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STUDY GOAL

• Identify a preferred multi-use trail corridor that will enhance the active transportation network and connect people and places across the Richmond region, consistent with state, regional, and local transportation planning initiatives

• Provide information to help inform funding applications
STUDY PROCESS

Environmental Agency Working Group (EAWG) Input

Study Initiation
February - March 2019
Data Collection, Background Review, and Existing Conditions Inventory

March 2019
Public Meeting/Online Survey
Identification and Documentation of Needs, Goal Setting, Establish Evaluation Criteria

Environmental Agency Working Group (EAWG) Input

Development of Multi-Use Trail Corridors

March - June 2019
Evaluation of Multi-Use Trail Corridors

April - June 2019
Identification of Recommended Preferred Multi-Use Trail Corridor

June - October 2019
Public Meetings
Preferred Corridor Refinement, Identification of Individual Project Segments, and Cost Estimating

Stakeholder Technical Advisory Group (STAG) Input

We Are Here

September October 2019
Fall 2019

Study Completion
Early 2020

ASHLAND TO PETERSBURG TRAIL STUDY

VDOT Virginia Department of Transportation
# Stakeholder Involvement

## Environmental Agency Working Group (EAWG)

**Goal:** Achieve permittable trail corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal and State Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Environmental Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Stakeholder Technical Advisory Group (STAG)

**Goal:** Provide input in the development of preliminary trail corridor options and preferred trail corridor option that meets local and regional needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies, Localities, Planning Organizations, and Special Interest Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henrico County, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover County, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Cities Area MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ashland, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Petersburg, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Richmond, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan RVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MARCH 2019 PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY**

**TOTAL SURVEYS**
- 778 ONLINE SURVEYS
- 53 PUBLIC MEETING SURVEYS
- **831 TOTAL SURVEYS**

**TOTAL MAPPING COMMENTS**
- 949 ONLINE COMMENTS
- 106 PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS
- **1055 TOTAL MAPPING COMMENTS**

**TOP PUBLIC DESTINATIONS**
1. Pocahontas State Park
2. Bryan Park
3. Virginia Capital Trail
4. James River
5. Crump Park
6. Stratton Park
7. Carter Park
8. Downtown Petersburg
9. Deep Run Park
10. Trolley Line Trail

**TRANSPORTATION TYPE**
- Walking or Jogging: 7% daily, 20% weekly, 23% a few times a year, 51% never
- Bicycling: 48% daily, 40% weekly, 9% a few times a year, 2% never
- Small-wheeled Transports: 4% daily, 6% weekly, 1% a few times a year, 92% never

**AGE AND GENDER**
- Women: 279
- Men: 496
- 66 - Older: 8%
- 56 - 65: 31%
- 46 - 55: 24%
- 36 - 45: 18%
- 26 - 35: 16%
- 22 - 25: 3%
- 66 - Older: 15%
- 56 - 65: 26%
- 46 - 55: 23%
- 36 - 45: 18%
- 26 - 35: 16%
- 22 - 25: 1%

**TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS**
- 2% Less than a mile
- 26% Less than 5 miles
- 23% 5 to 10 miles
- 19% 11 to 20 miles
- 25% 20 to 40 miles
- 5% More than 40 miles
- Personal safety: 35%
- Health reasons: 1%
- Lack of bicycle lanes: 32%
- Distance to destinations: 10%
- Lack of sidewalks: 18%
- Do not have time: 3%

**AVERAGE TRANSPORTATION MILES**
- Not
- Somewhat
- Important
- Very

**AVERAGE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPORTANCE**
- Work: 29%
- School: 57%
- Parks and Recreation: 67%
- Places of Worship: 58%
- Shopping Centers: 32%

*Numbers may not reflect total surveys or comments received, as responses were optional and multiple responses could be selected.*
PURPOSE AND NEED

• Identify a preferred corridor for a multi-use trail facility that will enhance the active transportation network in the Richmond metropolitan region, by improving bicycle and pedestrian safety, expanding non-motorized travel choices, and providing increased system linkage and connectivity to population centers, as well as key local and regional destinations, consistent with state, regional, and local transportation planning initiatives.

