



Photo: Ashland LOVE sign

RRTPO Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)



NOTES

This meeting is open to the public. Members of the public are invited to attend virtually. Please alert the RRTPO at RRTPO@PlanRVA.org if electronic transmission of this meeting fails for the public. Please refer to our [Statement Regarding Virtual Meeting Participation by Members of the Public](#) for more information.

Check out our complete [Public Meeting Participation Guide](#) online to learn about the different ways you can stay connected and involved.

Meetings are also live streamed and archived on our YouTube Channel at [Plan RVA - YouTube](#).

Members of the public are invited to submit public comments either verbally or in writing. Written comments can be submitted through the Q&A/Chat function on Teams by email to RRTPO@PlanRVA.org. Written comments will be read aloud or summarized during the meeting when possible and will be included in the meeting minutes. Verbal comments will be taken during the Public Comment Period on the agenda.

Powered By:



PlanRVA is where the region comes together to look ahead. Established in 1969, PlanRVA promotes cooperation across the region's nine localities and supports programs and organizations like the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization, Central Virginia Transportation Authority, the Emergency Management Alliance of Central Virginia, Lower Chickahominy Watershed Collaborative and Don't Trash Central Virginia.

AGENDA

Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meeting

Thursday, September 17, 2026, 12:00 pm - 1:30 pm

Call to Order: 12:15 pm

PlanRVA James River Board Room, 424 Hull Street, Suite 300,
Richmond, VA 23224 and via Teams Webinar Link.

If you wish to participate in this meeting virtually, please register through this

[WEBINAR LINK](#)

Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) FY2027 Outreach & Engagement Purpose:

To ensure the broader public can meaningfully participate in regional planning efforts to ensure plans are centered on people and communities.

CTAC Purpose:

The Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) advises the RRTPO on issues, plans, and matters appropriate for citizen input and ensures we're connecting to and engaging with the diverse people in our region.

12:00-12:15 pm – Join your colleagues for lunch and make informal connections

12:15 pm – Meeting Call to Order: Welcome and Introductions

(Chair Erin Phelan)

A. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Roll Call & Certification of a Quorum

(Sarah-Keel Crews, PlanRVA)

2. Consideration of Amendments to the Agenda

(Chair Phelan)

3. Approval of the May 21, 2026, and July 23, 2026, CTAC Meeting Minutes – page 4

(Chair Phelan)

Action Requested: a motion to approve the meeting minutes as presented.

4. Open Public Comment

(Chair Phelan)

5. CTAC Chair Report
(Chair Phelan, 5 min)

6. At-Large Member Organization Endorsement – page 26
(Chair Phelan)

Action Requested: a motion to approve the recommendation of the organizations to the Policy Board.

7. PQUAD Focus Group Feedback
(Holly Gordon, PlanRVA)

B. AMBASSADOR READINESS

1. LRTP 2050 Plan Adoption Debrief
(Kristin Hott, PlanRVA, 20 min)

C. UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM TOPIC

1. Transit Readiness Discussion
(Chair Phelan, 25 min)

D. OUTREACH NEEDS

1. Future Event Needs – CTAC News
(Kristin Hott, PlanRVA, 10 min)

Discussion Items: Natural Resources Plan, TIP Air Quality Conformity Update Comment, LRTP Beyond Adoption

E. MEMBER SHARE

1. Jordan Cole & Sera Erickson, VCU (2 min)
2. Ernest Moore, Jr, RDOT (2 min)
3. Open Member Comments

F. LOOKING FORWARD and NEXT STEPS

1. Next Member Share Volunteers
(Chair Phelan)

G. ADJOURNMENT

Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 21, 12:00 p.m.

PlanRVA James River Board Room, 424 Hull Street, Suite 300, Richmond, VA 23224
and via Zoom

Members and Alternates Present (X), Virtual (V):

17,

Town of Ashland	1	New Kent County	2	Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU)	1
Upton S. Martin	X	Bill Dismore	X	John D. Leonard	
Don Root	X	Powhatan County	2	Jordan Cole (A)	
Charles City County	1	Vacant		VA Conservation Network (VCN)	1
Bill Walton		City of Richmond	4	Fatima Kamara	
Chesterfield County	4	Andrew Bunn	X	Richard Hankins (A)	
Phillip Plymale		Alex Brackman		RVA Rapid Transit	1
Erin Phelan (A)		Sera Erickson		Chad Sanders	X
Goochland County	2	James Hutzler	X	NAACP, Richmond Branch	1
Robert L. Basham Jr.	V	Chamber RVA	1	James Minor	
Vacant		Demas Boudreaux	X	Charles Willis (A)	
Hanover County	3	League of Women Voters	1	Virginians for High-Speed Rail	1
Charlie Waddell		Sarah Weisiger	X	Michael Testerman	X
Henrico County	4	Karen Rosenblum (A)		RIC Area Bicycling Assoc.	1
Gordon Dixon, Chair	X	RVA Dept. of Transportation	1	Champe M. Burnley	X
Michael Wiebe	X	Ernest Moore, Jr.	X	John Hamilton (A)	
				SPAN Center	1
				Tony Williams (Missi Boyer)	

The technology used for the RRTPO CTAC meeting was a web-hosted service created by Zoom and YouTube Live Streaming and was open and accessible for participation by members of the public. A recording of this meeting is available on our [Plan RVA YouTube Channel](#).

A. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

During the Pathways and Intersections lunch conversation, Andrew Bunn presented background material on transportation funding in response to a committee request from the previous meeting for additional discussion on the topic. He had provided information to Kristin, who assembled a Menti-based exercise to help frame the conversation. Members were advised that the presentation was not intended to be a comprehensive or technical deep dive, but rather a high-level overview supported by graphics designed to illustrate the complexity of transportation funding and the general flow of funds through the system.

As discussion continued, Andrew briefly explained that the funding graphics were primarily intended to show how complicated the transportation funding process is, noting that only a small number of people in the state could fully explain every aspect of the chart. He clarified that one graphic focused on allocations, while another addressed revenues flowing into the state and how those revenues are distributed. Committee members then asked questions about maintenance funding, including whether only a small percentage of transportation funds was reserved for maintenance. Staff clarified that maintenance receives a much larger share—approximately 51 percent of the total transportation funding amount at the top level of the flow chart—and that construction funds may also be used to address maintenance shortfalls. It was emphasized that, under the Code of Virginia, maintenance and operations are the state's first priority, with new construction or expansion funded only after those needs are met.

The conversation then shifted to federal transportation legislation and the implications of a newly released federal bill. Members observed that the proposal appeared to provide significantly less funding than the 2021 federal infrastructure legislation and included fewer grant and formula funding opportunities, though it would still shape national transportation policy for the next five years if enacted. Additional discussion focused on the uncertainty surrounding federal reauthorization, leadership changes in Congress, and the likelihood of a bill passing before upcoming elections. Staff noted that early summaries suggested the proposal included some positive developments, particularly for MPOs, such as improved opportunities for direct federal grant access and expanded planning dollars to advance projects further in design. At the same time, there was concern that the proposal did not maintain the same level of support for multimodal transportation priorities seen in prior legislation. Members agreed it would be helpful to circulate a recent briefing document summarizing the federal committee action, and Andrew concluded by noting that anyone seeking a more detailed explanation of the state transportation funding graphic could consult the March CTB presentation, which provides a much more extensive walkthrough.

