

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

Thursday, March 19, 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):

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 (A)		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	V
Chesterfield County	4	Andrew Bunn	X	Richard Hankins (A)	
Phillip Plymale		Alex Brackman (A)		RVA Rapid Transit	1
Erin Phelan (A)	X	Sera Erickson		Chad Sanders	
Goochland County	2	James Hutzler	X	NAACP, Richmond Branch	1
Robert L. Basham Jr.	V	Chamber RVA	1	James Minor	
Hanover County	3	Demas Boudreaux	X	Charles Willis (A)	
Charlie Waddell	X	League of Women Voters	1	Virginians for High-Speed Rail	1
Henrico County	4	Sarah Weisiger	X	Michael Testerman	X
Gordon Dixon, Chair	X	Karen Rosenblum (A)		RIC Area Bicycling Assoc.	1
Michael Wiebe (A)	V	Dept. of Transportation,	1	Champe M. Burnley	V
		Ernest, Moore, Jr.	X	John Hamilton (A)	
				SPAN Center	1
				Tony Williams	X

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. ADMINISTRATION

CTAC Chair Gordon Dixon called the meeting to order at 12:21pm, following a new opportunity for folks to network during a brief lunch. He then let everyone introduce themselves to the group. Afterwards, Sarah-Keel Crews took roll and certified a quorum.

Chair Dixon then gave the floor to Ken Lantz, PlanRVA, to lead a moment of silence for the late Herbert Richwine. He recently passed but was a dedicated CTAC member for many years.

Then the Chair moved on to approving the November meeting minutes. On a motion by Upton Martin, seconded by Charlie Waddell, the minutes were unanimously approved. Chair Dixon opened the meeting for public comment, but seeing there was none, moved to the next agenda item.

There were no considerations of amendments to the agenda, but Charlie Waddell did have some commentary on the Miami TPO, and how we could look to them for guidance. Kristin Hott let the group know that PlanRVA collaborates with other TPOs and groups across the state. Demas Boudreaux mentioned that ChamberRVA is going to Phoenix this year for it's conference, and that there will be a transportation focus.

The Chair did not have a formal report, so he turned things over to Sarah-Keel Crews, who provided an update on the recent bylaw changes affecting CTAC.

Ms. Crews shared that the committee received an operational update regarding the bylaws changes. She stated that members had been provided links in the packet; that only minor clerical edits had been made, which did not require a vote; and that the updated versions were accessible through the packet QR code. The substantive change described for CTAC was that the voting structure for local government CTAC members had been updated to mirror the Policy Board model. Ms. Crews requested that localities first consider using existing alternates rather than appointing new individuals and stated that staff would communicate with localities about any assigned changes and would answer questions as needed.

After the bylaws update, Holly Gordon, PlanRVA, thanked the CTAC members who attended February's MPO recertification and provided an MPO recertification update, emphasizing that their input on public engagement and committee roles had been valuable; she reported that PlanRVA had received notification of recertification and that federal reviewers had praised several elements of the organization's work, including scenario planning, transparency and document design, public engagement practices, efforts to improve supporting plans, relationships with GRTC, trail advancement, and foundational data systems; she also noted that public comment related to the federal certification review remained open through March 20 via email submission to two reviewers and that comments were not anonymous.

B. UPDATES, PRESENTATIONS and COMMITTEE DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chair Dixon gave the floor to Kristin Hott, PlanRVA, who provided a detailed engagement update on the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) scenario process, including key points committee members should be prepared to explain if questions arose in the

community. Ms. Hott stated that April 17 was the deadline for the public to submit input and participate in the scenario “voting/rating” process and noted that staff needed a rapid internal turnaround because the Policy Board was scheduled to vote on April 23.

She explained that the LRTP engagement strategy was intentionally different from the approach used five years earlier. Under the prior model, the public was presented with an extensive, scored project list (potentially 100–200+ projects), which staff felt could be overwhelming for people who were not already familiar with transportation planning. For the current LRTP update, Ms. Hott said PlanRVA leaned into scenario planning by bundling investments into four scenarios, allowing the public to react to understandable packages and tradeoffs rather than a lengthy project list. She described how in-person events supported this approach through a “gallery walk” format using boards and handouts, giving participants time to compare scenarios side-by-side and ask questions in an informal, conversational setting with staff and other transportation subject-matter experts.

