ground."
- "Finding a solution: relocating the on-off ramp."
- "To be honest, I think things really started to move when the citizens held their own meetings and began reaching consensus on important issues."
- "The coming together of the local interests represented."
- "Support materials were thorough and provided in a timely manner when requested."

19. What got in the way of progress? What would you have done differently?

- "Inability of someone who never drives on the interstate system to comprehend the problems of those who do use it. I don't know that anything could have been done differently."
- "Members who were unable to attend regularly and who failed to study and understand their material and caused us to repeat steps."
- "Too much talk about irrelevant subjects. I think the process would have been more effective, more efficient, and less time consuming if the engineering study had been done first and then the committee formed to critique it. This would also make it easier to keep discussion on track. I also think good engineering should take precedent over local self-serving objections."
- "A stubborn member. I think we tried everything possible."
- "Too many people."
- "I think the process ran a normal course."
- "Getting bogged down by process."
- "Process was slow because of distrust among stakeholders – I don't believe anything could have speeded up this process."
- "Stick-in-the-mud policies in city!"

20. What follow-up would you like to see to ensure that BPIAC recommendations are given a maximum likelihood of implementation?

- "We will have to keep up with the study as it moves through the "process" – another education for us."
- "In Richmond go through North Team Process – in Henrico request Board of Supervisors for their endorsement. have the four political figures review it together."
- "We should have a voice at the next level of planning."
- "Representatives of the committee should have an opportunity to be heard at the state of final planning for the various phases of the overall program."
- "To be notified of meetings concerning this – I just have a bad feeling that all our work and recommendations will not be given serious consideration."
- "Intense political lobbying will be necessary – probably unsuccessful – because VDOT will do what it wants."
- "Unsure – any progress made."
- "Political support, serious consideration of BPIAC recommendations from CTB and Richmond VDOT."
- "Continuation of the advisory committee to ensure proper implementation of recommendations."
- "I would like VDOT to accept and promote our recommendations. I feel their acceptance would be the most important factor in getting the recommendations implemented."
- "Publicity and political interest."
- "Follow-up is now the responsibility of the participants and community organizations."

Appendix I: Meeting Summaries and Additional Copies of This Report

Meeting summaries and additional copies of this report are available upon request from the VDOT. Please contact

Patsy Napier
Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Tel: 804/ 786-2566
Fax: 804/ 786-5157
Email: napier_pg@vdot.state.va.us

Appendix J: Letters of Support

Letters of support received as of November 10, 1999 from citizen organizations are attached. Additional letters of support will be forwarded as they are received.