After the discussion concluded, CTAC Chair Gordon Dixon called the meeting to order at 12:21pm and allowed members to introduce themselves. Afterwards, Sarah-Keel Crews certified a quorum.

Chair Dixon then asked for a motion to approve the March 19th meeting minutes. On a motion by Mr. Upton Martin, seconded by Mr. Ernest Moore Jr., all voted in favor of approving the minutes.

Seeing there was no public commentary, Chair Dixon turned the floor over to Martha Shickle, PlanRVA, to address the FY27 UPWP.

B. PRESENTATIONS and COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

FY27 Unified Planning Work Program

Martha Shickle, PlanRVA, led a discussion on the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). She explained that the UPWP serves as the MPO's annual work plan for the upcoming fiscal year, outlining both the allocation of federal planning funds and the activities the MPO will undertake. Specifically, she noted that the MPO receives PL funds from the Federal Highway Administration and Section 5303 funds from the Federal Transit Administration, and the UPWP documents how those resources will be programmed. Ms. Shickle reported that the Policy Board approved the UPWP at its April 23 meeting and that staff successfully submitted it to state and federal partners by the required May 1 deadline. She also explained that, because the MPO underwent its triennial recertification review in February, staff worked to reflect verbal feedback from that process in the new UPWP, even though the formal report from FHWA and FTA had not yet been received. In addition, she noted that the document had been reformatted in recent years to make it more accessible and understandable to the public, including a section highlighting major accomplishments from the prior year.

The conversation then turned to how the CTAC might more actively engage with the work program and fulfill its advisory role. Referring to the bylaw's language describing CTAC's responsibility to advise on issues, plans, and matters appropriate for citizen input, Ms. Shickle invited members to identify the topics they would like to focus on over the coming year. Members responded by underscoring the need for greater public understanding of transportation planning and funding, noting that these processes are highly complex and often difficult for residents to follow. One member suggested that it would be useful for the committee to spend time learning how transportation funding works and how available dollars are leveraged at the state and regional levels. Another member, speaking from the Richmond perspective, emphasized that pedestrian and bicycle safety are pressing concerns in the city and expressed particular interest in learning more about the UPWP task related to selecting a high-injury network corridor. Members also reflected on the committee's advisory role and suggested that a brief standing update at each meeting on upcoming Policy Board topics and decisions would help CTAC members stay informed and better communicate with the communities they represent.

Ms. Shickle supported that suggestion and linked it to feedback received during the federal certification review, which encouraged the MPO to provide more specific timelines for work program deliverables. She proposed that staff could develop a document for CTAC showing anticipated Policy Board topics and actions over the course of the year so members would have greater visibility into what is coming and more time to prepare comments or raise issues. She explained that such a planning tool could help shape CTAC agendas and ensure the committee has opportunities to discuss matters before Policy Board action is taken. At the same time, she acknowledged that some items arise on short notice and cannot

always be forecasted well in advance. Even so, the group agreed that providing an evolving schedule of expected topics, along with regular reminders at CTAC meetings about what is upcoming, would strengthen the committee's advisory function, improve communication with the public, and better equip members to share timely information with their constituents

Ernest Moore Jr. left the meeting at approximately 12:40 p.m.

Community Engagement Update

Chair Dixon then gave the floor to Kristin Hott, who provided a brief update on current public engagement opportunities. She noted that members had the CTAC News in front of them and invited candid feedback on whether the format and content were useful, encouraging members to contact her directly if they would prefer different information or a different approach. She explained that the purpose of the CTAC News is to help members understand what engagement opportunities are currently open across a range of topics, not just transportation, so they can share that information more broadly in their communities.

Ms. Hott then highlighted several current and upcoming initiatives. First, she noted that there was an open public review and comment period for the air quality conformity assessment, which she explained is a required process tied to the region's history of nonattainment in the 1990s, even though the region has remained in attainment for many years. She said the draft plan was available for public review through June 14 and suggested that this provided a useful opportunity for community members to learn more about how regional transportation planning considers air quality impacts. She also reminded the group that the Engage site contains information from all three phases of long-range transportation plan outreach, including vision and values, regional goals, and investment package input, and said that members could refer community members there to better understand what has been heard so far. She noted that Kerry would provide a more detailed update on the latest developments related to that work.

Ms. Hott also drew attention to the RVA Weaver Awards, describing them as an important regional opportunity and explaining that she had been traveling around localities such as Goochland, Powhatan, New Kent, and Charles City to raise awareness. She explained that these awards function as regional micro-grants and are part of a broader national community weaving initiative connected to the Aspen Institute's Weave: The Social Fabric Project. She reported that the region had been selected as one of a limited number of community hosts nationwide and that the initiative would result in at least 20 awards across the region, with grants ranging from \$2,500 to \$5,000 each. She noted that additional information was available in a handout and through a recorded informational session and encouraged members to help spread awareness. Finally, she mentioned an upcoming recycling barriers study being conducted in partnership with the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority, explaining that staff would be engaging the community over the summer to better understand barriers to recycling and identify areas for improvement as landfill capacity becomes a growing concern. She concluded by again inviting feedback on the CTAC News and briefly noting recent outreach efforts, including participation in a Speed Symposium the previous evening.

Completed Transportation Plan Engagements

After Kristin Hott concluded her update, Kerry Wagenhauser presented on recently completed transportation plan engagement efforts. She emphasized that public input is essential to regional planning because it connects decision-makers with residents, helps ensure policies reflect real community needs, builds trust, and strengthens shared ownership, particularly by elevating historically underrepresented voices. She also cautioned members that, although survey response totals were strong, the results likely reflect some self-selection bias because respondents were people motivated enough to complete the surveys. Kerry noted that safety remains a central theme across all planning work, with staff using crash data, trend analysis, performance targets, coordination with partner agencies, and attention to near misses and other warning signs to identify unsafe conditions before serious crashes occur.

Reviewing the safety survey results, Ms. Wagenhauser said respondents overwhelmingly opposed unsafe driving behaviors, especially speeding in school zones, residential areas, urban and suburban streets, and construction zones, as well as distracted driving. Average responses fell firmly between “disagree” and “strongly disagree,” indicating broad support for safer behavior on the road. She said respondents also strongly supported roadway design and policy changes that favor pedestrian and cyclist safety, including lower-speed street design, yielding requirements, additional crossing time for pedestrians, traffic calming, crosswalks, push-button crossings, and bike lanes. She summarized the findings as clear evidence that the public supports safety improvements that reduce harmful interactions between vehicles and other road users.

