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2040 Vision List Projects
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## 2040 Vision List Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PROJECT BEGIN POINT</th>
<th>PROJECT END POINT</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Route 33 West Market Street / I-81 Exit 247 Improvements</td>
<td>Reconstruct overpass bridges and widen East Market Street to a six-lane facility between Carlton St and I-81 SB Ramps</td>
<td>Carlton St</td>
<td>I-81 Ramps</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$31,872,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Country Club Road Improvements</td>
<td>Create center turn lane with sidewalk and shared use path</td>
<td>I-81 Bridge</td>
<td>Vine St</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$9,142,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Mount Clinton Pike Improvements and Roundabout</td>
<td>Widen to 2-lane with median, shared use path and sidewalk; construct roundabout at Chicago Avenue/Park Road intersection</td>
<td>WCL</td>
<td>Virginia Ave</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$12,560,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29A</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Mount Clinton Pike Extension</td>
<td>Extend Mt. Clinton Pike as a 4-lane divided, urban minor arterial with SUP and Sidewalk</td>
<td>N. Main St</td>
<td>ECL</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$7,262,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Parkwood Drive Improvements</td>
<td>Widen to three-lane facility on existing road alignment and add sidewalk</td>
<td>Park Rd</td>
<td>Virginia Ave</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$4,158,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Maplehurst Avenue Extension</td>
<td>Construct a new 2-lane local road between Harrison Street and South Main Street</td>
<td>S. Main St</td>
<td>Harrison St</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$647,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Country Club Road Improvements</td>
<td>Construct a three-lane facility including a center turn lane with sidewalk and shared use path</td>
<td>I-81 Bridge</td>
<td>E. Market St</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$16,876,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Linda Lane Widening</td>
<td>Widen two lane with center turn lane to a five-lane facility with sidewalk and shared use path</td>
<td>E. Market St</td>
<td>Country Club Rd</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$6,149,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>South Main Street Turn Lane Extension at Port Republic Rd</td>
<td>Extend left turn lanes from southbound South Main Street onto eastbound Port Republic Road</td>
<td>Port Republic Rd</td>
<td>Maplehurst Ave</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$881,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Old Furnace Road Improvements</td>
<td>Between Vine Street and Smithland Road, improve to a three-lane facility including center turn lane and shared use path</td>
<td>Vine St</td>
<td>Smithland Rd</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$6,568,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>South Carlton Street Improvements</td>
<td>Improve to a three-lane facility including center turn lanes, sidewalks and storm drain facilities</td>
<td>E. Market St</td>
<td>Reservoir St</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$1,827,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley Road Improvements</td>
<td>Improve to a three-lane facility including a center turn lane and shared use path</td>
<td>S. Main St</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$25,415,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Greendale Road Extension</td>
<td>Construct new three-lane roadway from 0.20 miles west of Ramblewood Road to Pleasant Valley Road on new alignment that crosses Blacks Run and the railroad.</td>
<td>0.20 mi West of Ramblewood Rd</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley Rd</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$10,356,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>South Main Street Widening</td>
<td>Widen to 5-lane major arterial facility with center turn lane and bike lanes</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley Rd</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$18,761,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Port Republic Road Improvements (South)</td>
<td>Add center turn lane, reconstruct bike/ped facilities.</td>
<td>Devon Ln</td>
<td>I-81</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$3,694,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Port Republic Road Improvements (North)</td>
<td>Widen to add center turn lane and bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides</td>
<td>I-81</td>
<td>S. Main St</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$5,486,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PROJECT BEGIN POINT</td>
<td>PROJECT END POINT</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Smithland Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4-lane with a median, shared use path, and sidewalk</td>
<td>Linda Ln</td>
<td>Old Furnace Rd</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$9,948,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Garbers Church Road Improvements</td>
<td>Provide wide shoulders (buggy lanes) and add turn lanes at appropriate locations</td>
<td>Erickson Ave</td>
<td>Route 42</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$4,125,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13A</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Mount Clinton Pike Improvements</td>
<td>Rebuild 2-lane improved rural section to remove vertical curves and add shared use path and sidewalk</td>
<td>Switchboard Rd</td>
<td>WCL</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$4,179,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22A</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Northwest Connector Segment</td>
<td>Construct two lane rural roadway with wide shoulders</td>
<td>Kratzer Rd</td>
<td>US 11/ 81 Exit 251</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$12,827,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Mount Clinton Pike Extension 2</td>
<td>Extend Vine St. as a 4-lane divided, urban minor arterial and add bicycle facilities from city limits to intersection of Project 45/Research Dr Extension</td>
<td>WCL</td>
<td>Project 45</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$7,715,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29C</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Mount Clinton Pike Extension 2 ALTERNATE</td>
<td>Extend Mt Clinton Pk as a 4-lane divided, urban minor arterial and add bicycle facilities from city limits to Smithland Rd/Old Furnace Rd</td>
<td>WCL</td>
<td>Smithland Rd/Old Furnace Rd</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$15,634,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Research Dr Extension</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane divided limited access major collector with center median and shared use path</td>
<td>Route 11</td>
<td>Smithland Rd/Old Furnace Rd</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$14,728,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>US 33 Widening</td>
<td>Add local parallel streets/multi-way boulevards to east- and west-bound outer through lanes where appropriate. Parallel parking and sidewalks on local level streets. South side only from Jim Britt Way to Massanetta Springs Rd. North side only from Massanetta Springs Rd to Cross Keys Rd.</td>
<td>Jim Britt Way</td>
<td>Cross Keys Rd</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$19,814,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Port Republic Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane divided major arterial with bike-ped side path or shared use path</td>
<td>Boyers Rd</td>
<td>Cross Keys Rd</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$53,095,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Dinkel Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane divided rural arterial with bike-ped side path (from Old Bridgewater Rd (Rt 867) to US 11)</td>
<td>Route 867</td>
<td>US 11</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$8,239,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Oakwood Dr Re-alignment and improvements</td>
<td>Improve to 2-lane rural collector. Realign 704 (Oakwood Dr) between Rt 11 &amp; Rt 712 (Lewis Byrd Rd)</td>
<td>Route 11</td>
<td>Bridgewater Limits</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$8,342,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43A</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Erickson Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>Add bike lanes both sides</td>
<td>Route 33</td>
<td>WCL</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$836,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Switchboard Road Improvements</td>
<td>Realign to intersect with Fort Lynne R and rebuild 2 lane improved rural section to remove curves and add wide shoulders</td>
<td>NCL</td>
<td>Mt. Clinton Pk</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$6,965,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PROJECT BEGIN POINT</td>
<td>PROJECT END POINT</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81A</td>
<td>Mt Crawford</td>
<td>Friedens Church Road</td>
<td>Rebuild to 2 lane major collector to remove curves and add 4 ft shoulders from west of Rt. 989 (Creekside Dr.) to Rt 995 (Koiner Ford Rd)</td>
<td>Route 989</td>
<td>Route 995</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$13,171,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81B</td>
<td>Mt Crawford</td>
<td>Friedens Church Road</td>
<td>Rebuild to 2 lane major collector to remove curves, add 4 ft shoulders, and realign on new location from Rt. 995 (Koiner Ford Rd) to Rt 276 (Cross Keys Rd)</td>
<td>Route 995</td>
<td>Route 276</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$8,887,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>MPO/ Other</td>
<td>Interstate 81 Improvements</td>
<td>Widen to a 6-lane facility; spot improvements, safety and operational improvements (not specified)</td>
<td>North MPO Limits</td>
<td>South MPO Limits</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>$607,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>$607,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$171,613,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$93,977,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>$121,266,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$993,857,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Resource Agency Consultation
December 14, 2016

Dear Sir or Madam,

On behalf of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Organization (HRMPO), thank you for your review of this letter and enclosed materials. As the regional transportation planning organization for the City of Harrisonburg and the towns of Bridgewater, Dayton and Mt. Crawford, and portions of the County of Rockingham, we are charged with creating and maintaining a 25-year long range plan for all surface transportation investments in this area.

HRMPO staff is in the process of updating the MPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). As directed in 23 USC 143(i)(4)(A), Metropolitan Transportation Planning, this process includes consultation with state and federal resource agencies and an opportunity for your agency to comment on both our planning process and the draft list of priority projects.

The draft LRTP includes the a Goal to, “Enhance the quality of life for all residents.” In order to evaluate how well proposed transportation projects meet this goal, we review their potential impacts on known (mapped) resources as a “first look” in the planning process. As with any federally-funded project, environmental review through the NEPA process will still be necessary.

We invite you to review the enclosed list and map of proposed transportation projects and share your comments with us. We hope you will also share information with us regarding ways to improve our project evaluation process with regards to a transportation project’s potential impacts on natural resources. Please contact Ann Cundy, Transportation Program Manager at ann@cspdc.org or (540) 885-5174 if you have any questions or wish to discuss our process further.

Please submit your comments no later than January 13, 2017. Thank you again for your assistance.
In response to your request for comments regarding the above referenced Plan, I would like to offer the following:

The Virginia Marine Resources Commission, pursuant to Title 28.2 of the Code of Virginia, is responsible for protecting and preserving the marine fisheries, submerged lands, and tidal wetlands throughout the Commonwealth. The Commission issues permits for encroachment into, over, and under these State-owned submerged lands, both tidal and non-tidal. For nontidal waterways it has been the policy of the Habitat Management Division to exert jurisdiction only over the beds of perennial streams where the upstream drainage area is 5 square miles or greater. The beds of such waterways are considered public below the Ordinary High Water (OHW) line. Therefore, any activity associated with the proposed project which would result in an encroachment upon or disturbance to these areas below OHW would require the submittal of a completed Joint Permit Application (JPA). This application would then be subjected to a standard public interest review, including all appropriate local, state and federal regulatory agencies prior to permit issuance.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment early on in this process and should you have any questions, or if we may be of further service, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Happy Holidays!

V/R

Jay Woodward
Environmental Engineer, Sr.
Habitat Management Division
Virginia Marine Resources Commission
2600 Washington Ave., 3rd Floor
Newport News, VA 23607
Office (757) 247-8032
Mobile (757) 504-7009
jay.woodward@mrc.virginia.gov
Website www.mrc.virginia.gov
WATER IS LIFE
January 26, 2017

Ann Cundy
Transportation Project Manager
112 MacTanly Place
Staunton, VA 24401

Thank you for giving the Virginia Department of Forestry an opportunity to comment on the HRMPO long range plan. By including comments and plans that address the “urban tree canopy” for the numerous projects can be very educational, beneficial and helpful for the general public and project planners.

The benefits of trees in an urban setting are invaluable. From aesthetics, noise reduction, the cooling effects of tree shading and protection from soil erosion and stream sedimentation just to mention a few benefits. When doing a long range transportation project plan, consideration of existing tree species and final desired tree species and their location is very important. Many tree species will not do well along roadways or waterways, but there are species that will thrive under these conditions. So ensuring that the proper tree is in the proper place can provide the benefits and keep future tree maintenance and removal costs at a minimum.

Thank you for the consideration,

Sincerely,

John Hisghman
John Hisghman, Senior Area Forester
Virginia Department of Forestry
Central Region Shenandoah Work Area:
Clarke, Frederick, Page, Rockingham, Shenandoah, Warren Counties
265 Lakeview Drive/ PO Box 121
Woodstock, VA 22664
john.hisghman@dof.virginia.gov
Appendix C: Public Comment
-----Original Message-----
From: Kate Caldwell Schurtz [mailto:walnutcove@ntelos.net]
Sent: Saturday, December 31, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>
Subject: loop road

I respectively ask that the proposed loop road through farm land, battlefields, and open spaces be denied.

I am a farm owner, tax payee, and I vote. Please reconsider this terrible decision. My farm and livelihood will be effected.

Kate C Schurtz
540-478-3488
3826 Spaders Church Rd
Mt Crawford VA  22841
I am aghast at the lack of recent input by affected residents of the county and city. I live in the high residential growth area SE of Harrisonburg and we see constant high speeds, noise and accidents on the roads, unmet needs for improvement of roads where safety is an issue, the destruction of trees and other health-giving vegetation for construction and for preservation of tourist-attracting natural beauty. We lack public transportation, bike and footpaths.

We, the people, need to have plenty of time to read and comment on the vision plan which is little changed from the previous versions. Slow down and stop planning only for harmful “growth” and yet more concrete. Allow us, the residents, our right to make our input.