During the LRTP segment, she also provided specific language and figures staff were using with the public so committee members could repeat them accurately. She stated that approximately \$7.9 billion was being considered for LRTP scenario investments and described one scenario as reflecting a “traditional” allocation pattern—roughly 70% highway and 30% other modes, with a hard cap—while another scenario, described as “mode shift,” reduced the highway share and increased investment in non-highway modes. Ms. Hott noted that while the “mode shift” scenario was shaped by an aspiration closer to a 55/45 split, real-world constraints currently placed it closer to about 60% highway and 40% other modes. She also highlighted transparency elements included in the materials, including an example that one scenario included approximately 7.2% bicycle and pedestrian projects and 133 total projects, and that the scenario materials showed how projects scored against regional goals.

The committee discussed how to balance simplicity for the public with the need for transparency, and staff explained that the scenario materials intentionally displayed how projects had been scored against a rubric tied to regional goals—safety, sustainability, reliability, and resiliency. Ms. Hott described that the public-facing materials showed the number of projects falling into high/medium/low ranges for each goal (for example, the materials included a breakdown for safety across high, medium, and lower score ranges). She emphasized that this information could be complex for a casual audience, but that the organization believed it had to remain transparent about the underlying scoring and the long, phased process that led to scenario development.

CTAC members then raised a practical operational concern: if members were expected to function as ambassadors in their communities, they needed periodic refreshers and more structured preparation on terminology, funding sources, and how to navigate the website tools residents were being asked to use. One member noted that the charts used in public engagement contained “a tremendous amount of information” and suggested dedicating time—potentially as much as 15 minutes per meeting—to focus on one chart at a time so members could confidently explain what it meant and how it was developed.

Another related suggestion was for staff to periodically walk the committee through the PlanRVA/Engage web pathways (a simple “click-by-click” orientation), so members could

more easily guide residents in real time. Staff agreed with the need for member confidence-building and explained that one challenge was timing—boards and scenario materials were being produced on tight schedules and were not always available early enough to preview at a prior bi-monthly meeting—suggesting that an additional virtual orientation could be useful when materials were finalized close to an engagement launch.

Champe Burnley left the meeting at approximately 12:55 p.m.

Erin Phelan provided the Chesterfield County member share in addition to the engagement updates, focusing on current transportation conditions and active initiatives in the county. Ms. Phelan described Chesterfield as a large, geographically diverse locality with both rural and more densely developed areas and stated that Chesterfield's estimated mid-2025 population was approximately 401,000, representing a significant share of the greater Richmond region. She also referenced recent growth trends, including a nominal population increase from 2020 to 2025 that ranked among the highest in Virginia localities and reflected roughly 10% growth over that period, which she linked to visible housing development and expansion of public infrastructure such as schools and other facilities.

Ms. Phelan explained that Chesterfield was developing a Comprehensive Active Transportation Plan as an update to the county's 2015 Bikeways and Trails Plan, with public input beginning in late 2025 and plan completion anticipated in summer 2026. She stated that early survey results showed strong support for physically separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities rather than shoulder-adjacent lanes and noted that the county maintained online story-map style resources with additional detail. Ms. Phelan also highlighted related active transportation projects, including sidewalk extensions to improve safety and connectivity and intersection improvements, particularly near schools, reflecting a county emphasis on safer connections between neighborhoods and school sites.

Linking planning to day-to-day concerns raised by residents, she reported recurring community themes related to pedestrian accessibility and safety, including difficulty crossing major corridors where development exists on both sides but crossing infrastructure has not kept pace. Ms. Phelan provided an example of a busy roadway with restaurants, shopping centers, and housing on both sides but without a safe crosswalk connection and also cited broader concerns about bicycle network continuity between communities. She added that Chesterfield's zoning ordinance modernization effort ("ZOMOD") intersected with transportation planning, describing land use regulation and transportation infrastructure as mutually reinforcing and reflective of a "chicken-and-egg" dynamic.