Turning to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Kerry described it as the region’s short-term funded action list and compared it to a grocery list of projects already “in the cart” because funding is in place. She reported that survey respondents generally felt too much funding is directed toward highway projects and not enough toward transit and other modes, though she noted that many highway projects also include pedestrian-supportive features such as sidewalks. Overall, respondents did not express especially strong feelings about current TIP projects, but they did report only modestly improved understanding of the TIP after engaging with the material, with average self-reported understanding at 63 out of 100.

Ms. Wagenhauser then discussed the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization’s long-range transportation plan, describing it as the region’s fiscally constrained 20- to 25-year transportation blueprint. She said public response to this portion of engagement was especially strong and showed overwhelming support for “mode shift,” meaning less emphasis on highway expansion and greater investment in transit, walking, biking, safety, sustainability, and other alternatives. She also reviewed online engagement metrics, distinguishing among visitors, views, and contributors, and noted that the safety plan generated the highest number of contributors while the TIP generated the fewest.

Kristin Hott added an important clarification about those figures, explaining that paper survey responses entered by staff into the Engage site may not appear as separate contributors because the system can count multiple entries under a single IP address. She noted that this occurred frequently during both the safety and long-range transportation plan outreach processes, meaning the contributor totals likely understate actual participation. Members then asked whether the safety survey findings—particularly the roughly 1,050 responses—had been presented to the TPO or Policy Board. Kerry said she was unsure because her focus is the TIP, and Martha Shickle clarified that the safety input had not yet been presented due to timing and agenda constraints but was expected to come forward in the upcoming fiscal year. Members stressed that the volume and consistency of the safety input showed a clear trend that should be shared with decision-makers.

Staff responded that the Policy Board has already shown strong interest in safety, having approved annual regional safety targets in February and treated safety as one of its top priorities in recent years. Staff explained that implementation of the safety plan is somewhat contingent on future funding and that the recent public input was collected in part to help shape recommendations on next steps. Those recommendations are expected to return to the Policy Board later in the summer or, if necessary, in September. Members were encouraged to consider what role CTAC might play in helping advance that conversation.

Discussion then shifted to the long-range transportation plan and the public's strong preference for mode shift. Members asked what opportunities remain for advocacy if the final project mix does not fully reflect that preference. Staff explained that public engagement on the long-range plan is still ongoing, but also noted that the project list approved by the Policy Board in April was a necessary procedural step for completing the required air quality conformity analysis. Because the region has remained under conformity requirements due to its former nonattainment status, any major change to the approved list at this stage would require restarting conformity analysis, delaying adoption of the plan and potentially putting all projects at risk. Staff emphasized, however, that the long-range plan remains a living document that can be amended during its five-year life cycle, creating future opportunities to continue advancing mode shift priorities.

Members also discussed the challenge of explaining project categories to the public. Several noted that projects labeled as “highway” projects may still contain meaningful bicycle, pedestrian, or transit elements, but those multimodal features are not always evident in project descriptions. A member asked whether staff could provide a breakdown showing what percentage of projects include sidewalks, shared-use paths, or other active transportation components. Staff said that type of breakdown is likely possible, though defining project “purpose” can become complicated depending on whether the measure is based on dollars, usage, or other factors. Staff agreed that federal labels often obscure multimodal elements and said this was helpful feedback on how to make transportation information more understandable and transparent.

The committee also discussed Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding and its relationship to conformity and mode shift. Staff confirmed that the region still receives CMAQ funds, but explained that those funds are tied to the region's conformity status and are expected to go away once conformity reviews are no longer required. Members observed that this is somewhat counterintuitive given that multimodal investments also support congestion mitigation goals, and they asked whether those funds could be used more intentionally to support transit, bicycling, and walking. Staff explained that the region does have a flexible funding process, using a scorecard similar to Smart Scale to allocate funding and help localities leverage additional dollars, though that process may not always favor smaller or alternative transportation projects. Members recalled that CMAQ funding is roughly \$30 million annually and expressed interest in learning more about how it has been used and what may replace it when it ends.

As the discussion continued, members suggested that conformity, CMAQ, funding flexibility, and mode shift would make a valuable topic for a future CTAC meeting. Staff agreed and indicated that a deeper briefing could help the committee better understand the tradeoffs, procedural constraints, and policy choices shaping the region's transportation decisions. Kerry said she would note members' interest in both how CMAQ funds have been used in recent years and what future funding options may exist once that source is no longer available.

PQuad Engagement Plan Preview

With no further immediate questions, the meeting transitioned to Martha Shickle, who returned to the Unified Planning Work Program and Task 14, the prioritization process pilot previously referred to as the PEQUOD grant. Martha explained that the pilot is directly tied to the committee's broader discussion about transparency, tradeoffs, and how transportation decisions are made. She said the project is still in its early stages and that, from last fall through this coming September, staff are essentially "planning to plan" by completing a literature review and refining the project framework.

Martha explained that the effort is intended to strengthen the region's prioritization process by building on the transportation demand model already used to evaluate investments in highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and transit. That model currently helps estimate effects on congestion, air quality, and other transportation measures. The goal of the pilot, however, is to broaden that analysis to better capture wider impacts on the built environment, economic conditions, and community pressures such as housing affordability. She cited investments like the Pulse and the planned east-west line as examples of projects that can create both positive outcomes and unintended consequences, and said the long-term aim is to move toward a more holistic, outcome-based way of evaluating transportation investments.

She added that the pilot is also intended to make the decision-making process more transparent and understandable to the public. Martha noted that the transportation model can feel abstract and inaccessible, and that elected officials often hear from residents who do not understand how projects are prioritized or why one advances over

another. She explained that Congress funded this program to help a select group of MPOs improve transparency in decision-making and noted that PlanRVA's MPO is the only MPO in Virginia to receive this funding. The concept under development is a revised scoring system that incorporates stronger measures of economic return on investment and other impacts aligned with the region's scenario planning framework. In practice, the tool is expected to support Policy Board decisions for funding programs such as CMAQ, RSTBG, Smart Scale recommendations, and CBTA-related investments, while potentially evolving into a broader framework for federal and state transportation funding decisions over time.

Martha also described a public-facing element of the pilot: an interactive web-based platform that would allow staff, advisory groups, decision-makers, and the public to explore different investment scenarios and better understand the tradeoffs associated with them. She emphasized that the tool is not intended to dictate decisions, but to provide a more robust and transparent analytical basis for them. It would also help explain why regional decision-makers might sometimes depart from a technical ranking or an adopted plan.

Continuing the discussion, Martha emphasized that a clearer scoring and ranking system would not eliminate exceptions but would help explain them. She said there are valid reasons a project might advance even if it does not rank highest technically, including public input, geographic balance, regional consensus-building, partnership opportunities, or a desire to invest more intentionally in historically underinvested communities. She also noted that the grant requires staff to assess the public's current understanding of how transportation decisions are made and then repeat that assessment later to see whether the pilot improves public understanding. Staff are still considering how best to design that pre- and post-assessment so that it produces meaningful results.