Linda Dove
Dear Ms. Ann Cundy and Ms. Bonnie Riedesel,

I wanted to take a moment from my day to weigh in on the proposed plan for future road building in Rockingham County. As a recent transplant to the area I can say without a doubt that projects such as the loop road bypass, project #’s 22B and 26, would have detracted from my family’s decision to move to the area. One of the reasons why we chose to live here is the rural character of the area, which would be greatly disturbed by the type of construction that is being proposed. I cannot support the funding of new roads being built while existing roads could be improved. I would rather see funds allocated for projects that improve alternative transportation modes such as shared use paths that are likely to draw more people to the area for tourism and recreation than diverting traffic away from the city. To make my sentiment more succinct, let me include these bullet points set forth by the Community Alliance for Preservation with which I am in complete agreement.

- the public should have a real opportunity to give input into the vision plan used to plan transportation in Harrisonburg and Rockingham,

- our vision for Harrisonburg and Rockingham does NOT include an unnecessary and destructive loop road through the county’s finest farmland, battlefields and open space,

- citizens envision beautiful scenery, healthy farms, and walking and biking options, not sprawl and endless pavement that a bypass around Harrisonburg would bring.

- the timing of public input was far too short and interfered with holidays.

Thank you for your time,

Matt Hassman

Sentara RMH Medical Center
Community Health Educator
540-564-7097
Hello,
I am writing to express my concerns about the HRMPO's long term plan. Specifically, I do not support the plan's focus on proposed widening of Switchboard Road (projects 129 and 130), other segments of the loop road (projects 22B, 26), an unnecessary Bridgewater Bypass through working farmland (project 27), and unpopular and expensive roadways to Dayton (projects 77B, 39, 137, 138, and 21).

I would like to see more focus on modest improvements that honor our Valley's working farms, battlefields, and open space. I also would like to see more weight given to the needs of cyclists and pedestrians.

I appreciate all of your hard work and I look forward to seeing what new opportunities and strategies the HRMPO will develop through this planning process.

Sincerely,
Zach Foster
Dear Ms. Cundy and Ms. Riedesel,

I am very disappointed in the vastly overdeveloped Transportation Vision Plan which your organization has released. This county and Harrisonburg need a transportation plan which is reasonable and sustainable in what will have to be a less fossil fuel dependent future. We must be very careful to avoid overly impacting our family farmlands which provide a vital part of our local economy.

Many elements of your plan fail to take this consideration into account, including:

1. An expensive loop road around the northeast and northwest sides of Harrisonburg which will destroy or otherwise impact thousands of acres of prime farmland. (Projects 26 and 22B) Improvements to existing roads for safety and capacity would serve the same function and cost much less.

2. A Bridgewater Bypass should only involve minimally necessary improvements to existing roads such as Route 704, where some improvements have already been made.

As citizens of this area, we were not given enough time to carefully consider all the details and far reaching implications of this transportation plan. We expect our tax dollars to be spent wisely, prudently and without undue waste or environmental impacts. The chance to be able to participate in these important decisions is what America is all about.

Thank you for consideration of our concerns,

Sincerely,

Malcolm G. Cameron, Jr.
From: Rich Harris [mailto:harrisrah321@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 11:18 PM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>
Subject: Public Comment on the Long Range Transporting Plan

Ann Cundy, Transportation Program Manager,

I am writing to express my disappointment in the Long Range Transportation Plan. The draft focuses to heavily on unwanted and expensive large road projects that will encourage sprawl and take away from preserving our communities scenic beauty and agricultural heritage. The plan needs to include more public involvement. The public has spoken against the loop road (project 22B, 26) and I am surprised this project is still in the plan. Additionally more public input is needed on the Bridgewater bypass (project 27), widening of Switchboard Road (project 129, 130) and the series of projects around Dayton (projects 77B, 39, 137, 21).

I encourage the MPO to allow more debate and consideration of the plan and look at the projects listed above.

Sincerely,

Rich Harris
101 Breezewood Terrace
Bridgewater, VA 22812
From: Cheryl Lyon [mailto:clyon@silverlakemill.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 7:46 AM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>; Bonnie Riedesel <bonnie@cspdc.org>
Cc: 'Charles T. Long' <chazvt@gmail.com>; 'Shelley Newman' <pierce.shelley@gmail.com>; bpopowicz@daytonva.us; feberly@rockinghamcountyva.gov
Subject: HRMPO LRTP Vision Plan & CLRP Projects

I would like to express my opposition at this time to Project #39 on the fiscally constrained list. It appears likely that the preliminary engineering on this project will occur since nearly 90% of the funding for this project list is anticipated ($28,063,200 of $31,238,133), so it is critical that is removed from the list now.

Project 39 extends Eberly Road eastward, destroying highly productive farmland and totally changing the flow of traffic in the Dayton area. It was my understanding from HRMPO about 5 years ago that this project was being removed from the list. I am extremely surprised to see that it is back. We were promised it would not be put back unless it was discussed with the town.

Coupled with Project #137, 138 and 139, a direct and speedy route from Dayton to U.S. Route 11 would be created. The implications of such a route for Dayton are substantial, and before they are incorporated in either the Vision Plan or the Constrained Plan, Dayton citizens should have a better publicized opportunity to participate in the discussions.

The townspeople in Dayton strongly want its “small town character” protected and even enhanced. About 5 years ago, it was decided that Stone Spring Road would give adequate access to U.S. Route 11.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Lyon, Owner
Silver Lake Mill
2328 Silver Lake Rd.
Dayton, VA 22821
540-421-2256
Dear Ms. Riedesel and Ms. Cundy,

As a proud resident of Rockingham County, I wanted to voice my concerns for the latest MPO transportation plan. The plan continues to include novel roadways and expansion through farmland and battlefields endangering the economic and historical character of our community. We need more safe biking and walking options and smarter urban-rural development.

Also, the public deserves to be amply notified for important decisions like this regarding the future of Rockingham County and the city of Harrisonburg.

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

Regards,
Bethany Versluis Fairfield
Ann, good afternoon,

My name is Jacob Brown, and I am a resident here within the city of Harrisonburg. I work for James Madison University, and I am an active member of the Shenandoah Valley Bicycle Coalition.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the Long Range Transportation Plan. It is important that the public has an opportunity to provide input into the vision plan for transportation within Harrisonburg and Rockingham County. I apologize if my comments are coming in towards the end of the comment period, but I might say the comment period seems a little short and with it being open over the holidays, it might have been overlooked by some. Is it possible to extend the comment period in case others have missed the opportunity?

In any case I just wanted to add that I don't feel our vision for Harrisonburg and Rockingham should include an unnecessary loop road through the surrounding farmlands and fine open spaces of the county. I love that our area has such beautiful scenery and healthy farmland, and we are fortunate to have many walking and biking options for transportation. In my experience bypass roads and similar projects only seem to invite sprawl, and take away from the landscape by adding more pavement and concrete. My family and I would appreciate it if your team could take a closer look at what projects are truly necessary.

Specifically, the projects below are of most concern to me. I feel these projects are unnecessary and would that they would detract from many of the great things about our area.

- Proposed widening of Switchboard Road (projects 129 and 130)
- Various other loop roads (projects 22B, 26)
- Bridgewater Bypass through working farmland (project 27)
- Roadways to Dayton (projects 77B, 39, 137, 138, and 21).

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to comment. We appreciate your efforts and consideration.

Regards,

Jacob Brown
Attn: Ann Cundy and Bonnie Riedesel
112 MacTanly Place
Staunton, VA 24401

The Shenandoah Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBc) greatly appreciates the work of the Harrisonburg and Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Organization and appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Long Range Transportation Plan for our region. While we recognize the desire to build bigger and bigger roads to meet the population growth of our region, we implore the MPO to consider the full implications implicit in large road projects. We ask the MPO lean towards planning for upgrades to existing infrastructure to include large intersections, interstate interchanges, bridges, and other existing choke points in our local transportation system. Such upgrades should focus on improving efficiency and safety for all road users at these crucial points.

Given the limited resources at hand to improve our transportation network, we hope that time and energy can be spent largely on upgrading our existing infrastructure. We have the following comments specifically pertaining to the draft Long Range Transportation Plan:

- We would like to see the public more involved and engaged in the process. Since these projects stand to cost the public considerable money and could have a serious impact for better or worse on their daily lives. This could mean providing the public with a real opportunity to give input into the vision plan used to steer transportation projects in Harrisonburg and Rockingham.
- Our vision for Harrisonburg and Rockingham does not include unnecessary large road projects through the county’s finest farmland, battlefields and open space.
- We ask that the MPO consider the natural beauty of our region and reflect our citizen’s vision to maintain beautiful scenery, healthy farms, and walking and biking options.
- Large road projects may temporarily relieve traffic but long-term, we must be careful as to what type of development they encourage and where we drive that development.
- For this LRTP, the timing of public input was far too short and interfered with the holidays. We request longer public input periods for future MPO projects.
- Specific projects on the constrained list that cause us concern include:
  - The widening of Switchboard Road (projects 129 and 130),
  - Other segments of the loop road (projects 22B, 26
  - The Bridgewater Bypass through working farmland (project 27),
  - Unpopular and expensive roadways to Dayton (projects 77B, 39, 137, 138, and 21).
We are encouraged to see a number of projects specifying sidewalks and bicycle facilities even at this early planning stage. When possible and appropriate, we ask planners to consider physical separation for bicycles whether on shared use paths or in buffered or protected bicycle lanes. This is especially important on any bridges where bicycles are often pinched between traffic and a raised sidewalk. We need to be sure we are planning projects to reach the “interested but concerned” cyclists.

Improving the quality of life in our community hinges on more people riding bicycles and walking for transportation, recreation, and as part of their daily routine. Nearly sixty percent of the general population considers themselves “interested but concerned” when it comes to riding a bicycle. While less than ten percent identify as “enthused and confident.” Our aim is to encourage and empower the “interested but concerned” citizen to use a bicycle more often. Future projects within the boundaries of the Harrisonburg and Rockingham MPO should always emphasize development of facilities to achieve this goal. Based on ridership, we know current facilities in our region are not persuading this subset of the general population to use a bicycle more in their daily lives.

In the end we recognize the challenging balancing act the MPO must play as it weighs input and desire from member localities and struggles to work with projects that have been in discussion for decades. We hope the MPO will consider taking a second look at some of the projects on the Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan list. Hopefully, this second look will involve a hard look at which projects may no longer need to be included in the draft plan.

Kyle Lawrence
President of the Shenandoah Valley Bicycle Coalition Board of Directors
I am so disappointed in the publicized plans for the new transportation plan..... It's obvious the city/county has BIG plans to support far-reaching development as it eyes thousands of acres of superior farmland within the embrace of the proposed loop system. This is already very evident in the new SE connector road which leads to the hospital.

Rockingham County prizes it's agricultural and the character of it's rural lands.....At least that's what it says in the long range development plan for the county....dark sky, controlled/guided development, protecting the rural character, and all that. But the inroads in the Dayton area - and the new loop to the north-east, which reaches all the way out to Keezletown shows that's not the case...and, in the second case, it's evident to me the eventual need for an "inner loop" which would someday attach directly across Rt. 33 the SE connector. Why not do that now? And leave Keezletown out of the big-city plans?

Thank you for considering my thoughts.

Kathleen Wissinger
McGaheysville, Va.
Dear Transportation Planners,

It is disappointing that a project with such regional impact would be set up for public comment during the holidays with a short response time. Citizens should be afforded a better timed opportunity for input into the long term vision plan (with potentially permanent and destructive impacts) for transportation in Harrisonburg and Rockingham County.

I am opposed to the project which includes an unnecessary and destructive loop road through the county's finest farmlands, battlefields and open space.

As a county resident, I am for sensible road improvements, respectful of farmlands, and safe transportation options for all citizens that preserves natural scenery, farmlands and walking/biking options (NOT more cars and trucks with bigger roads and expanded pavement).

Respectfully,

C. Sinclair Hubard
molehill09@verizon.net
3286 Hemlock Street
Harrisonburg (Rockingham County), Virginia
From: Tyre Yancey [mailto:rfdfolkart@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2016 12:31 PM
To: Bonnie Riedesel <bonnie@cspdc.org>
Subject: Bridgewater bypass??

I sent a map of the proposed bypass to Steve Landes, Michael Fulcher, and Sec. Layne. I highlighted where the bypass would intersect with Oakwood Drive and Dinkel Ave. and asked how traffic would be forced to use the longer routes required by the bypass. I did not receive an answer from anyone. The proposal to reduce the bypass to a two lane road instead of the original four lane, "to see if it is effective", shows no one can make a case for this project. Why destroy this valuable farmland and disrupt the production of this Old Order Mennonite family's dairy and poultry operation when this road is not needed? I have submitted several suggestions to VDOT on ways to improve the traffic flow in Bridgewater. I have not received any response.