A major project discussed during the member share was the Powhite Parkway extension, which Ms. Phelan described as being in early stages and approximately 8–9 miles in length. She stated that the project was currently in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) phase, with a NEPA decision anticipated around mid-2027. Ms. Phelan reported that VDOT had recommended an alignment option (Alternative 1A) and that the Board of Supervisors had adopted a resolution supporting that alternative, while noting that the State Transportation Board held approval authority for the alignment. She said public comments had included concerns about whether the extension would cut off access to

existing roads and explained that the concept response to-date had been that access would generally be maintained (for example, through overpasses), although plans were still high-level at this stage. In response to questions about construction timing, Ms. Phelan noted that the NEPA decision would be followed by detailed design, right-of-way acquisition, and advertisement for construction, and suggested that the overall timeline could extend roughly a decade into the future.

Following the Chesterfield update, the committee returned to the broader theme of public understanding and intergovernmental roles. Ms. Phelan stated that, as a committee member, one ongoing challenge was translating CTAC discussions into explanations the public could easily understand, particularly when questions involved transportation funding flows and decision-making authority. She noted a common misconception that counties were responsible for “getting all the funding,” and said it would be helpful to have a clear explanation—potentially a simple visual—showing how transportation funding moves, who makes which decisions, and how regional versus local responsibilities differ. Staff responded that these conversations are most effective when PlanRVA and locality partners present information together, since staff did not want to speak on behalf of localities or substitute for their authority; staff described coordinated outreach as the preferred approach, even if it requires additional planning time.

Holly Gordon then provided a symposium update and debriefed “Pathways to the Future”, which several members and staff had attended. Ms. Gordon stated that the event was sold out, held at the Richmond Times-Dispatch printing facility in Hanover, and attended by a broad cross-section of stakeholders. She reported that participants felt the symposium effectively connected housing and transportation, including discussion of affordable housing, housing stock data, and how transportation resources influence housing development patterns and regional growth. Ms. Gordon also relayed member observations that the breadth of represented organizations was notable, and that many attendees framed transportation impacts through the lens of their own organizational missions, ranging from affordable housing to economic development.

Ms. Gordon noted that the symposium discussion also raised transit-related themes, including interest in expanded service and how transit investments could support workforce access. She shared that one participant heard a Chesterfield-related emphasis on expanding GRTC service further into Chesterfield County along Route 360 to provide a lower-cost commuting option for workers, and added that, to their understanding, GRTC management had not made a decision to extend service in that direction as of the meeting. Ms. Gordon also conveyed a participant’s reminder that understanding transportation funding and scenario concepts often takes multiple iterations and encouraged members not to feel they needed to be “experts,” noting that their baseline knowledge still exceeded that of most members of the public encountered during engagement.

Michael Wiebe left the meeting at 1:32pm.

Ken Lantz, PlanRVA, provided several partner and network updates that reinforced CTAC’s interest in cross-sector coordination, particularly where transportation intersects with human services. He noted that GRTC would celebrate six years of fare-free “open access” service on Friday, March 27, from 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. at Benchtop Brewing, describing the

event as an opportunity for partners to connect and recognize the milestone. Mr. Lantz also reported that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) had completed its 2026 Coordinated Human Service Mobility Plan (updated every three to five years), which identifies needs and gaps in human services transportation, and raised the strategic question of how services that are often provided “under the radar” by agencies can be better integrated into mainstream regional planning discussions. In additional updates, he shared that the SPAN Center continues to convene a Human Services Transportation Coordination Entity Steering Committee (most recently meeting on February 17), with ongoing work tied to long-range planning and the SPAN Center’s Ride Connection service for seniors and people with disabilities; he added that SPAN Center is pursuing Section 5310 funding to support human services transportation. Finally, Mr. Lantz noted continued engagement with broader human services networks, including participation in the February 18th Goochland Community Partners meeting, which covered topics such as health improvement planning, support for older adults, and housing study updates—linking those conversations back to themes raised at the symposium.

After the updates concluded, Chair Dixon noted that the next member share would be done by Demas Boudreaux. Mr. Lantz also provided a reminder to the group about the CTAC honorarium policy and necessary paperwork.

C. ADJOURNMENT

With no further comment, the meeting was adjourned at 1:40pm by Chair Dixon, who noted that the next meeting will be May 21, 2026 at 12:00 p.m.