Martha suggested that CTAC could serve as a useful group for that testing because members are engaged enough to provide thoughtful feedback while still reflecting the perspective of nontechnical community representatives. A member noted that CTAC itself is a relatively uncommon feature among MPOs and suggested that the committee could function well as the pilot's test group. Martha agreed that staff were interested in that possibility. Another member observed that, while transportation planning is complex, most residents are focused primarily on outcomes such as safety, mobility, and congestion rather than technical details, and encouraged staff to continue learning from peer regions and national best practices. Martha responded that the Richmond region is itself viewed as a leader in scenario planning, while also agreeing that there is still value in learning from others.

Other members voiced strong support for the pilot's transparency goals, particularly the idea of creating a tool that clearly shows what projects are being selected, where funding comes from, and what factors shaped those choices. One member noted that existing state funding portals can be difficult to interpret because they often use vague funding labels and said a clearer local tool would be very valuable. Another specifically supported involving CTAC in the pilot because it would both help educate the committee and help

staff refine how they communicate a highly technical process to the public. As discussion concluded, members and staff agreed that the themes raised throughout the meeting—including transportation funding, conformity and CMAQ, mode shift, and the prioritization pilot—are closely connected and would make strong topics for future meetings. The chair observed that a useful stream of future agenda items was beginning to emerge and noted that, as the meeting had reached its usual adjournment time, anyone needing to leave could do so while the group continued informally.

Michael Wiebe left the meeting at 1:29 p.m.

Member Share: ChamberRVA

Demas Boudreaux and Chet Parsons offered reflections on the recent ChamberRVA Intercity Visit and the value of the program for the region's ongoing collaboration across jurisdictions. Mr. Boudreaux, speaking on behalf of ChamberRVA, thanked Mr. Parsons for participating and noted that ChamberRVA serves the broader region across nine jurisdictions. He said one of the strengths of the program was that the speakers and organizers presented ideas from the host region in a way that made them relevant and adaptable to the Richmond region's circumstances, rather than simply showcasing examples that would be difficult to translate locally. Mr. Parsons and others were credited with helping shape a program that acknowledged local realities and made it easier for participants to think constructively about how outside examples could inform regional practice here.

The discussion also highlighted one of the major themes that emerged from the visit: the challenge of working across a fragmented local government structure. Mr. Parsons noted that this remains one of the region's recurring obstacles, particularly in Virginia, where local governments often operate in highly separate ways. In response to a question about whether the comparison region had a similar governance framework, he explained that it is also located in a Dillon Rule state, which made the comparison especially useful, even though its local government structure differs somewhat because several key cities are organized within a county context. Even so, Mr. Parsons said the region shared enough similarities—in both state-local tensions and regional coordination challenges—that the exchange felt more applicable than abstract. He noted that participants also heard pointed commentary there about relationships between the legislature and local governments, which sounded familiar in important ways.

Both Mr. Boudreaux and Mr. Parsons underscored the broader value of the trip as a regional convening opportunity. Mr. Boudreaux remarked that one of ChamberRVA's key contributions is its ability to bring together jurisdictions that do not always naturally operate in alignment, helping foster the relationships needed for regional collaboration. He also noted that this year's trip drew especially strong participation from local government, with 205 attendees overall and approximately 25 percent of them being local elected or appointed officials. He said eight of the region's nine member jurisdictions were represented, making it one of the strongest showings in recent years. The discussion emphasized that the benefits of the trip extended beyond formal programming, as it also

created space for local officials, business leaders, and nonprofit representatives to build social capital, exchange ideas across jurisdictional lines, and work through regional issues in a setting somewhat removed from the day-to-day scrutiny of home.

Partner Meeting Updates

The meeting then moved into partner updates, with Ken Lantz, PlanRVA, providing a brief report on recent developments at GRTC. He shared that at its April meeting, the GRTC board approved a contract for architectural and engineering services for the western extension of the Pulse bus rapid transit line from Willow Lawn to Parham Road. He said the current schedule anticipates completion of design by August 2027, followed by construction from April 2028 through September 2029, with service expected to begin later in 2029. Mr. Lantz also reported that GRTC approved a contract for construction management, engineering, and inspection services related to the installation of additional passenger amenities, including 44 shelters and 28 benches, with that work expected to be completed by the end of the year. He further noted that GRTC had recently approved its FY27 operating budget, which totals a little over \$100 million and assumes continuation of fare-free service. In addition, he explained that GRTC had completed its required regional public transportation plan in order to remain eligible for Central Virginia Transportation Authority funding, with the plan anticipating approximately \$35 million in funding, about \$33 million of which would be programmed and roughly \$2 million placed in reserve. Finally, he announced an upcoming “Tap into Transit” community fundraising event scheduled for July 14 from 4:30 to 7:30 p.m. at Main Street Station, which will include a silent auction and celebrate the impact of open-access transit.

C. LOOKING FORWARD and NEXT STEPS

1. CTAC Member Congrats

The chair closed the meeting with a brief set of recognitions for CTAC members, offering congratulations to several individuals for recent accomplishments. He first acknowledged Andrew Bunn and former CTAC chair Sera Erickson, noting that both had recently completed their master’s degrees in Urban and Regional Planning. He then highlighted Mr. Bunn’s additional achievement of winning a planning competition event and invited him to briefly describe his capstone project. Mr. Bunn explained that his project focused on proposing a resilience microhub network for Richmond and on planning and beginning implementation of the first such hub in the Hillside Court area of Southside. The chair and members responded positively, recognizing the relevance and value of that work.

Chair Dixon also acknowledged James Hutzler for recently receiving an IDEAL Award from Rappahannock Community College. He noted that Mr. Hutzler serves there as an adjunct faculty member teaching political science and described the award as recognizing employees who exemplify the college’s values of integrity, diversity and inclusion, excellence, access, and lifelong learning through their performance, service, and broader contributions to the institution’s mission. The recognition was presented as another example of the impressive professional accomplishments represented within the committee.

2. Next Member Share Volunteers

Chair Dixon then asked members to volunteer for the next meeting's member share. He himself said that he'd be happy to present Henrico County's traffic calming initiatives. James Hutzler agreed to give an update on the state budget, and RVA Rapid Transit representative, Chad Sanders, volunteered to share as well.

3. FY27 Leadership & Meeting Schedule

Sarah-Keel Crews, PlanRVA provided an update on planning for the FY27 CTAC leadership rotation and meeting schedule. She explained that the committee typically meets on a regular cadence, but before sending out dates for the upcoming fiscal year, staff wanted to check with members to confirm that the proposed schedule would work—particularly because July can be a difficult month for attendance due to vacations and other summer travel. During the discussion, July 16 was identified as the likely date under the committee's regular third-Thursday pattern, and members confirmed that the timing would work.