Tyre Yancey
To: Ann Cundy, Transportation Program Manager
    Bonnie Riedesel, Executive Director
    Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission

From: John D. Hutchinson V, Conservation Director,
    Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation

Subject: Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan
Date: January 4, 2017

I am writing on behalf of the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation to express concern that some projects in the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) would have significant negative impacts on the Cross Keys Civil War battlefield and other rural areas of Rockingham County.

Cross Keys was one of the principle battles of the Civil War, as identified by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission and the National Park Service in the Study of Civil War Sites of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia (National Park Service, September, 1992).

In recognition of the importance of protecting these battlefields, the Rockingham County Board of Supervisors in the 2007 comprehensive plan established the Cross Keys and Port Republic Historic Preservation Area as defined by the boundaries of the Cross Keys and Port Republic battlefield study areas as delineated in the 1992 study. As stated in the comprehensive plan:

> The Cross Keys and Port Republic Historic Preservation Area is planned primarily for agricultural uses with similar character to the Agricultural Reserve. ... The County will refrain from constructing new roads and major improvements to existing roads that would significantly adversely impact the battlefields (Rockingham County, Virginia Comprehensive Plan for 2020 and Beyond, 2007, page 2-14).

As you may know, a portion of the Cross Keys battlefield is included in the Harrisonburg Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Area (HRMPA), specifically areas west of Cross Keys Road and east of Oak Ridge Road. Cross Keys Road was one of the primary avenues of advance and retreat during the battle. A number of projects listed in the LRTP intersect with Cross Keys Road and would lead to the eventual degradation of the battlefield. These include the following proposals.

- Project # 30 upgrade Route 33 East as a 6-lane, urban major arterial (from ECL Harrisonburg to east MPO boundary);
- Project # 33B widen Port Republic Road to 4-lane major arterial (from Boyers Road to east MPO boundary)
- Project # 81A upgrade Friedens Church Road to a 2-lane collector from west of Route 989 (Creekside Drive) to Route 995 (Koiner Ford Road); and

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation
P.O. Box 897 ~ 9386 Congress St. ~ New Market, VA 22844 ~ 540.740.4545
ShenandoahAtWar.org ~ facebook.com/ShenandoahAtWar
• Project # 81B upgrade existing Friedens Church Road to a 2-lane collector and realign on new location from Route 995 (Koiner Ford Road) to Route 276 (Cross Keys Road).

Additionally, the included segments of the “Loop Road,” specifically the widening of Switchboard Road and the Northwest and Northeast Connectors should not be recommended in the plan. These are very costly projects—over $50 million for each connector and $2.5 million for widening Switchboard. These projects, which if built would likely lead to proposals to widen Cross Keys Road through the battlefield, are not necessary.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan.
From: John Eckman [mailto:john.eckman@fnfsr.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 5:00 PM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>; Bonnie Riedesel <bonnie@cspdc.org>
Subject: H-R MPO Transportation Plan

Dear Bonnie and Ann,

I am writing to voice the very serious concerns of Friends of the North Fork of the Shenandoah River with elements of the proposed MPO transportation plan.

As an organization concerned with the health of the North Fork and its tributaries since 1988, we and our hundreds of members are deeply concerned about major projects that could have negative water quality impacts. Justification for such projects must meet a high standard for public benefit. We are not aware that any standard has been met by the proposed loop road around the north end of Harrisonburg as described in the Vision Project Map.

Projects 22B and 26 would have direct and significant impact on headwater streams in the North Fork. Of particular concern are the impacts on tributaries of Linville Creek, which is currently part of major investments in a TMDL implementation grant, and Smith Creek, which is designated by USDA as one of a handful of Showcase Watersheds in the Chesapeake Bay region and the only one in Virginia.

The Smith Creek Watershed Partnership, including federal, state, and local agencies, farmers, localities, and nonprofits, has been working for a decade to improve water quality on Smith Creek. The proposed road would undermine significant public and private investments in that area.

Thank you for your consideration and your work.

Best regards,

John Eckman, Executive Director

Friends of the North Fork of the Shenandoah River
P.O. Box 746
Woodstock VA 22664
540.810.2258 (c) 540.459.8550 (o)
From: K M Zunich [mailto:kmzunich@iasispartners.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 5:19 PM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>
Subject: Newest Transportation plan is not good for Rockingham County

Dear Ms. Cundy,

As a part-time resident of Broadway, VA, I am dismayed by the newest Harrisonburg-Rockingham transportation plan released by the MPO. It is just like the old plan, and is entirely inconsistent with what we citizens envisioned, including the fact that we do not want an unnecessary and destructive loop road through the county's farmland, open space, and battlefields.

The public should have a real opportunity to provide input into a plan with adequate time to do so. Please reconsider and allow the public to have our say in doing what we think is best for Rockingham County.

Yours sincerely,
Kathryn M. Zunich, MD
--
Kathryn M. Zunich, M.D
Managing Partner
Iasis Partners, LLC
3112 N. Peary Street
Arlington, Virginia 22207-5327
Tel 703 875 3106
www.iasispartners.com

CONFIDENTIALITY
This email and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender, erase all copies of this message and its attachments, and do not disseminate it to any other person.
Dear Ms. Cundy and Ms. Riedesel,

I am writing to urge you not to support the proposed Metropolitan Planning Organization transportation plan in its current form.

First and foremost, I believe the proposed loop road through Rockingham County is not in the best interests of our community. Our farmlands, historic sites and open spaces are precious to the kind of forward thinking locale many of us want to live in. This is accomplished by density, good and reliable public transportation, and pedestrian and bike friendly access to our community, and not the sprawling development of farmland and historic areas that would result from the loop road. Biking and walking are popular modes of transportation and should not be excluded from the MPO plan.

I urge you to revise the current MPO plan to include the above recommendations. If action must be taken on the current plan before it can be revised, I urge you to extend and more assertively advertise the comment period for the current plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.

Very truly yours,
Janet I. Trettner

- the public should have a real opportunity to give input into the vision plan used to plan transportation in Harrisonburg and Rockingham,
- our vision for Harrisonburg and Rockingham does NOT include an unnecessary and destructive loop road through the county’s finest farmland, battlefields and open space,
- citizens envision beautiful scenery, healthy farms, and walking and biking options, not sprawl and endless pavement that a bypass around Harrisonburg would bring.
- the timing of public input was far too short and interfered with
holidays.
From: DWStricklr@aol.com [mailto:DWStricklr@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 6:34 PM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>; Bonnie Riedesel <bonnie@cspdc.org>
Cc: DWStricklr@aol.com
Subject: H-RMPO NO loop roads thru farms

Ms. Cundy, Ms. Riedesel, once again I will express my OPPOSITION to tearing up farmland for the purpose of building roads that the Rockingham county community does not want or need, and CANNOT AFFORD to pay for, especially the proposed bypasses around Harrisonburg proper.

Apart from the numerous reasons that have been lifted up over the last 20 years for NOT ADDING to the overall levels of general pollution of air, water, noise, and viewsheds that new roads will burden us with, the world has recently changed, with the advent of self-driving cars and trucks and the sharing-economy. Over the next 10 years we will see the rapid adoption of this new technology, which will result in much higher efficiencies of existing road usage, even in relatively rural areas.

VDOT cannot keep the existing road infrastructure maintained, so it is folly to make the problem worse by building more miles of potholes. NO LOOP ROADS! NO BYPASS ROADS!

Sincerely Yours,
David W. Strickler
3165 Arrowhead Road
Rockingham VA 22801
Dear Ann and Bonnie,

I am writing to voice my thoughts on the HRMPO Long Range Transportation Plan as the comment period comes close to an end.

As a lifelong resident of the Harrisonburg/Rockingham area, I am of the opinion that one of our area's greatest assets is the beauty of the surrounding land, specifically farm land and our proximity to the forests and mountains. I don't believe that the pursuit of growth and preservation are mutually exclusive, but rather can be easily balanced and it all starts in the planning for the future.

I am not an avid biker, but I see the value and appeal the biking community brings to our area. Considering bike and pedestrian friendly plans into all applicable projects are essential to growing a connected community.

I am also of the opinion that the the loop road through virgin land should not take precedence over the widening of 81.

I am excited for the future of the Harrisonburg region and look forward to raising my own children in an area we can all say we are proud to be from.

Thank you for allowing the public to comment and voice their opinion.

Warmest regards,

David Frazier
I am a Rockingham County Resident near Singers Glen, and I have some concerns about the MPO project map. It seems to be another proposal of the same plan of the same unnecessary road expansions through sensitive farmland and battlefields. Without a doubt, the public needs to be well informed of this proposal and its details, and have the opportunity to give feedback.

- The public should have a real opportunity to give input into the vision plan used to plan transportation in Harrisonburg and Rockingham,
- The vision for Harrisonburg and Rockingham should NOT include an unnecessary and destructive loop road through the county’s finest farmland, battlefields and open space,
- Citizens envision beautiful scenery, healthy farms, and walking and biking options, not sprawl and endless pavement that a bypass around Harrisonburg would bring.
- The timing of public input was far too short and interfered with holidays.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sara Godshall
I am writing to register my dismay at seeing the Loop road in the new MPO plan. I feel strongly that the public should have a real opportunity to give input to the vision plan used to plan transportation in Harrisonburg and Rockingham county. Visionary thinking for Harrisonburg and Rockingham county does NOT include an unnecessary and destructive loop road through some of the county’s finest farmland. As a private citizen, I envision beautiful scenery, healthy farms, and walking and biking options, not sprawl and endless pavement a bypass to the north and west would bring.

Sincerely, Lee Good

--

“We are not called to be successful but to be faithful.” St. Francis of Assisi
January 4th, 2017

To: Central Shenandoah Valley Planning District

I am writing to comment on the Long Range Transportation Plan for the Harrisonburg-Rockingham County MPO. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to look over these plans during the public meeting you had last month at the Rockingham County Building in Harrisonburg. I strongly encourage this and other types of public outreach be done during any of these long term planning projects. Many of us live here due to the natural beauty, farm land and open space in the Valley, new and enlarged transportation corridors can greatly threaten these Valley assets.

There are two specific projects that concern me the most, ones which I think should be considered for removal in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

- **Project #129 & #130 Switchboard Road:** This currently provides a safe and comfortable gateway for cyclist who travel between the City of Harrisonburg & Rockingham County. As we plan to remove these comfortable and safe routes they will unfortunately not be replaced with similar types of infrastructure. This route is highly used among cyclist, for both those who live in the Valley and those visiting the area.

- **Project #22B & 26 Loop Road:** This has been on the plans for too long despite the ongoing opposition of this portion of the loop road. By removing this segment of the loop road from the Long Range Transportation Plan it will increase the opportunity for farming to remain an important part of community, ensure open space remains in the valley and keep our low traveled rural roads just the same. The building of additional segments of the loop road will encourage the unneeded development in this area while forever removing farms in this portion of our community.

Thank you for much for taking these comments into consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas Jenkins
375 East Wolfe Street
Harrisonburg, VA 22802
January 4, 2017

TO: Harrisonburg-Rockingham MPO

RE: Draft of the Long Range Transportation Plan

We have just become aware of the Long Range Transportation Plan and are extremely concerned about Projects 77b, 39, 137, 138 and 139, which together would dramatically increase traffic between Dayton and Route 11.

We ask that its adoption be delayed until these projects can be reviewed in light of Dayton’s Comprehensive Plan, its compatibility with community values, the Ag Forestal districts that are within Dayton and border it, and our planned Greenway trails.

Surveys of Dayton residents are clear about wanting to maintain Dayton’s small-town atmosphere and the draft needs to be thoroughly vetted with that in mind. **We are extremely concerned.**

Bob Beeson

Dana Ferrer

Shelby Newman

Lauree Purcell

Amy Johnson
January 5, 2017

Bonnie Riedesel
Executive Director,
Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission
Sent via email to bonnie@cspdc.org

Dear Ms. Riedesel,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) for 2040. Community Alliance for Preservation (CAP) is a citizens’ group based in Rockingham County that works with the public, elected leaders and local and state government agencies to enhance Rockingham County's rural character, urban spaces and natural and cultural resources.

CAP has several concerns with the process used to develop the CLRP as well as both concerns and support for specific projects in the Vision Plan and CLRP.