• **Need elements:**
  - Need Element No. 1: Safety, including areas of concern identified by VDOT’s Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (PSAP)
  - Need Element No. 2: Connectivity, including public and STAG defined destinations of interest
  - Need Element No. 3: Consistency with existing or planned active transportation facilities
Corridor Development

• Considerations Included:
  • Existing or proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities
  • Existing designated bicycle routes
  • Existing utility easements
  • Abandoned rail lines
  • Local and regional planning documents
  • Input from EAWG, STAG, and public comments received
  • Jurisdictional crossings (streams and wetlands)
  • James River crossing points
  • Knowledge of regional network
PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

- Included consideration of six corridor options based on following considerations:
  - Ability to meet Purpose and Need
  - Environmental conditions
# Preliminary Evaluation Results

## Ashland to Petersburg Trail Study – November 2019

### Table: Corridor Option Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Option</th>
<th>Purpose and Need Met? (Y/N)</th>
<th>NWI Wetlands(^1) Acres</th>
<th>NHD Streams Linear Feet (lf)</th>
<th>Retain for Detailed Evaluation? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3,581</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4,345</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5,587</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPLE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>9,709</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1 National Wetland Inventory (NWI) wetlands numbers reflect all Cowardin classifications except Riverine.

---

*Ashland to Petersburg Trail Study – November 2019*
DETAILED EVALUATION

• Evaluation of corridors that met purpose and need and represent least impact to aquatic resources
  • Included two corridors with consideration given to cost and feasibility of implementation to identify the most practicable recommendation for a preferred corridor
# DETAILED EVALUATION RESULTS

## Ashland to Petersburg Trail Study – November 2019

## Purpose and Need Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDOR OPTION</th>
<th>RED</th>
<th>ORANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length Along VDOT's Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Corridor (mi):</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations of Interest (within 0.5mi):</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length on Existing or Planned Active Transportation Route (mi (%)):</td>
<td>44 (88%)</td>
<td>34 (82%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RED</th>
<th>ORANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands (acres)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streams (linear feet)</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Traffic Stress 1 Facility (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way (no. of parcels):</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bridges:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Preliminary Cost (FY 2026 dollars)*:</td>
<td>$157,000,000.00</td>
<td>$105,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Per Mile Cost (FY 2026 dollars)*:</td>
<td>$3,358,000.00</td>
<td>$2,414,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Draft preliminary costs are undergoing internal review and should only be used for comparison purposes. Draft preliminary costs are based on cost per mile with adjustment factors applied where implementation barriers, environmental impacts, or right of way constraints were identified.

## Recommended Preferred Corridor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RED</th>
<th>ORANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Preferred Corridor?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have any comments about or input on the preferred multi-use trail corridor?
- Excited for this trail to be built and in full support of this project
- The preferred orange line corridor looks like the most feasible and cost effective
- Consider going over the 9th Street / Manchester Bridge rather than the T. Potterfield Bridge

Do you think the preferred multi-use trail corridor addresses the following need elements?
- Provides a safe active transportation corridor through the Richmond Region: 94% YES 6% NO
- Provides connectivity for active transportation through the Richmond Region: 96% YES 4% NO
- Consistency with existing or planned local and regional active transportation plans: 94% YES 6% NO

Please provide any additional information that you believe will assist in advancing the study’s next steps.
- Important to have good trail signage and lighting for safety
- The trail should be paved in all areas and if it must run along an existing road, have barriers in place
- This trail will be great for our region and has a lot of support

284 - TOTAL INTERACTIVE MAP COMMENTS

1. Connect the trail with additional side streets to provide more outlets for use
2. Avoid the high traffic and safety concerns of Route 1 and use existing trolley right of way through Belmont Golf Course
3. Extend the Appomattox River Trail to connect with Old Town Petersburg
4. Steep incline at Brown’s Island Way will discourage pedestrians and cyclists
5. Route 145 (Chester Road) is a safer and more preferred alternative than Route 1
6. Concern with over crowding on the T. Tyler Potterfield Memorial Bridge
7. Preferred crossing over the Manchester Bridge
8. Continue the trail through properties at the intersection of Route 625 and Kelmarbi Road
9. Relocate the northern terminus further north near Downtown Ashland
10. Avoid Villa Park Drive and use existing trolley right of way
## NEXT STEPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Process</th>
<th>Anticipated Study Timeframes</th>
<th>Study Participants*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Introduction</td>
<td>February – March 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Existing Conditions Inventory</td>
<td>February – April 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of Needs</td>
<td>March – May 2019</td>
<td>EAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Corridor Options</td>
<td>March – June 2019</td>
<td>STAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Corridor Options</td>
<td>April – June 2019</td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Recommended Preferred Corridor Option</td>
<td>June – October 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Preferred Corridor Option and Documentation</td>
<td>August – November 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
www.ATPTrailStudy.org
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