C. ADJOURNMENT

With no further comment, the meeting was adjourned at 1:40pm by Chair Dixon, who noted that the next meeting will be July 16, 2026 at 12:00 p.m.

Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 23, 12:15 p.m.

PlanRVA James River Board Room, 424 Hull Street, Suite 300, Richmond, VA 23224
and via Teams

Members and Alternates Present (X), Virtual (V):

33 Votes, 17 for quorum

Town of Ashland	1	New Kent County	2	Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU)	1
Upton S. Martin		Bill Dismore		John D. Leonard	
Don Root	V	Powhatan County	2	Jordan Cole (A)	X
Charles City County	1	Vacant		VA Conservation Network (VCN)	1
Bill Walton		City of Richmond	4	Fatima Kamara	
Chesterfield County	4	Andrew Bunn	X	Richard Hankins (A)	
Erin Phelan* Chair	X	Alex Brackman		RVA Rapid Transit	1
Rodriques Jackson		Sera Erickson	V	Chad Sanders	X
Sheretta Byrd	X	James Hutzler	X	NAACP, Richmond Branch	1
Dr. Courtney Hamilton	V	Chamber RVA	1	James Minor	
Goochland County	2	Demas Boudreaux	X	Charles Willis (A)	
Robert L. Basham Jr.* Vice Chair	X	League of Women Voters	1	Virginians for High-Speed Rail	1
Vacant		Sarah Weisiger	X	Michael Testerman	X
Hanover County	3	Karen Rosenblum (A)		RIC Area Bicycling Assoc.	1
Charlie Waddell	X	RVA Dept. of Transportation	1	Champe M. Burnley	
Henrico County	4	Ernest Moore, Jr.	X	John Hamilton (A)	
Gordon Dixon				SPAN Center	1
Michael Wiebe				Tony Williams (Missi Boyer)	V

The technology used for the RRTPO CTAC meeting was a web-hosted service created by Teams and YouTube Live Streaming and was open and accessible for participation by members of the public. A recording of this meeting is available on our [Plan RVA YouTube Channel](#).

A. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Phelan called the meeting to order at 12:18 p.m. and introduced herself as the FY27 Chair. She also welcomed Bob Basham as the Vice Chair. Ken Lantz, a recently retired PlanRVA team member who worked with CTAC, was also welcomed as a guest. Chair Phelan then noted that there were a few new CTAC members. Sarah-Keel Crews introduced the new members who were present, then took the roll call. During the roll call, it was noted that Ernest Moore Jr. brought an intern, Calvin, to the meeting. There was not a physical quorum, so no action could be taken on any items. Committee members did not have any considerations of amendments to the agenda and there was no public comment.

Demas Boudreaux asked the Chair for permission to make a brief announcement after public comment, noting that he might need to leave early. With the Chair's approval, he shared information about an upcoming ChamberRVA Chesterfield transportation-focused meeting sponsored by PlanRVA. He explained that the event would cover topics including the Powhite Parkway extension, the Willis Road interchange, bus rapid transit, and economic development. He noted that registration is available through the ChamberRVA website, where attendees could find his contact information, the event calendar, time, and location. The meeting will be held in person at the Tenmans facility across from Kroger's, near the former Cloverleaf Mall area. He added that the event costs \$20 but interested attendees could email him for access. Staff also noted that the event is listed on the Long-Range Transportation Plan page on the Engage site, along with other upcoming events. Mr. Boudreaux concluded by confirming the event is in person only and that coffee and pastries will be provided.

Chair Phelan then transitioned to the minutes, asking the committee if there were any comments. Seeing none, she moved on to the at-large member organization discussion. Because there was not a quorum, the committee was not able to vote on a recommendation, but they were able to discuss the agenda item.

The committee discussed the at-large member organization endorsement item, noting that no vote would be taken. Staff explained that recommendations for filling open organizational seats had been included in the packet and would ordinarily be voted on for advancement to the policy board for approval. In response to a question, staff clarified that there are two vacant organizational seats, and each organization may have one representative and one alternate, with only one vote per organization; therefore, the appointments could involve up to four individuals total but only two voting organizational seats and one stipend per seat. The two recommended organizations were identified as the Hanover County NAACP and LAR. A member expressed support for adding the Hanover County NAACP, noting recent discussions with its president and emphasizing that broader participation and additional perspectives strengthen the committee. The member specifically praised Ms. Jordan's community activism at the county and school board levels and stated that she would bring a valuable perspective to CTAC. Staff also clarified that the vacancies were not newly created but had existed for at least two years.

With no further discussion, the committee moved on to an informational item regarding the start of the new fiscal year, including linked attendance and stipend policies. Ms. Crews encouraged members to review the policies and explained that new CTAC members, or those new to the stipend process, would be contacted separately about eligibility and required paperwork if they wished to opt in. In response to a question, staff confirmed that members who had already completed stipend paperwork do not need to resubmit it annually unless they choose to change their stipend election, even though the policies are re-adopted each year.

B. AMBASSADOR READINESS

Transportation Planning Cycle

Myles Busching, PlanRVA's Director of Transportation, provided a high-level overview of the regional transportation planning cycle for new CTAC members. He explained that the process begins with identifying transportation issues and potential solutions through studies and plans developed by VDOT, DRPT, GRTC, PlanRVA, and local governments.

Those needs are then considered through the region's long-range transportation plan, which prioritizes projects over a 20-year period based on regional goals, available funding, and practical trade-offs, since transportation projects are costly and needs typically exceed available resources. Mr. Busching noted that the 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan is nearing completion and is scheduled for adoption by the policy board in September. He also described the RRTPO's role in project funding, explaining that it both controls certain funding programs directly and serves as an applicant for competitive state programs such as Smart Scale, where the region may submit priority projects such as interchanges, bus rapid transit routes, and other large-scale investments. Once funding is awarded, project agreements must be coordinated with federal and state partners before implementation begins, although the region itself does not construct the projects.

After projects are completed, the RRTPO uses performance measures to evaluate whether they achieved the intended outcomes, and that evaluation informs the next cycle of planning. In response to a question, Mr. Busching explained that the RRTPO directly selects about \$35 million in projects annually across four funding programs, often contributing funding to help projects compete more effectively for larger funding sources. Examples included improvements near the port at Deepwater Terminal, sections of the Fall Line Trail, and replacement of the Mayo Bridge.

Mr. Busching then responded to a question about transportation project cost overruns by noting that escalating costs have become an industry-wide challenge, particularly following COVID-19 and recent construction inflation. He explained that the RRTPO has established a soft cap on how much it will increase its contribution to a project when costs rise, generally limiting additional regional funding to a 50% cost increase, with limited waiver categories for broader economic conditions. While this does not solve the broader issue of cost escalation, Mr. Busching said it helps manage the region's financial risk by placing responsibility for costs beyond that threshold back on localities and project sponsors. He acknowledged that finding a practical long-term solution to fully capping project costs remains an unresolved challenge across the transportation industry.