Process

- CAP thanks the MPO staff for revising its approval schedule for the CLRP to allow for a few more days for public input over the holidays. **We hope the MPO will in the future involve the public early in its transportation planning and provide opportunities to participate at a time and location convenient for the public.** Starting assumptions, transportation shortcomings, identified safety concerns, and sensitive historical and environmental areas can all be better identified if public participation is allowed earlier in the planning process.

- In the past, when citizens raised concerns about the excessive number of possible road projects in the Vision Plan, the plan was described as simply a compilation of each MPO member locality’s “pie-in-the-sky” wish lists of transportation projects. Perhaps that is how it is viewed by MPO officials. Unfortunately, however, outside of the MPO the Vision Plan becomes a more authoritative document, influencing the transportation sections of the City and County Comprehensive Land Use Plans and ultimately VDOT planning documents. This is particularly concerning, as there has been little meaningful evaluation or study or public input to the Vision Plan projects. In addition, members tend to politely defer to others on projects outside of their jurisdiction, so there is very little scrutiny of unnecessary or even damaging projects. CAP would like to see this circular planning dilemma reformed. At a minimum, however, **language should be added to the final CLRP document to clarify that the Vision Plan projects have not been vetted and that weight not be given to projects contained within unless further evaluation and public involvement are given.**

- As described above, localities and the MPO seek consistency among their transportation planning documents. This is reasonable, to an extent. However, the
non synchronous process of developing local comprehensive plans and MPO CLRP documents make it inevitable that some documents will be more up to date. We urge you to critically evaluate the merits of specific projects when revising the CLRP, not simply “staple” together old plans from various jurisdictions and VDOT. **Needed changes should be made in whatever document is currently being evaluated. Waiting for each jurisdiction to make its own changes provides no benefit to the public or local governments.**

**CAP Supports the following projects**

- I-81 safety spot improvements such as work done at interchange 247 to eliminate the merge weave pattern and guard rails to prevent crossover head-on collisions.

- Increased transportation mode options that will result from expanding network of sidewalks and bike lanes.

**CAP Opposes the following projects**

**From the CLRP**

- Project ID# 129 Switchboard section of NW Connector. CAP’s long standing opposition to the various segments of a loop road around Harrisonburg apply to this project. Much of the intended connector would eventually be built on new location through farmland in an area of the County without infrastructure to support development that follows a major road construction project. This expensive project would undermine County comprehensive plan goals to support the agriculture economy and concentrate development around towns and the City of Harrisonburg. A 4-lane divided major arterial roadway would be an extreme change to the scenic country road through cornfields and is not needed now or in the foreseeable future as there is no water or sewer infrastructure planned in Rockingham’s comprehensive plan to support future development in the area.

- Project ID # 39 connector in Dayton between Eberly and Route 11. This short segment is part of a significant string of projects that would dramatically alter Old Order Mennonite farmland and agricultural forestal districts in the Dayton area. These road projects are not supported by Dayton citizens or officials.

- Project ID# 27 Bridgewater Bypass. VDOT’s own traffic data shows that this project will make traffic worse on Dinkel Avenue and Main Street in Bridgewater. The Harrisonburg-Rockingham region cannot afford an expensive bypass that does not solve, but rather exacerbates traffic problems.

**From the Vision Plan**

- After 17 long years of sustained public opposition to a Harrisonburg loop road or bypass through Rockingham County’s prime farmlands and historic battlefields, it is time to **eliminate all segments (130, 129, 22B, and 26)**. The loop road is an extraordinarily expensive project that would encourage sprawl and undermine the agriculture economy, scenic and historic resources, and community identity of the area. A Harrisonburg bypass is not needed to serve the rural areas that make Rockingham Virginia’s top agricultural producer. In fact, a bypass through the county’s prime farm land would increase rural development pressure in direct conflict with the county Comprehensive Plan. Project #26, for example, is in a region that does not show growth on Rockingham County’s **2050** land use map. A Harrisonburg bypass on long-range plans hurts our region’s ability to plan for and fund the sensible road projects we really need.

- Cross Keys Battlefield is not given meaningful protection since several large-scale road **projects (26, 30, 33B, 81A/81B)** dead end into the Battlefield. The majority of Cross Keys Battlefield is not within the MPO boundary, but it is immediately adjacent and therefore deserves significant consideration to protect this
important historic resource. This lack of consideration of the Battlefield points to problems with the method for developing the Vision Plan. One step that could help would be to include Civil War battlefields and agricultural/forestal districts on MPO maps. Conflicts between proposed road projects and these important resources would be immediately obvious.

- The “Dayton Connector” will increase pressure on the Old Order Mennonite community and ag/forestal districts near Dayton. The small town character of the Dayton area and safety of horse and buggy traffic will irrevocably change if a major connector is built. Major new highways inevitably bring pressure for new housing subdivisions, commercial development and eventually the need for expensive public services. This, in some of the most rural and productive farmland in the county. CAP urges elimination of segments 39, 77B, 137 and 138 which also conflict with town greenway plans and projects currently being developed.

Other
- It appears the project description and the map label for project #43 do not match in the document.

Submitted by:
Kim Sandum
Executive Director,
Community Alliance for Preservation
540.209.2552
preserverockingham@gmail.com
www.preserverockingham.org

cc: Ann Cundy, Transportation Planner, CSPDC
Rockingham Board of Supervisors
From: Jason Burch [mailto:burch1428@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 07, 2017 7:00 AM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>
Subject: Long Range Transportation plan comments

Ann,

Please excuse my delay in sending comments. This is my first opportunity for personal email in a while. I want to express thanks for holding the public input meeting in December to showcase the Long Range and Vision plans for the MPO area. I would like to address a few concerns I had:

-In the Long Range Plan, project 129 concerns me. This is an improvement to Switchboard road. Without subsequent improvement to Mount Clinton Pike. I believe this will set the county up for a situation similar to the dogwood avenue problem in the city of Harrisburg.

-Projects 137, 138, and 139 create connectors that will impact roads heavily traveled by our Mennonite community to attend one of their churches. I'm concerned, with today's complete disregard for driving safety that society exhibits, for the Mennonite community as they travel these larger, faster, roads.

-Several features of the Vision plan seem awfully similar to the "loop road" of years gone by. At a glance, it appears the loop road has been segmented down to smaller improvements that, in total, create the basis for a few more connectors to fully create the loop road.

-Project 21 of the vision plan also concerns me. This is a road that crosses Mosby Road. If you look at this area in conjunction with the long Range plan, I cannot believe the road to be necessary. Projects 137, 138, and 139 improve access from 11 to 42 and so does project 21, within a mile or two of each other.

-In general, the Vision plan doesn't seem to fit our area. It appears to be a NOVA solution (wider, faster, bigger) to a Harrisonburg problem (people living on the opposite end of town from their destination). I caution that bigger roads will be simply roads at first but will soon be followed by businesses and other industrial uses. Businesses fill in and the problem repeats itself. It's an endless conflict where development dollars and tax dollars always seem to beat the farmers or homeowners. Additionally, these road projects will cause conflicts between existing residents like Belmont estates where they have a long standing subdivision that will now be sided by 33 and whatever project 43 creates. When traveling places, I often notice massive industries or roads with sound walls right beside an older subdivision. Instances like that show a lack of vision for the community. Reduced to an example in my home, it's the equivalent of me adding solar panels to my roof in 2017 knowing I have to replace my shingles in 2018. I'd recommend reducing the size of Erickson Avenue to reduce its traffic and adding bike lanes or a shared use path. Instead, via intersection changes, force the use of Garbers Church road. It's already four lanes and connects the same two roads together.
Thank you for your consideration of my tardy commentary. I really appreciate the opportunity for public input and commentary and wish more folks would participate.

Jason Burch
From: Ann Cundy
To: Rita Whitfield
Subject: FW: Input on 2040 comprehensive plan
Date: Monday, March 06, 2017 4:36:13 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Rebecca Chalam [mailto:jetpup@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 6:18 PM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>
Subject: Input on 2040 comprehensive plan

February 20, 2017
Topic: 2040 Comprehensive Plan

Dear Ann Cundy,

I am writing on behalf of the concerned citizens of Port Republic.
Port Republic is a unique village of historic value bordered by two rivers that form a national treasure; the south fork of the Shenandoah River. Port Republic is treasured not only for it's rich long standing heritage, but because of the historical significance of the Civil War battles that took place here and in Cross Keys. Visitors come to see our quaint way of life and natural beauty and relive the battles that took place here. As residents of Port Republic, we feel it is our duty to preserve Port from encroachment of urban sprawl in order to keep it's history alive.

Thus, as we ponder the 2040 long range comprehensive plan for roads in our area, we are concerned about several things.

1. Project #33B - making 4 lanes of highway from Boyers Road to Rt. 276 on Port Road. This is very worrisome. This will bring large volumes of traffic dangerously close to the Cross Keys Battlefield. And we all know that along with large roads, come more unnecessary building of "convenience establishments". This will bring urban sprawl closer to the corridor that leads from The Battle of Cross Keys, past the Widow Pence Farm, through the pastoral fields and mountain views to the quaint village that we call home - Port Republic. We feel like the four lane highway is not needed that far out.

2. Projects # 22 B and 26 - making large extender roads that connect onto I-81 North. It seems that these roads go through existing farms. We are not in favor of fragmenting working farms and fostering urban sprawl through these areas just to make it easier for people to get onto I-81. Can you possibly look for more efficient and affordable ways to have access to the interstate? It seems like it would be cheaper to make improvements to existing roads, rather than build completely new ones.

3. I-81. Every day we get traffic alerts on our phones saying that I-81 is closed due to an accident. Sometimes in both directions! This is getting to be a problem we can't ignore anymore. We, along with most of the county residents that we have talked to, want the available funds to be spent on widening and improving I-81. It needs to be safer and more efficient for trucks and other vehicles. We rely heavily on tourists coming to see our beautiful surroundings and historical areas. If they can't get here on I-81, we are all going to lose many dollars in revenue.

Thank you for listening to our input about the long range transportation plan. We thank you for this opportunity to input our ideas. Please take a trip to our beautiful Port Republic for a small sightseeing tour. We welcome the chance to show you why we are so anxious to "Preserve Port".
Sincerely,

Rebecca Chalam (540-421-5341)
and members of the Port Republic Preservation Society
Dear Ann Cundy,

I attended yesterday's informational session at the Community Development office on the county's transportation plan. I just wanted to say as a Switchboard Road property owner that I oppose widening the road to a 4 lane road. It's not that the road would not benefit from improvements, particularly those that would improve safety for bikers. However, I think that a 4-lane road, part of a longer corridor of a future bypass around the north northwest side of Harrisonburg would destroy the agricultural character of that part of the county and that the price is not worth the benefits as I understand them. Just wanted to express my opinion.

Best,
Nathan Musselman
1475 Switchboard Road
Having lived for a decade and a half in the area...the overall focus areas of improvements to target all of our communities are sound...

I have got ideas to consider:

-Latest add-on to Peach Grove Ave. to Ridgedale SHOULD find a way, kind of a W tilt and curve, toward the very western stretch of Ridgedale's (turns into Greendale) smooth road NW of those (kind of problematic though motorists take caution) the two almost 90 turns in a row.

There's little to no reason to make this extension so close to another well utilized intersection, only 1 mile east is very close to the generally major NW-SE and from the N and outlet of, respectively, Stone spring and Reservoir roads.

Crashes are a concern around having both bends, and that is a worry that likely affects people driving west to east, as opposed to vice versa, from Greendale to Ridgedale on the same road.

Ultimately, one may consider the landfill on Grassy Creek Rd. and facilitate a kind of Pleasant Valley (you've got a proposed smoothening out already planned around MTC) and Rt. 11's established commercial and Industrial areas of SW H'burg as good reasons to help make this area of roads better.

-With one slight bump, (Rt. 11) a kind of South H'burg W-E bypass at the southern reaches of the city is plausible and helpful. I live off of Rt. 704 east of B'water around Rt. 11 South of H'burg in the County and can totally see how a road that goes over a little bit of elevation...connects Rt. 42 @ Dayton to help their cause of the town's business and tourism, and Rt. 11 and head toward that area I stated above in this e-mail. (Also, consider another possible option, either now or in the future as this is really a 2040 wish list...without funding yet for sure, of fostering a path directly to Pleasant Valley Rd.)
December 23, 2016

Dear Harrisonburg-Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Organization:

I am writing to comment on your Draft Constrained Long Term Plan and Draft Vision Projects. I am very disappointed to see that these proposals still contain segments of the Loop Road, specifically the widening of Switchboard Road in the Constrained Long Term Plan and the Northwest and Northeast Connectors in the Vision plan. These are very costly projects—over $50 million for each connector and $2.5 million for widening Switchboard. These projects are completely unnecessary and it is hard for me to believe that the Commonwealth of Virginia, or indeed VDOT, does not have a better use for these funds. Please remove these projects from your plans.