Mr. Busching then presented the newly adopted regional Safety Action Plan as a practical example of the transportation planning cycle in action. He explained that, unlike the prior safety plan, this version is intended to be more action-oriented and to give the region a stronger role in advancing safety improvements rather than simply providing findings to localities. The plan, adopted by the policy board in July, identifies a regional high-injury network showing where fatal and serious injury crashes are concentrated. Mr. Busching noted that about 1% of regional roadways accounted for approximately 70% of fatal and serious injury crashes reviewed, with many of the highest-risk locations located on major arterial roads such as Routes 60, 360, and 250, where traffic volumes and speeds are higher. That analysis, combined with community input and corridor continuity considerations, was used to designate priority safety corridors where improvements could have the greatest impact.

He outlined six major actions included in the plan: developing a regional street design guide, launching a road safety assessment program, creating a quick-build toolkit, implementing quick-build safety projects, coordinating complementary safety plans with state and local partners, and maintaining a safety dashboard to track progress over time. Mr. Busching emphasized that the plan is not intended to be a 20-year-only effort but is designed to generate near-term projects and improvements, including quick-build treatments such as flex posts and other temporary materials that can be tested before being made permanent. He also explained that potential funding sources could include HSIP, SGR, and the RRTPO's own dedicated funding programs, depending on the nature of the projects.

In response to questions, Mr. Busching clarified that the plan considers both physical infrastructure and behavioral factors, but it takes an infrastructure-first approach based on the Safe System framework. The goal is to build redundancy into the transportation network so that people are protected even when mistakes occur. The crash analysis included all users, including drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists, with a major emphasis on vulnerable road users because pedestrians have represented a growing share of regional fatalities, roughly one-third of the total in the prior year. When asked whether pedestrian deaths are assessed based on fault or avoidability, Mr. Busching explained that the planning approach assumes fatal and serious injury crashes are preventable and focuses on designing a system that keeps people safe even when they make poor decisions. He also confirmed that the Safety Action Plan is part of the region's implementation of Vision Zero and reflects a shift toward more proactive regional action to reduce deaths and serious injuries. He added that safety was elevated as the highest-weighted scoring component in the long-range transportation plan based on community and advisory work group feedback, reinforcing that safety is the region's top transportation priority.

FY27 Schedule & UPWP Work Plan

Holly Gordon provided an overview of the FY27 CTAC schedule and UPWP work plan alignment, explaining that the committee's meeting topics have been intentionally coordinated with the Unified Planning Work Program so CTAC's work supports the TPO's required activities and helps members prepare to engage with their communities. She noted that each meeting agenda will follow a consistent structure in response to member requests for clearer preparation, more relevant transportation information, and ongoing outreach guidance. Ms. Gordon also

highlighted a new optional November field trip, which is being developed in response to member interest. The field trip will allow members to participate in an on-the-ground safety corridor audit with regional engineers and experience how the Safety Action Plan is applied in practice. Because the regular November meeting is needed for an important focus group, the field trip will be scheduled as an additional optional activity, with more details to come.

Michael Wiebe joined virtually at approximately 12:50 p.m.

Public Engagement Plan Annual Update

Ms. Gordon then reviewed the annual update to the Public Engagement Plan, which was originally created in FY24 and must be updated each year with benchmarking data. She explained that the update compares FY25 and FY26 engagement metrics to show year-over-year trends. Overall, she said the numbers are generally steady, with some increases in engagement site activity, newsletter subscribers, and media mentions. The increase in engagement site use was expected because PlanRVA is using the site more consistently and the public is becoming more familiar with it as a central place for information and input. Ms. Gordon also noted slight decreases in events attended and people engaged, explaining that FY25 included four major planning products, which naturally created more opportunities for public-facing engagement than FY26. She emphasized that engagement numbers are not expected to increase exponentially every year and may vary depending on the number and type of planning efforts requiring public input. Ms. Gordon concluded that the overall numbers are positive, while acknowledging that there is always more work to do to reach broader and more diverse communities, and she reminded members that related materials and QR codes are available online.

During the question-and-answer portion, Charlie Waddell asked how PlanRVA approaches outreach and education goals from year to year, particularly with underserved communities or groups that may be harder to reach. He asked whether those communities are revisited on a regular cycle, such as every two or three years, or primarily by invitation. Ms. Gordon explained that there is not a single standing rule for how often groups are revisited, but that the approach can be defined within specific engagement strategies. For example, in the Long-Range Transportation Plan engagement strategy, PlanRVA set a goal of attempting to revisit the same groups three times during that planning process. However, she noted that this has been more difficult in practice than expected because community groups are not always available, interested, or ready to participate within the required planning timelines. She emphasized that relationship-building is a long-term effort.

Mr. Waddell then reflected that a lower number of engagements with underserved communities in a given year does not necessarily mean outreach is shrinking, because the pool of potential contacts and relationships may still be expanding even if fewer groups are engaged during that period. Ms. Gordon responded that

the issue is not always that simple and noted that the distinction between “underserved” and “hard to engage” communities in the 2024 Public Engagement Plan may not be clear enough. She suggested that the next update to the plan could revisit those definitions and consider whether more specific language or measures are needed.

PPPP Engagement Activity

Ms. Gordon introduced the PPPP, or “PQuad,” engagement activity by explaining that it is part of a pilot program intended to make PlanRVA’s transportation project selection process easier for the public to understand. She noted that the program is focused on improving transparency, strengthening data-driven decision-making, and helping people better understand how transportation projects are evaluated, prioritized, and funded. Holly emphasized that while projects are already being selected through appropriate technical processes, the rationale is not always clear to the public because much of the methodology, funding leverage, and scenario planning happens behind the scenes. The PQuad effort is intended to create clearer methodologies, visual tools, dashboards, and explanations that show how projects are chosen, how funding sources interact, and how different future scenarios may affect planning decisions. She also explained that when decisions differ from project rankings or scoring results, the process should clearly document valid reasons, such as public support, geographic balance, or benefits to economically distressed areas, to help address public concerns about fairness or favoritism.

Ms. Gordon then explained CTAC’s role in supporting the engagement component of the PQuad effort. She said the project includes both technical methodology work and public engagement activities. The immediate task for CTAC was to review proposed pre-test survey or focus group questions that will be used to assess how much community members understand about transportation decision-making before receiving additional education and information. Those same or similar questions would later be used as a post-test to evaluate whether public understanding improved as a result of the engagement process. Ms. Gordon said PlanRVA intends to revisit community groups previously identified through the Long-Range Transportation Plan engagement process, including the target list developed around reaching five groups in each of the region’s nine localities, while also adding new groups as appropriate. These conversations are intended to take place in focused, facilitated settings rather than through an open online survey, so participants will be given context before being asked to respond.