The Loop Road project has been proposed for years. It has consistently and vigorously been opposed by those who live in the area that would be affected by it. It is completely unnecessary. Traffic that would use the Northwest Connector now uses highways 42 or 11 and Mount Clinton Pike or 33. It takes only minutes longer to get from exit 251 to highway 33 using existing roadways than would be true using the Connector. Moreover, there is simply not that much traffic involved. I live on Lincolnshire Drive. At peak traffic times I may have to wait 2 or 3 minutes to turn onto Mount Clinton Pike. At most times of day the wait is seconds.

Widening Switchboard is also completely unnecessary. I drive Switchboard often and have never had to slow down because of traffic. There used to be some safety issues because of the turns and hills on Switchboard. Painting a white line on Switchboard has solved these problems.

Widening Switchboard and adding a Northwest Connector would destroy valuable farmland and open up west Rockingham County to development. West Rockingham has some of the most valuable and productive farmland in the Commonwealth. It includes many Old Order Mennonite farms which contribute significantly to the local economy and will not be served by, indeed will be hemmed in by, limited access four-lane roads. This area is not slated for development in the Rockingham County comprehensive plan and does not need increased highway access. Even if these roads could be built for free, they would do more harm than good.

If the HRMPO has extra money it needs to spend, what is most needed in this area is a widening of Mount Clinton Pike between Park Road in the City and Lincolnshire Drive to add bicycle and pedestrian paths. I frequently encounter people walking between town and Gemeinschaft or bicyclists heading out of Harrisonburg into the County. The road is very narrow with deep ditches on either side. Cars come in from the County at high speed and speed up leaving the City. It is a miracle that no one has been killed yet walking or riding over the hill.

Please spend our taxpayer money on projects that are needed, not on boondoggles that will cause, not solve, problems,

Timothy Jost,
1370 Lincolnshire Drive,
Harrisonburg, Va. 22802
jostt@wlu.edu
540 421 1529
Two comments:

I work with newly arrived refugees and immigrant communities, long term please consider adding public transportation to places of significant employment, principally to Dayton and Bridgewater. There is not safe and affordable transportation to these communities for hourly wage workers without cars.

Secondly, please consider adding a sidewalk for pedestrian traffic on Mt. Clinton Pike where it transitions from the City of Harrisonburg to Rockingham County near EMU. There is considerable pedestrian traffic due to the Gemeinschaft Home and Lincolnshire Road. The combination of the speed of the traffic and hills hiding pedestrians creates a dangerous location to walk.

Thank you, Art.

Art Stoltzfus (574) 370-7197 (Cell)
From: Cheryl Lyon [mailto:clyon@silverlakemill.com]
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 2:55 PM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>; Bonnie Riedesel <bonnie@cspdc.org>
Cc: 'Charles T. Long' <chazvt@gmail.com>; 'Shelley Newman' <pierce.shelley@gmail.com>; bpopowicz@daytonva.us; 'Fred Eberly' <feberly@rockinghamcountyva.gov>
Subject: HRMPO LRTP Vision Plan

The comments below are from:
Leon F. Rohrer, 4423 Linhoss Road, Dayton, VA 22821. His telephone number is 540-879-9040.
To those with the HRMPO Policy Board:

As a lifetime resident of the Dayton area and having followed the HRMPO LRTP for quite a few years, my feelings of disappointment are only deepening. The same expensive, broken plan insists on presenting itself again and again, even after it assumed to have disappeared! The plan does not correlate with actual road projects under construction... while across town landowners are being notified of a 4 lane highway and its not on the map. See proj. 130.

As a farmer, the Eberly Rd project 173 and its extenders projects 39-137 and 13B are totally unnecessary and should never be considered. The town residents don't want it, and certainly farmers don't want or need 4 lane highways through productive farming acres. Development, urban sprawl and roadways devouring acreage at an alarming rate and sadly these acres are never replaced...

Another example of question - project 36-63. Both widened but not connected? Was there any engineering put in the map writing for road design?

Switchboard Rd does need improvement. A nice 2 lane road with sizable shoulders should be sufficient.

There are other roads that need moderate help but there should be great care given on where and how extensive.

Kindly we ask are the map designers even aware of the heritage of the proposed area? Our homes, farms and our very livelihood are being threatened terrorized with the many proposed road improvements. The residents of the Rockingham Co. Community do not want, need nor can we afford any unnecessary projects. All we ask is to please be realistic as you proceed forward with a "vision". It will affect the next generation and beyond. Thank you for your considerate attention.
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) PUBLIC MEETING COMMENT FORM

Goals and Objectives

Picking the right transportation projects for funding and ensuring the best use of limited tax dollars is a difficult task. In order to further evaluate projects, we want to know which plan goals are most important to you. Each goal has a set of objectives that specifies how each goal will be achieved. These objectives are listed in the LRTP on page 65.

Please visit the www.HRVAMPO.org website to view or download a digital copy of the LRTP.

1. Please rank each goal from most important to least important.

1 = the most important
6 = the least important

*Mark only one oval per row.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make strategic investments to provide connectivity and accessibility throughout the HRMPO area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the safety and security of the transportation system for all users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimize existing infrastructure for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase mobility options through expansion of transit service and bicycle and pedestrian facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect the land use and transportation decision-making processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the quality of life of all residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

MORE CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE PUT IN PLACE AND THIS WOULD PREVENT THE NEED OF SOME OF THESE PROJECTS AND IMPACT ALL RESIDENTS LESS FINANCIALLY. IN A NEGATIVE WAY.

To share the survey or comment online, visit www.HRVAMPO.org website

**Para español, por favor contáctenos**
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) PUBLIC MEETING COMMENT FORM

Goals and Objectives

Picking the right transportation projects for funding and ensuring the best use of limited tax dollars is a difficult task. In order to further evaluate projects, we want to know which plan goals are most important to you. Each goal has a set of objectives that specifies how each goal will be achieved. These objectives are listed in the LRTP on page 65.

Please visit the www.HRVAMPO.org website to view or download a digital copy of the LRTP.

1. Please rank each goal from most important to least important.

   1 = the most important
   6 = the least important

   *Mark only one oval per row.*

   | Make strategic investments to provide connectivity and accessibility throughout the HRMPO area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

   | Improve the safety and security of the transportation system for all users. |  |  |  |  |
---|---|---|---|---|

   | Optimize existing infrastructure for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods |  |  |  |  |
---|---|---|---|---|

   | Increase mobility options through expansion of transit service and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. |  |  |  |  |
---|---|---|---|---|

   | Connect the land use and transportation decision-making processes. |  |  |  |  |
---|---|---|---|---|

   | Enhance the quality of life of all residents. |  |  |  |  |
---|---|---|---|---|

2. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

   I was impressed with the thought that went into the making of this plan. It does seem that everything has been considered and any questions that were answered are here.

To share the survey or comment online, visit www.HRVAMPO.org website

**Para español, por favor contáctenos**
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) PUBLIC MEETING
COMMENT FORM

Goals and Objectives

Picking the right transportation projects for funding and ensuring the best use of limited tax dollars is a difficult task. In order to further evaluate projects, we want to know which plan goals are most important to you. Each goal has a set of objectives that specifies how each goal will be achieved. These objectives are listed in the LRTP on page 65.

Please visit the www.HRVAMPO.org website to view or download a digital copy of the LRTP.

1. Please rank each goal from most important to least important.

   1 = the most important
   6 = the least important

   *Mark only one oval per row.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make strategic investments to provide connectivity and accessibility throughout the HRMPO area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the safety and security of the transportation system for all users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimize existing infrastructure for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase mobility options through expansion of transit service and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect the land use and transportation decision-making processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the quality of life of all residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

   I'm in favor of a 2 lane improvement on Switchboard Rd vs a 4 lane. That hopefully gets some very needed safety improvements made with the limited funds available.

To share the survey or comment online, visit www.HRVAMPO.org website

**Para español, por favor contáctenos

[Handwritten note: Tim Parrish delinas@gmail.com]
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) PUBLIC MEETING COMMENT FORM

Goals and Objectives

Picking the right transportation projects for funding and ensuring the best use of limited tax dollars is a difficult task. In order to further evaluate projects, we want to know which plan goals are most important to you. Each goal has a set of objectives that specifies how each goal will be achieved. These objectives are listed in the LRTP on page 65.

Please visit the www.HRVAMPO.org website to view or download a digital copy of the LRTP.

1. Please rank each goal from most important to least important.

   1 = the most important
   6 = the least important

*Mark only one oval per row.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make strategic investments to provide connectivity and accessibility throughout the HRMPO area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the safety and security of the transportation system for all users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimize existing infrastructure for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase mobility options through expansion of transit service and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect the land use and transportation decision-making processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the quality of life of all residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

   REMOVE ALL DAYTON CONNECTORS FROM THE VISION PLAN

To share the survey or comment online, visit www.HRVAMPO.org website

**Para español, por favor contáctenos**
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) PUBLIC MEETING
COMMENT FORM

Goals and Objectives

Picking the right transportation projects for funding and ensuring the best use of limited tax dollars is a difficult task. In order to further evaluate projects, we want to know which plan goals are most important to you. Each goal has a set of objectives that specifies how each goal will be achieved. These objectives are listed in the LRTP on page 65.

Please visit the www.HRVAMPO.org website to view or download a digital copy of the LRTP

1. Please rank each goal from most important to least important.
   
   1 = the most important
   6 = the least important

   *Mark only one oval per row.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make strategic investments to provide connectivity and accessibility throughout the HRMPO area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the safety and security of the transportation system for all users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimize existing infrastructure for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase mobility options through expansion of transit service and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect the land use and transportation decision-making processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the quality of life of all residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

Remove connectors in Dayton from vision plan - no need for them are greater priorities i.e. improve 81 - reduce congestion - a death trap

To share the survey or comment online, visit www.HRVAMPO.org website

**Para español, por favor contáctenos**
March 15, 2016
Harrisonburg-Rockingham MPO Policy Board
1201 McTanly Place
Staunton, VA 24401

I am extremely concerned about 3 broad issues related specifically to the HRMPO LRTP and about 2 additional issues that relate not only to the LRTP, but relate to how the MPO notifies the public:

1. Proposed roads leading to/from locations near Dayton
2. Discussion of changes near Cargill at Dayton
3. Responsibility to protect the culture and heritage of the Old Order Mennonite community.
4. The need to change how the public is notified as well as the content of those notifications
5. The de facto disenfranchisement of the Old Order Mennonite community, even though their farming lands are dramatically affected by the road plans

Proposed roads that lead to/from Dayton:

Dayton citizens want to preserve the rural, small town atmosphere, as well and preserve the Old Order Mennonite community that surrounds it. This was clear in a survey conducted in 2011 by the James Madison University business department; a survey which continues to drive the town’s vision in other areas.

Project 21 linking Route 42 and Rt 11 through an extension of Meigs Lane is redundant. The movement of traffic east/west is accomplished by Stone Spring Road to the north and Project 36 to the south.

Projects 39, 137, 138 and 119 are also redundant and unnecessary for the same reasons.

Project 77B is not necessary; there are two busy times of day, related to Pence Middle School.

Discussion of changes near Cargill in Dayton:

I understand that changes are being discussed to reposition West Mosby so that it does not go under the Cargill plant, but would pass to the north or south of the plant. There will always being congestion twice a day, regardless of placement. There is no point moving it, especially since it would remove farmland and possibly spur general development that Dayton does not want.

Responsibility to protect the Old Order Mennonite community:

We have a responsibility to respect and protect the Old Order Mennonite community that surrounds Dayton – it is a remarkable treasure of faith and heritage that influences us every day in Dayton. Development in Rockingham County is increasingly tightening the reins on their farms. As a result, our Mennonite families have started new communities in Kentucky and Ohio! Projects 77B, 39, 137, 138 and 119 all threaten Mennonite farmlands.

Because of their faith and culture, Mennonites are reluctant to participate in government, so it behooves others to also be aware of their difficulties.
Need to change how the public is notified of events and plans:

As we are all aware, newspaper and magazine readership is plunging, and many of them have already gone out of business. It is a bit absurd to believe that an advertisement placed in the classifieds will be read by anyone anymore. The communications culture has shifted dramatically.

I understand that I can sign up for email notifications. I am attaching one for the March 16 meeting. What does it really tell me (or anyone)? I am a college graduate, and I have no idea if I should be there or not!

So how do you communicate? I do not know what the answer is, but perhaps you can contract with an outside resource to maintain a mailing list (both U.S. mail and email) that will simplify the jargon, add maps, and make it understandable. Residents can sign up to be on one of the lists. I saw an Old Order Mennonite with a map and mailing sent out by CAP (Community Alliance for Preservation); perhaps you can contract with CAP.

Disenfranchisement of Old Order Mennonites:

Because the HRMPO official notices are tucked away in classifieds that no one reads, and because Mennonites do not have access to internet because of their beliefs, these people do not have access to notifications even though it is their farmlands that may be more affected than any other category of resident.

This situation MUST be solved!

*The HRMPO has the opportunity to be forward thinking and reshape communications within the boundaries that they oversee. Please rise to the challenge!*

Sincerely,

Cheryl Lyon

2328 Silver Lake Road

Dayton, VA 22821
Subject: FW: comment about transportation plan

Ann W. Cundy, AICP
Transportation Program Manager
Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission
112 MacTanly Place
Staunton, VA 24401
540-885-5175

From: charlotte shrsti [mailto:charlotteshrsti@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 11:34 AM
To: Ann Cundy <ann@cspdc.org>
Subject: comment about transportation plan

Dear Ms. Cundy,

I'm a resident of Rockingham county and live on Switchboard Rd. I'm writing to respectfully request that the Metropolitan Planning Organization reconsider its plans to widen and reconstruct Switchboard Rd. as major four lane road with access to Hwy 81.

I ask you to instead preserve and protect this as-of-yet unspoiled and undeveloped end of town. Every day there are many joggers and cyclists who pass our home. This is a valuable road for recreational purposes, as a scenic tourist destination, agriculturally and to the families who want to live on a safe country road.

Instead of widening the road to encourage more vehicle use and commercial development I would like to see a bicycle and pedestrian path to town. I would use it regularly instead of driving my car to town and recreationally with my husband and two little boys.

Thank you for taking my voice into consideration.

Sincerely,
Charlotte Shrsti
1453 Switchboard Rd.
Comments/Questions/Concerns:
Send VTRC John Miller info

Contact Information (Optional):

Comments/Questions/Concerns:
Long range transportation planning should include bus systems and other public systems to leave car at home to get around between towns and out in country in between

Contact Information (Optional):
Lynnhewalt@ymail.com

Comments/Questions/Concerns:
Dayton was promised that objectionable projects would be removed if the town's comprehensive plan was changed, the plan has been changed but the projects are only moved to "Appendix E" to come up again in 5 yrs.

Contact Information (Optional):
Cheryl Lyon @clyon@silverlakemail.com
540-421-2256
Comments/Questions/Concerns:

- 23B: Destroys Farmland/ rand character
- 27: unnecessary, through productive farmland
- 21: unnecessary, Dayton has enough access
- 22A: Really? Get rid of it
- 33B: endangers Cross Keys Battlefield
- 22B: Awful idea. Destroys farmland and is completely unnecessary

Contact Information (Optional):
lee.good702@gmail.com

What I Like: (Really!)

- 43A: Bicycle lanes on Eriksen
- 124, 125: I 81 improvements

Old "Loop Road Segments" No. No. No. 130A, 24, 22B, 62c

Destruction of Ar/Forest in Dayton Area: 31, 77B
To those within the HRMPO policy board,

As a land owner and dairy farmer of Rockingham County, and seeing once again the road plans you all keep trying to jam down our throats, after repeatedly telling you we don't need or want them, it is becoming very annoying with your repeated harassment trying to bring this stuff back again and again.

Several facts are being ignored-look over look past, just to do something that we as a community do not need! We lease 3 acres to Cargill for a parking lot. This road plan #139 will cut thru that, and split our farm. We don't want it, don't need it, please get it!

I also have a feeling Cargill won't want to lose their parking lot.

Now, a few concerns I have is that no environmental study has been done on flood plain or water back up from building up new road out of flood plain, and backing water up into Cargill plant. I am 52 years old and have seen water 1 1/2 to 2 feet deep in their area 5-6 times in my life! This road not only is not needed, but will ruin a 3 coming 4 generations of product farming and your food. I would also comment at this time, my father, Sam Wenger who is now deceased, was told several times that this road would not happen! Interestingly enough it keeps coming back. I have word from Dayton they don't want it. This community is largely ag and this land is in an Ag Forrest District! It seems to me your goal is to harass and terrorize us people with blatant, off the hip plans that make no sense or good for the community! Please remember that Ag is your bread and largely Rockingham County tax dollars. The county does not have the money to throw recklessly around, and cause more problems than fix! I have heard that we need access to I81 from Dayton area. We do not agree, seeing there are 5 exits into this area now. Plus this road does nothing for or in this effect.

P.S. I was not able to come to the meeting. There are many people against this road, and as the land owner, I thought you need to hear it from us! Thank You very much!

Clifford Wenger
To the Board of HRMPO,

5-3-2018

Once again, the farmers will stop working long enough to write another letter as we stare at the next round of road project proposals. Last March, 2017 I sent a letter of concern regarding several other alarming so-called projects. With time, I felt heard and appreciated the sensible approaches used.

Now we learn that some of those projects went into the Appendix E... After disappearing... Here they are again! I don't understand! The average citizen doesn't even understand all this quiet road language and isn't even aware of what is being planned and enacted that will change the rural setting of our beloved Rockingham County.

Do HRMPO representatives really understand what an effect project 139 would have on Ag., the very heartbeat of Rockingham Co.? A new road goes shooting through Cargill leased parking lot. Flood waters have long since been a problem and this will heighten the problem. Is Cargill even aware of the project? Cargill represents farmers all over state of Virginia and beyond. How to the farmland east of Cargill, all in Ag. Postal District? Project 139 will split family farms that for 4 generations have provided an existence for those who provide food to the local rural citizenry. Project 139 will cause much havoc lessening the acreage need to meet requirements of ag. One by one farms are ruined.

Please think and wisely plan to use the states allotted budget, don't just haphazardly throw money to use it up in an unwise project. Have a heart and stop terrorizing the farmers, their families, towns and companies. These decisions will affect many people and generations and maybe even yours own grocery cart. Please remove Pr. 139. Thank you kindly, Ron Robinson.
Our Imagine Dayton citizens group was represented at the HRMPO public open house April 26 regarding the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Amendment. Since that meeting, we have studied the proposed changes. The attached map shows Project 21 (extension of Meigs Lane to Kaylor Park Road) and Project 139 (extension of Rt 257 to West Mosby Road). We strongly object to both projects for these reasons:

- The projects effectively create a large parcel of agricultural land that suddenly becomes ripe for development because of its enhanced accessibility. Already, a 30-acre tract within that large parcel is being considered for a 400-unit housing development. Other major portions within that large parcel adjoin or are very near the town of Dayton. One single development of that size would ruin the character of Dayton.

- The extension of Meigs Lane is redundant and accomplishes little. It parallels Erickson / Stone Spring by just 1.1 miles, certainly not enough to justify its cost.

- The Town of Dayton does not need improved access to I-81. The town’s access is less than three miles, and so is Bridgewater’s.

Specifically with regard to Project 139 that would extend Rt 257:

- A significant portion of westbound traffic on West Mosby Road continues straight through the traffic light at Rt 42 and goes to Dayton’s Main Street. At Main Street, the traffic typically turns right and goes through Dayton’s downtown. To close the intersection effectively shuts off an important flow to the downtown, and the town has expended substantial time and funding to improve downtown visitation. A traffic study should confirm those observations.

- The extension of Rt 257 will cut through the Cargill parking lot. Since Cargill is Dayton’s primary source of income, placing the Project on the LRTP should only be done with Cargill’s permission.

- If the extension of Rt 257 is realigned to avoid taking the Cargill parking lot, one or more historic houses will be lost, and an important high-production farm will be cut in two.

Dayton’s 2017 Updated Comprehensive Plan clearly states:

- Pg 12: [Goal] “Preserve, enhance, and promote Dayton’s historic, rural, small-town atmosphere while seeking limited planned residential growth.
  Objective 1: Maintain the integrity of residential, commercial, historic, and industrial areas.
  Objective 2: Encourage the transportation network to be compatible with Dayton’s desire to protect the small town character.”
Successful long-term planning for the appropriate use of the area in and around Dayton will provide the framework for the desired preservation of town history, character, and charm.

However, Dayton residents have stated they value the small-town atmosphere and are reluctant to see full commercialization of the Route 42 corridor to Harrisonburg or Bridgewater.

...maintain and increase the economic and social vitality of Dayton while preserving its essential small-town character.

Along with objecting to Projects 21 and 139, we ask for the removal of Projects 39, 77B, 137, 138 and 139 from Appendix E of the plan. I think you will recall our strong objections to the projects last year; objections that were also raised by Dayton’s government and by our Rockingham County Supervisor Fred Eberly. When this was discussed in 2012, we understood that the above projects were “dead,” only to see them appear again in 2017.

We were told in 2017 that they would be removed when Dayton’s Comprehensive Plan was appropriately amended. The plan has been amended, and we find these projects are relegated to Appendix E – and we will see them again in five years. They need to be removed from all places in the plan. At the April 26 meeting, we were advised by Ann Cundy that we need to have our Dayton MPO representative request it. Is this the case? Once we have our representative request the removal of these projects, will we finally see them removed?

Robert Bersson
Dana Fenner
Cheryl Lyon
Shelley Newman
Dear Bonnie Riedesel,

I was unable to attend the recent MPO Open House on the LRPT, but I wanted to share my opposition to the Switchboard section of NW Connector. A four-lane divided major arterial roadway would be an extreme change to the scenic country road through cornfields and it does not seem to really be needed in the first place.

I also want to express my support for more bike lanes in the county. One road in serious need is Mount Clinton Pike as the road heads out into the county. Many students and others run or bike on that road. I’m afraid that with all the blind spots and non-existent shoulder that it is only a matter of time before there is an accident.

Nathan Musselman
1475 Switchboard Road
May 10, 2018

Bonnie Riedesel  
Executive Director,  
Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission  
Sent via email to bonnie@cspdc.org

Dear Ms. Riedesel,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the amended Harrisonburg-Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for 2040. I offer several comments on the process used to develop the LRTP as well as both concerns and support for specific projects in the Vision Plan and LRTP.

First, I thank the MPO staff for hosting a public information meeting on the amendments which my wife and I attended. We hope the MPO will continue these public outreach efforts to involve the public early in its transportation planning and provide opportunities to participate at a time and location convenient for the public. Starting assumptions, transportation shortcomings, identified safety concerns, and sensitive historical and environmental areas can all be better identified if public participation is allowed earlier in the planning process.

Second, the culling and the new ranking criteria applied to the Vision List brings much needed changes to the LRTP. I wish, however, that the discussions of the working group that developed the criteria and applied them were transparent and open to the public. In particular, the discussion of which projects to remove completely from the LRTP would have been illuminating, especially since the public has requested that several loop road segments be removed from the plan for more than a decade.

Unfortunately, the public did not have an opportunity to participate in the development of either the Vision Plan list or the Projects for Future Consideration list. For that reason, projects with sustained public opposition continue to be included on the two lists. Including these long lists of projects allows proponents of unneeded projects to say “it’s in the plan” even though the project might be poorly ranked on the Vision List or on the unevaluated Projects for Future Consideration list.

The entire LRTP document, including appendices, is considered authoritative, influencing the transportation sections of the City and County Comprehensive Land Use Plans and ultimately VDOT planning documents. Rockingham County is in the midst of its comprehensive planning process, and could simply incorporate the MPO’s project lists, even though MPO claims that projects are included because they are in the Rockingham County Comprehensive Plan. We are stuck in an endless loop where projects are never fully and properly evaluated, but just remain in the plan because they are already in the plan.

I ask that you, please, remove these unneeded, unpopular projects from the lists. (Specific projects to be removed are named below.) If the MPO insists upon continuing to include these projects, you must clarify in the final LRTP document that the Projects for Future Consideration
in Appendix E have not been vetted and that weight should not be given to projects contained within unless further evaluation and public involvement are given.

I thank the MPO Policy Board for including Civil War battlefields on MPO maps and encourage you to do the same with agricultural/forestal districts. Conflicts between proposed road projects and these important resources would be immediately obvious.