Ms. Gordon asked CTAC members to work in small groups to review the sample survey questions included in the handout and consider whether they were the right questions, whether anything was missing, whether the questions were clear, and whether different groupings or wording would be needed. She noted that the sample questions were drawn from a federally recommended paper, though PlanRVA is not required to use them exactly. Members attending virtually were asked to review the questions independently because the webinar format did not allow breakout rooms. During the discussion, Mr. Waddell raised a related suggestion about whether PlanRVA should more often reach out to broadcast media, particularly television stations, to help publicize engagement events

or outreach opportunities. Ms. Gordon encouraged him to include that recommendation in his notes as useful feedback for the engagement process.

Ernest Moore and his intern, Calvin, left at approximately 12:54pm

During the small-group activity, participants worked through the proposed PQuad engagement questions and discussed whether the questions would be understandable and useful for focus group participants. Several members sought clarification about the purpose and scope of the questions, including whether they were intended to address transportation planning generally or the recently completed Long-Range Transportation Plan process specifically. Ms. Gordon clarified that the questions are meant to assess participants' understanding of how transportation project decisions are made, particularly in relation to the long-range planning process and the significant regional transportation funding decisions connected to it. She explained that PlanRVA intends to revisit groups that had been engaged over the past several years during the Long-Range Transportation Plan process and ask questions that measure their baseline understanding of the process, with the goal of improving clarity and transparency.

Participants also discussed whether some of the proposed questions might feel too abstract or difficult for community members to answer without enough context. Ms. Gordon reiterated that the questions would not be sent out cold as a standalone public survey; rather, they would be used in facilitated focus group settings after participants receive background information and an explanation of the process. She noted that the intent is to avoid leading participants to a predetermined response while still giving them enough information to answer meaningfully. The group also discussed whether the questions should be open-ended and how responses would be used as data points to evaluate understanding before and after engagement. Overall, the discussion helped identify concerns about clarity, framing, and the need to make the questions accessible to participants who may not already be familiar with transportation planning terminology or project selection processes.

Demas Boudreaux left the in-person meeting at approximately 1:15 p.m.

Dr. Courtney Hamilton left the virtual meeting at approximately 1:19 p.m., but re-entered at 1:30 p.m.

Holly Gordon closed the PQuad small-group activity by inviting members to share the most valuable insights from their discussions and encouraging them to either submit their written notes that day or send additional thoughts afterward. One key clarification was that the engagement effort will use a focus group format, not one-on-one interviews or a stand-alone survey. Participants will be brought together, given background information, and then asked to complete individual survey questions at the end so PlanRVA can collect data points, including demographics and measures of understanding. Holly also clarified that some of the timing-related questions are intended to evaluate participants' experience with the recently completed Long-Range Transportation Plan process rather than the focus group session itself. Members noted

that the long duration of regional planning processes creates challenges for public engagement, because it can be difficult to keep the same individuals involved over multiple years as people move, lose interest, or become engaged only when a specific topic matters to them. Another member cautioned that asking people whether they “understand” a process may produce unreliable answers because many people may say yes to avoid appearing uninformed. Others agreed that anonymous written responses may help participants answer more candidly, but the question wording should still be carefully considered to avoid response bias.

C. OUTREACH NEEDS

LRTP Engagement-Final Stage

Kristin then provided an outreach update focused on the final public engagement stage for the RRTPO Long-Range Transportation Plan. She referenced the CTAC News handout, which is intended to help members understand and share upcoming engagement opportunities, and reminded members that CTAC serves as a group of thought partners and community connectors. Ms. Hott explained that the final public engagement period for the Long-Range Transportation Plan opens July 29 and runs through August 27. Members received flyers with QR codes directing people to the project page, and the materials include visuals used at community events to help explain the draft plan and show how it evolved from earlier scenario planning work. She emphasized that even if members of the public are encountering the plan for the first time during this final phase, staff can explain that it is part of a two-year update process and that the long-range plan is updated on a recurring five-year cycle.

Ms. Hott encouraged CTAC members to become familiar with the RRTPO project page on the Engage site and to direct community members there for information and feedback opportunities. She noted that surveys on the site are anonymous and that people can follow projects to receive email updates when new engagement opportunities open. She also explained that the site includes translation options for 10 languages, although some graphics and image-based materials remain a challenge because they are not automatically translated. Ms. Hott said the materials also include explanations for topics such as rail and bridge projects, which are important to the regional transportation system but may not appear in the same way in the current scenario materials. In addition to the Long-Range Transportation Plan, she highlighted other active engagement items, including the Weaver Awards and the Recycling Barrier Study, noting that these can serve as additional entry points for residents who may be interested in broader regional issues.

Ms. Hott then invited CTAC members to accompany staff to public engagement events, either to shadow staff or to participate more actively in sharing information with the public. She specifically mentioned the September 16 VCU/MCV Campus Pedestrian Safety Fair, which Dan Motta will lead, as an opportunity where CTAC members would be welcome. In response to a question about keeping the public engaged between five-year long-range plan updates, Ms. Hott explained that there are other opportunities for transportation input between long-range planning cycles, including the Transportation

Improvement Program, CTAC meetings, online participation, local-level engagement, and other regional planning efforts such as the Safety Action Plan. She also emphasized the importance of helping residents understand PlanRVA's regional role and limitations, particularly when they raise concerns about specific neighborhood-level transportation issues that may fall under local or state authority. The discussion concluded with recognition that transportation projects often take many years from planning to implementation, and that public communications should continue to help residents understand those timelines.

D. MEMBER SHARE

1. Chad Sanders, RVA Rapid Transit - Chad Sanders introduced himself as the relatively new Executive Director of RVA Rapid Transit and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to participate in CTAC. He described RVA Rapid Transit as an organization rooted in the work of policy leaders, clergy, and community advocates, including Reverend Ben Campbell, who recognized the need for transit riders to have a meaningful voice in complex regional transportation conversations. Mr. Sanders emphasized that RVA Rapid Transit helps connect large-scale planning and funding discussions to the everyday experiences of riders, such as the need for sidewalks, safe bus stops, and reliable access to work, school, and community destinations.

He outlined several core priorities for the organization: more buses serving more places across the region, safe and dignified places for riders to wait, and ensuring that rider perspectives are included in policy and decision-making. He also highlighted support for open access and zero-fare transit, noting that vehicle ownership is costly and that fare-free transit can help riders save money during a time of affordability concerns. Mr. Sanders connected transit to broader issues including climate action, public safety, and public health, and he noted that bus riders are also pedestrians, making transit access closely tied to the region's safety planning efforts. He closed by expressing gratitude for the chance to learn from and work with CTAC members, while acknowledging the strong foundation built by his predecessors and describing his goal of helping guide RVA Rapid Transit into its next phase over the coming decade.

2. Open Member Comments
During the new open member comments agenda item, the Chair explained that the purpose of the discussion was to give CTAC members an unprogrammed opportunity to raise questions, share concerns from their communities, and identify ways the committee could better support community needs and help members take information back to the public. One member highlighted Tap in the Transit Day as a successful example of outreach, noting that it reached people in the community who are not typically engaged in transportation planning or transit issues and generated significant visibility through attendance and social media activity.