Localities and the MPO seek consistency among their transportation planning documents. This is reasonable to an extent. However, the non-synchronous process of developing local comprehensive plans and MPO CLRP documents make it inevitable that some documents will be more up to date. Needed changes should be made in whatever document is currently being evaluated. Waiting for each jurisdiction to make its own changes provides no benefit to the public or local governments.

I support the following projects:

• I-81 safety spot improvements such as work done at interchanges 247 and 245
• Increased transportation mode options that will result from expanding network of sidewalks and bike lanes.

I would also encourage you to take on two urgent projects that I do not see on the list.

• Improving the intersection where Chicago Avenue meets Mt. Clinton Pike, possibly installing a roundabout. (this may be part of project 8)
• Adding a bike/pedestrian lane along Mt. Clinton Pike from EMU to Lincolnshire Drive. This is an area with heavy bike traffic from bicyclists heading into the county and coming up from Lincolnshire, as well pedestrian traffic as residents from Gemeinschaft walk to the bus stop, to shopping, and to work. Mt. Clinton Pike is narrow and the banks steep on either side. It is a miracle that no one has yet been killed as cars and trucks crest the hill at high speed. In terms of safety, I would rank this higher than any other improvement in the city or county.

I oppose the following projects:

From the CLRP

• Project ID# 130 and 130B, Switchboard section of NW Connector. I drive Switchboard several times a week. Traffic is never heavy. The double yellow line has dramatically improved safety on Switchboard, and nothing further needs to be done. The suggested improvements seem intended to pave the way for the construction of the Loop Road, which faces widespread opposition in west Rockingham. The intended connector would eventually be built on new location through farmland in an area of the County without infrastructure to support development that follows a major road construction project. This expensive project would undermine County comprehensive plan goals to support the agriculture economy and concentrate development around towns and the City of Harrisonburg. A four-lane divided major arterial roadway would be an extreme change to the scenic country road through cornfields and is not needed now or in the foreseeable future as there is no water or sewer infrastructure planned in Rockingham’s
A comprehensive plan to support future development in the area. The low ranking this project received demonstrates that it is unnecessary and counterproductive.

- Project ID# 27 Bridgewater Bypass. VDOT’s own traffic data shows that this project will make traffic worse on Dinkel Avenue and Main Street in Bridgewater. The Harrisonburg-Rockingham region cannot afford an expensive bypass that does not solve, but rather exacerbates, traffic problems. Scarcе transportation dollars should not be spent on Preliminary Engineering of this project, which does not score well using the new ranking criteria (ranks 31 out of 36).

From the Vision Plan and Projects for Future Consideration lists

- After 18 long years of sustained public opposition to a Harrisonburg loop road or bypass through Rockingham County’s prime farmlands and historic battlefields, it is time to eliminate all segments (130B ranked 26th, 22A ranked 33rd, 81A ranked 32nd, 82B ranked 34th, 26, 22B, and 22C ). The loop road is an extraordinarily expensive project that would encourage sprawl and undermine the agriculture economy, scenic and historic resources, and community identity of the area. A Harrisonburg bypass is not needed to serve the rural areas that make Rockingham Virginia’s top agricultural producer. Project #26, for example, is in a region that does not show growth on Rockingham County’s 2050 land use map. In fact, a bypass through the county’s prime farm land would increase rural development pressure in direct conflict with the county Comprehensive Plan. A Harrisonburg bypass on long-range plans hurts our region’s ability to plan for and fund the sensible road projects we really need.

- Cross Keys Battlefield is not given meaningful protection since several large-scale road projects (26, 30, 33B, 81A/81B) dead end into the Battlefield. The majority of Cross Keys Battlefield is not within the MPO boundary, but it is immediately adjacent and therefore deserves significant consideration to protect this important historic resource. Large scale projects that increase development pressure on Battlefield lands would be in direct conflict with Rockingham County’s comprehensive plan, which includes the Cross Keys and Port Republic Historic Preservation Area. The scale of these projects should be downgraded to match the rural character of the historic area in order to preserve it.

- The “Dayton Connector” and the Meigs/Kaylor connection will increase pressure on the Old Order Mennonite community and ag/forestal districts near Dayton. The small town character of the Dayton area and safety of horse and buggy traffic will irrevocably change if a major connector is built. Major new highways inevitably bring pressure for new housing subdivisions, commercial development and eventually the need for expensive public services. This is a particularly concerning prospect in some of the most rural and productive farmland in the county. I urge elimination of segments 21 ranked 22nd, 39, 77B, 137, 138, 43B, and 139 ranked 19th, which also conflict with town greenway plans, planned bike/buggy lanes, and the newly adopted Dayton Comprehensive Plan.

- Project 123 calls for a new I-81 interchange at Smithland Road. This project is at a historic working farm, and it is excessively expensive. In addition, it does not meet federal requirements for separation between interchanges on the interstate. The project should be removed from the list.
Thank you for your consideration of these matters,

Timothy Stoltzfus Jost  
1370 Lincolnshire Drive  
Harrisonburg, Va 22802  
jostt@wlu.edu
May 9, 2018

Bonnie Riedesel  
Executive Director,  
Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission  
Sent via email to bonnie@cspdc.org

Dear Ms. Riedesel,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the amended Harrisonburg-Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for 2040. Community Alliance for Preservation (CAP) is a citizens’ group based in Rockingham County that works with the public, elected leaders and local and state government agencies to enhance Rockingham County’s rural character, urban spaces and natural and cultural resources.

CAP has several comments on the process used to develop the LRTP as well as both concerns and support for specific projects in the Vision Plan and LRTP.

**Process**

- CAP thanks the MPO staff for hosting a public information meeting on the amendments as well as offering a training session on the transportation model being used to evaluate projects in the Vision List. **We hope the MPO will continue these public outreach efforts to involve the public early in its transportation planning and provide opportunities to participate at a time and location convenient for the public.** Starting assumptions, transportation shortcomings, identified safety concerns, and sensitive historical and environmental areas can all be better identified if public participation is allowed earlier in the planning process.

- The culling and the new ranking criteria applied to the Vision List were much needed changes to the LRTP. While developing the ranking criteria tools was necessarily technical and required expertise beyond what most of the public has, **we wish the discussions of the working group were transparent.** Google groups, conference calls, and email are more efficient ways to get work done, but they are not very transparent. The discussion of which projects to remove completely from the LRTP would have been illuminating, especially since several loop road segments have been requested to be removed from the plan for more than a decade.

- Unfortunately, the public did not participate in the development of either the Vision Plan list or the Projects for Future Consideration list. For that reason, projects with sustained public opposition continue to be included on the two lists. Including these long lists of projects allows proponents of unneeded projects to say “it’s in the plan” even though the project might be poorly ranked on the Vision List or on the unevaluated Projects for Future Consideration list. The entire LRTP document, including appendices are considered authoritative, influencing the transportation sections of the City and County Comprehensive Land Use Plans and ultimately VDOT planning documents. We ask that you, please, remove these unneeded, unpopular projects from the lists. (Specific projects to be removed are named below.) If the MPO insists upon continuing to include these projects, they must clarify in the final LRTP document that the Projects for Future Consideration in Appendix E have not been vetted and that weight should not be given to projects contained within unless further evaluation and public involvement are given.
We thank the MPO Policy Board for including Civil War battlefields on MPO maps and encourage them to do the same with agricultural/forestal districts. Conflicts between proposed road projects and these important resources would be immediately obvious.

Localities and the MPO seek consistency among their transportation planning documents. This is reasonable, to an extent. However, the non-synchronous process of developing local comprehensive plans and MPO CLRP documents make it inevitable that some documents will be more up to date. Needed changes should be made in whatever document is currently being evaluated. Waiting for each jurisdiction to make its own changes provides no benefit to the public or local governments.

**CAP Supports the following projects**

- I-81 safety spot improvements such as 1-work done at interchange 247 to eliminate the merge weave pattern, 2- realignment of ramp at exit 245 to eliminate a dogleg intersection that leads to merging difficulties and delays at the exit traffic signal, and 3- guard rails to prevent crossover head-on collisions.

- Increased transportation mode options that will result from expanding network of sidewalks and bike lanes.

**CAP Opposes the following projects**

**From the CLRP**

- Project ID# 129, 130 and 130B, Switchboard section of NW Connector. CAP’s long-standing opposition to the various segments of a loop road around Harrisonburg applies to this project. Much of the intended connector would eventually be built on new location through farmland in an area of the County without infrastructure to support development that follows a major road construction project. This expensive project would undermine County comprehensive plan goals to support the agriculture economy and concentrate development around towns and the City of Harrisonburg. A four-lane divided major arterial roadway would be an extreme change to the scenic country road through cornfields and is not needed now or in the foreseeable future as there is no water or sewer infrastructure planned in Rockingham’s comprehensive plan to support future development in the area.

- Project ID# 27 Bridgewater Bypass. VDOT’s own traffic data shows that this project will make traffic worse on Dinkel Avenue and Main Street in Bridgewater. The Harrisonburg-Rockingham region cannot afford an expensive bypass that does not solve, but rather exacerbates, traffic problems. Scarce transportation dollars should not be spent on Preliminary Engineering of this project, which does not score well using the new ranking criteria (ranks 31 out of 36).

**From the Vision Plan and Projects for Future Consideration lists**

- After 18 long years of sustained public opposition to a Harrisonburg loop road or bypass through Rockingham County’s prime farmlands and historic battlefields, it is time to eliminate all segments (130B ranked 26th, 22A ranked 33rd, 81A ranked 32nd, 82B ranked 34th, 26, 22B, and 22C ). The loop road is an extraordinarily expensive project that would encourage sprawl and undermine the agriculture economy, scenic and historic resources, and community identity of the area. A Harrisonburg bypass is not needed to serve the rural areas that make Rockingham Virginia’s top agricultural producer. Project #26, for example, is in a region that does not show growth on Rockingham County’s 2050 land use map. In fact, a bypass through the county’s prime farm land would increase rural development...
pressure in direct conflict with the county Comprehensive Plan. A Harrisonburg bypass on long-range plans hurts our region’s ability to plan for and fund the sensible road projects we really need.

- Cross Keys Battlefield is not given meaningful protection since several large-scale road projects (26, 30, 33B, 81A/81B) dead end into the Battlefield. The majority of Cross Keys Battlefield is not within the MPO boundary, but it is immediately adjacent and therefore deserves significant consideration to protect this important historic resource. Large scale projects that increase development pressure on Battlefield lands would be in direct conflict with Rockingham County’s comprehensive plan, which includes the Cross Keys and Port Republic Historic Preservation Area. **The scale of these projects should be downgraded to match the rural character of the historic area in order to preserve it.**

- The “Dayton Connector” and the Meigs/Kaylor connection will increase pressure on the Old Order Mennonite community and ag/forestal districts near Dayton. The small town character of the Dayton area and safety of horse and buggy traffic will irrevocably change if a major connector is built. Major new highways inevitably bring pressure for new housing subdivisions, commercial development and eventually the need for expensive public services. This is a particularly concerning prospect in some of the most rural and productive farmland in the county. **CAP urges elimination of segments 21 ranked 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 39, 77B, 137, 138, 43B, and 139 ranked 19\textsuperscript{th}, which also conflict with town greenway plans, planned bike/buggy lanes, and the newly adopted Dayton Comprehensive Plan.**

- Project 123 calls for a new I-81 interchange at Smithland Road. This project is at a historic working farm, and it is excessively expensive. In addition, it does not meet federal requirements for separation between interchanges on the interstate. The project should be removed from the list.