Ken Lantz then offered two comments. First, he expressed support for the discussion about adding new at-large member organizations to CTAC and encouraged the committee to continue assessing who is not currently represented at the table. He specifically noted the need to consider representation from the disability community and the Hispanic/Latino community. Second, he pointed out that as Plan 2050 wraps up, work will soon begin on Plan 2055, creating an opportunity for CTAC to evaluate what worked and what did not work in the current long-range planning outreach process. He suggested that the next planning cycle provides a “blank slate” for the committee to consider how it can be more effectively engaged, both collectively and individually, in future public outreach and engagement efforts.

Chad Sanders added support for broadening organizational representation, particularly for groups serving formerly incarcerated individuals and other vulnerable populations. Drawing on his prior work, he emphasized that transportation is essential for people reentering the community because access to jobs, housing, peer support, and basic opportunities often depends on reliable transit. He noted that bus passes and transportation access can be critical tools in helping people rebuild their lives and change their family and community trajectory. He praised the suggestion to include organizations that serve these populations and offered to share additional local contacts.

Staff then noted that outreach has already begun with a group serving the region’s Latino population and with a tribal member, but emphasized that adding new organizations requires relationship-building and attention to capacity. Staff explained that potential members should have opportunities to learn about CTAC, attend or view meetings, and understand the responsibilities before being asked to fill an organizational seat. Members were encouraged to invite organizations from their networks to participate in other ways as well, such as attending meetings, providing public comment, or sharing information about their work, even without holding a formal seat. Staff also noted that the committee’s attendance policy and stipend have helped make participation more accessible and appealing, although the midday Thursday meeting time can still be a barrier.

Michael Wiebe asked whether the committee had discussed holding an on-site CTAC activity to examine a specific intersection or corridor and consider potential safety improvements. Staff confirmed that this idea had been incorporated into the FY27 schedule as an optional November field trip, developed in response to member suggestions and interest in the Safety Action Plan. The field trip will involve participation in a safety corridor audit and will be held in addition to the regular November CTAC meeting, with further details to be provided later.

Staff then clarified that because CTAC did not have a quorum and could not vote on the recommended at-large organizational seats, the recommendations cannot move forward to the policy board for its September meeting. Instead, CTAC will need to revisit the item and take a formal vote at its next meeting before the recommendations can advance. Staff emphasized that this delay does not appear to affect the organizations’ interest but does make in-person attendance at the September CTAC meeting especially important. A member asked whether the

committee could take a non-binding show of support despite lacking quorum, but staff indicated there was no urgency and that it would be better to follow the formal process at the next meeting.

The Chair also noted that, as CTAC chair, she will attend policy board meetings beginning with the next one in September and can share CTAC's discussions with the policy board while also reporting policy board updates back to the committee. She invited members to let her know if there are specific items they would like communicated.

E. LOOKING FORWARD and NEXT STEPS

Jordan Cole and Sera Erickson volunteered to do a VCU member share at the next CTAC meeting.

F. ADJOURNMENT

With no further comments from members, Chair Phelan adjourned the meeting at 1:44 p.m., noting that the next meeting would be September 17, 2026 at 12:00 p.m. in the James River Boardroom and via Teams.

**ACTION ITEM**

September 17, 2026

TO: CTAC Members**SUBJECT:** Recommendations for Open Organizational Seats on the Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)**BRIEF:**

The purpose of this memorandum is to formally present two organizations for consideration in a July 23, 2026 vote by the Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) to recommend they fill the open organizational seats on the committee. The CTAC structure currently allows for 12 organizational seats, 10 of which are actively filled. If the recommendations are approved by CTAC, the names then will advance for membership consideration by the Policy Board at its September meeting.

Background and Context

The conversation surrounding CTAC's open seats and member engagement has been an ongoing priority. As outlined in the RRTPO bylaws, CTAC has a clear mandate to emphasize diverse representation and perspectives from communities facing significant systemic barriers to transportation: *"To the maximum extent possible, the at-large appointees should represent diverse organizations with recognized transportation planning concerns including transportation disadvantaged populations."*

Bringing these two new organizations into the committee directly aligns with this mission and enhances the capacity of our subcommittee, the CTAC Transportation Equity Work Group, which advised the MPO on urban transportation planning processes affecting disadvantaged populations, most recently with the Honorarium Policy pilot program.

Proposed Membership Recommendations

We are putting forward the following two organizations for a recommendation vote today. Both entities bring distinct, invaluable perspectives on what it means to navigate transportation barriers in the Richmond region. Both the Tribe and the organization being considered for membership have actively participated in the current LRTP 2050 update process.



- **Hanover County NAACP** hcbnaacp.org
- **OAR of Richmond, Inc. (OAR)** oarric.org

Hanover County NAACP

The Hanover County NAACP brings an important cultural and suburban and rural community perspective to the committee, ensuring regional planning conversations reach Hanoverians and reflect the distinct accessibility and infrastructure needs of underrepresented residents living outside the urban core.

This local branch's work is relevant to CTAC's mission through several of its active community initiatives and membership committees, including veterans, faith, and youth leadership committees:

- **Community Health and Environment Focus:** The organization has interest in the intersection of infrastructure growth, local air quality, and public health. They provide community insight into how expanding logistics, shipping corridors, and freight transit affect neighboring residential areas and general community wellness.
- **Preservation and Balanced Growth:** They engage their members (250+) and county residents at large in advocating for the thoughtful development of infrastructure in the county, including transportation projects. Their involvement has involved community organizing to address the stability, safety, and connectivity of long-standing local neighborhoods and historic communities.
- **Workforce Mobility and Economic Access:** The organization serves as a community bridge for the locality's understanding of transportation hurdles facing Hanover workers and families, and African American resident and business experiences.

OAR of Richmond, Inc. (OAR)

OAR Richmond is uniquely positioned to represent transportation-disadvantaged populations by bringing firsthand expertise on the steep transit barriers faced by formerly incarcerated individuals. A lack of reliable transportation is a leading obstacle to successful reentry, particularly when trying to access employment hubs in suburban areas that Richmond's core public transit network does not fully reach. More Information:

OAR actively solves these fundamental infrastructure gaps through highly targeted, practical initiatives:



- **The "Ride 2 Reentry" Program:** In partnership with Outpost Richmond, this program provides clients with bicycles, helmets, locks, lights, and critical safety gear. Crucially, it includes weekly classes teaching bike safety and ongoing maintenance, equipping clients with a sustainable, independent means of commuting to work.
- **Job Search Support:** OAR provides direct transit assistance, including organizing rides and distributing transit passes, to ensure participants can physically get to interviews and job searches.
- **Resource Connections:** Once employment is secured, OAR continues to support clients by connecting them with the necessary gear, tools, and clothing required for their specific job sites.