Submitted by:
Kim Sandum
Executive Director,
Community Alliance for Preservation
540.209.2552
preserverockingham@gmail.com
www.preserverockingham.org

cc: Ann Cundy, Transportation Planner, CSPDC
MPO Policy Board members
Rockingham Board of Supervisors
Appendix D: Vision List Project Scores
<p>| PROJECT ID | JURISDICTION | PROJECT NAME | Rank | Project Score | Project Cost | Project Benefit | Congestion (7.5%) | Safety (25%) | Accessibility (25%) | Economic Development (25%) | Environment (10%) | Land Use (7.5%) |
|------------|---------------|--------------|------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 101        | Harrisonburg  | Maplehurst Avenue Extension | 1    | 150.1          | $647,676      | 9.7            | 0.0 | 0.8           | 3.4                         | 5.5             | 0.0            |
| 43A        | Rockingham    | Erickson Avenue Improvements | 2    | 100.7          | $836,625      | 8.4            | 0.0 | 1.4           | 0.8                         | 0.0             | 6.2            |
| 124        | Harrisonburg  | Port Republic Road Improvements (South) | 3    | 82.1           | $3,694,800    | 30.4           | 0.0 | 15.8          | 4.5                         | 0.7             | 9.4            |
| 110        | Harrisonburg  | South Carlton Street Improvements | 4    | 79.7           | $1,827,788    | 14.6           | 0.0 | 0.7           | 3.5                         | 1.3             | 8.3            |
| 108        | Harrisonburg  | South Main Street Turn Lane Extension at Port Republic Road | 5    | 60.9           | $881,775      | 5.4            | 0.0 | 0.0           | 1.0                         | 4.4             | 0.0            |
| 125        | Harrisonburg  | Port Republic Road Improvements (North) | 6    | 35.6           | $5,486,778    | 19.5           | 0.0 | 4.3           | 4.4                         | 0.9             | 9.4            |
| 107        | Harrisonburg  | Linda Lane Widening | 7    | 33.6           | $6,149,784    | 20.7           | 0.1 | 0.4           | 5.2                         | 3.7             | 9.7            |
| 29A        | Harrisonburg  | Mount Clinton Pike Extension | 8    | 28.5           | $7,262,603    | 20.7           | 0.0 | 0.4           | 5.3                         | 4.7             | 9.8            |
| 13B        | Harrisonburg  | Mount Clinton Pike Improvements and Roundabout | 9    | 28.0           | $12,560,783   | 35.1           | 0.1 | 13.8          | 5.0                         | 4.1             | 9.6            |
| 13A        | Rockingham    | Mount Clinton Pike Improvements | 10   | 26.5           | $4,179,799    | 11.1           | 0.0 | 1.1           | 2.4                         | 0.2             | 7.4            |
| 109        | Harrisonburg  | Old Furnace Road Improvements | 11   | 26.3           | $6,568,500    | 17.3           | 0.0 | 1.1           | 5.0                         | 0.9             | 9.4            |
| 45         | Rockingham    | Research Dr Extension | 12   | 23.5           | $14,728,740   | 34.6           | 0.0 | 22.2          | 2.5                         | 3.8             | 6.2            |
| 29B        | Rockingham    | Vine St Extension | 13   | 21.3           | $7,715,539    | 16.4           | 0.1 | 0.6           | 2.5                         | 3.9             | 7.6            |
| 3A         | Harrisonburg  | Country Club Road Improvements | 14   | 20.3           | $9,142,659    | 18.5           | 0.0 | 1.4           | 5.0                         | 1.5             | 9.8            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project Score</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Project Benefit</th>
<th>Congestion (7.5%)</th>
<th>Safety (25%)</th>
<th>Accessibility (25%)</th>
<th>Economic Development (25%)</th>
<th>Environment (10%)</th>
<th>Land Use (7.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Dinkel Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>$8,239,595</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29C</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Mt Clinton Pike Extension 2 ALTERNATE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>$15,634,119</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Parkwood Drive Improvements</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>$4,158,990</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Greendale Road Extension</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>$10,356,518</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82B</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>Mount Crawford Avenue</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>$6,175,980</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Smithland Road Widening</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>$9,948,985</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Garbers Church Road Improvements</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>$4,125,550</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Oakwood Dr Realignment and improvements</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>$8,342,325</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Country Club Road Improvements</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>$16,876,752</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Switchboard Road Improvements</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>$6,965,400</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>South Main Street Widening</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>$18,761,625</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>US 33 Widening</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>$19,814,603</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley Road Improvements</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>$25,415,025</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>Don Litten Parkway</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>$30,503,760</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project Score</td>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>Project Benefit</td>
<td>Congestion (7.5%)</td>
<td>Safety (25%)</td>
<td>Accessibility (25%)</td>
<td>Economic Development (25%)</td>
<td>Environment (10%)</td>
<td>Land Use (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Interstate 81 - Exit 247 Bridges and Interchanges</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>$31,872,383</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81A</td>
<td>Mt Crawford</td>
<td>Friedens Church Road</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>$13,171,750</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22A</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Northwest Connector Segment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$12,827,945</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81B</td>
<td>Mt Crawford</td>
<td>Friedens Church Road</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>$8,887,060</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Port Republic Road Widening</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$53,095,770</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MPO/ Other</td>
<td>Interstate 81 Improvements</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$607,145,225</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: Projects for Future Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>North Main Street (Noll Drive to Charles St)</td>
<td>Create center turn lane and bicycle lanes, remove on street parking</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$692,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Virginia Avenue (W. Gay Street to 5th Street)</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes, with bicycle lanes, remove parking and make sidewalks</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$8,996,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>North Liberty Street (Edom Road to NCL)</td>
<td>Construct center turn lane and bike/ped facilities.</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$14,982,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Washington Street (from North Main Street to Liberty St)</td>
<td>Make improvements from N. Main St to Liberty St, add left and right turn lanes</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Vine St/Smithland Road Connector</td>
<td><strong>Construct 2-lane major collector facility from Vine Street to Smithland Road</strong></td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$790,500</td>
<td>Deleted by Working Group Consolidated with project 136. Project 136 is now 29A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>North Main Street (from Charles Street to Mount Clinton Pike)</td>
<td>Create a center turn lane and construct bicycle and pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$5,720,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>New Connector between Mount Clinton Pike and Acorn Drive</td>
<td>Construct a two-lane connector facility</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$3,809,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Acorn Drive to Friendship Drive Connection</td>
<td>Construct a two-lane connector facility</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$3,455,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Norwood Street to East Market Street Connections</td>
<td>Construct a local street to connect Norwood Street, Hawkins Street, Franklin Street, Highland Avenue, Long Avenue and East Market Street</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$2,392,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Carpenter Lane/Pike Church Rd Realignment</td>
<td>Realign Carpenter Lane with Pike Church Road at South Main Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>$1,975,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Port Republic Road/Neff Avenue/University Blvd Connection</td>
<td>Construct connection, at minimum, pedestrian and bicycle use and consider public transit use</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$6,560,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Hidden Creek Lane Extension</td>
<td>Construct connection to Erickson Avenue on new location</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$10,078,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Willow Hill Drive</td>
<td>Construct connection to Pleasant Hill Road</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$1,860,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>COST ESTIMATE</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Summit Avenue</td>
<td>Construct connection from Summit Ave to West Market Street including Hillside Avenue to College Avenue</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 6,733,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Longview Drive/Vine Street Connector</td>
<td>Reconnect intersection and extend new road to City limits to connect with Project 4S in Rockingham County.</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 2,569,400</td>
<td>Removed per Working group meeting on 11/14/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Neff Avenue (from Port Republic Road to Turner Ashby Lane)</td>
<td>Widen roadway and add median</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$ 11,826,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Neyland Drive Connection</td>
<td>Construct connection from Neyland Drive to Wyndham Drive</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 1,683,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Keezletown Road</td>
<td>Construct a two-lane facility with median, bicycle and pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$ 6,384,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Connection between Skylark Lane and Port Republic Road</td>
<td>Construct connection from Skylark Lane to Port Republic Road.</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 3,931,625</td>
<td>Removed per Harrisonburg’s guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Connection between Devon Lane and Stone Spring Road</td>
<td>Construct connection from Devon Lane to Stone Spring Road</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 4,075,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>East Kaylor Park Drive Improvements</td>
<td>Construct East Kaylor Park Drive, provide street connection to Boxwood Ct parallel to South Main Street; realign Boxwood Court with Pointe Drive.</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 11,440,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Washington Street Extended</td>
<td>Extend Washington Street as a two-lane major collector facility to the east of Vine Street to the ECL</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 1,063,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Interstate 81 - Smithland Road Interchange</td>
<td>Construct new interchange at Smithland Road</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>$ 53,812,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130A</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>Switchboard Road (West Market Street to NCL)</td>
<td>Widen/reconstruct as 4-lane divided major arterial and add bicycle lanes</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$ 4,596,000</td>
<td>Dependent on 130B in the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Smithland Road (North Valley Pike Route 11 to Old Furnace Road-Linda Lane)</td>
<td>Construct new roadway and Widen on existing roadway to 4-lane urban median arterial facility with bike lanes between North Valley Pike (Route 11) in county to Linda Lane in city and Old Furnace Road</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 11,680,000</td>
<td>Rockingham elected to remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Northeast Connector</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane limited access facility, with center median, curb &amp; gutter, &amp; bike-ped facilities, from Spotswood Trail (US 33E) north to I 81 Exit 251</td>
<td>New location</td>
<td>$ 50,430,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>US 33 Spotswood Trail (from ECL to East MPO Boundary)</td>
<td>Upgrade US 33 E as a 6-lane, urban major arterial</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$ 37,588,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>COST ESTIMATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>US 33 Rawley Pike (from WCL to West MPO Boundary)</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane rural major arterial (from West MPO boundary to WCL)</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$47,894,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Northwest Connector Segment</td>
<td>Widen existing 2-lane Buttermilk Creek Rd to 4-lane limited access facility, with center median, curb &amp; gutter, &amp; bike-ped facilities</td>
<td>Existing Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22C</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Northwest Connector Segment</td>
<td>Fort Lynne Road - Realign and construct new two lane road with center median, curb &amp; gutter, &amp; bike-ped facilities</td>
<td>Existing &amp; New Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>N. Valley Pike Widening</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lanes rural major arterial with center median and bike lanes/shoulder from Mt Clinton Pike to I-81 exit 251 to Route 765</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$44,414,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>New Major Collector Roadway</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane minor arterial as extension of Walton Way between Route 682 and North River Rd</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$5,904,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>New Minor Material Arterial</td>
<td>New Minor Arterial north of NCL Harrisonburg, east of Kratzer Rd</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$5,965,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>New Major Collector Roadway</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane major collector east and west of Kratzer Rd located south of proposed Northwestern Bypass</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$4,817,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>New Major Collector Roadway</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane major collector east and west of Kratzer Rd located immediately north of NCL Harrisonburg</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$3,876,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43B</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Erickson Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>Add center turn lane or create a bypass over to Silver Lake road that eventually connects to Route 33</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$12,376,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Confederacy Drive Extension</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane major collector facility extending Confederacy Dr north of Rt 33</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$4,961,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Autumn Lane</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 2-lane major collector between Osceola Springs Rd and Ridgedale Rd</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$6,703,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Grassy Creek Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen to 2-lane major collector</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$4,817,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension of Peach Grove Ave should happen first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Kratzer Road</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 2-lane major collector facility with bike-ped lanes from NCL Harrisonburg to north MPO boundary</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$13,161,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Friedens Church Rd to Scholars Rd Major Collector</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane major collector connector road that connects Creekside Dr and Valley Branch Rd</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$14,264,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Route 704 Improvements</td>
<td>Widen/improve alignment</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$7,257,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Route 704 Improvements</td>
<td>Upgrade/widen. Straigten alignment at Route 704 and Pleasants Rd.</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$20,602,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Rt 42/11 Connector from Mosby Rd/Huffman Dr to Widen Pike Church Road to a 2-lane minor arterial</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$3,712,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>COST ESTIMATE</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Rt. 42/11 Connector from 0.20 miles west of Claudes Ln. to Covenant Drive</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane minor arterial connection on new location</td>
<td>New Location</td>
<td>$ 6,115,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>New Major Collector Roadway</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane major collector connecting Milky Way Ln to proposed Bridgewater bypass (north of Mt. Crawford Avenue/Dinkel Avenue Intersection.)</td>
<td>Existing and New Location</td>
<td>$ 1,860,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>Millview Drive Extension</td>
<td>Extend Millview Drive to Ottobine Road (Route 257)</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$ 2,767,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mt Crawford</td>
<td>Scholars Road Improvements</td>
<td>Reconstruct/ Improve 2-lane rural collector</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$ 4,981,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A</td>
<td>Mt Crawford</td>
<td>Dinkel Avenue Widening</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane rural arterial with center median and side path (from Mt Crawford Ave to Old Bridgewater Rd (Rt. 867)</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>$ 13,097,500</td>
<td>Project Segmented. 35B should be scored first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Eberly Road Extension / Rte 42 &amp; Rte 11 Connector</td>
<td>2-lane rural arterial extending Eberly Road on east side of Route 42 on new location, improving the intersection of Mosby Rd/Pike Church Rd/Liskey Rd</td>
<td>New Location/ Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77B</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Eberly Rd, between Silver Lake Rd. and Rt. 42</td>
<td>Improve arterial between Silver Lake Rd. and Rt. 42</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>