



Photo: Rt. 288 from River Road,
Goochland County

Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) LongRange Transportation Plan (LRTP) Advisory WorkGroup



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

[TEAMS WEBINAR LINK](#)

NOTES

This meeting is open to the public. Members of the public are invited to attend virtually. Please alert RRTPO staff 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 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 Zoom by email to RRTPO@PlanRVA.org.

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 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN ADVISORY WORKGROUP

Wednesday, May 27, 2026, 10 a.m.

Virtual Meeting Registration: <https://events.teams.microsoft.com/event/12222992-a2fa-4fdf-a240-cd5b8159ff8f@921b5c3b-5d1a-47f2-9798-a2d384dd1e0f>

- 1. Attendance**
(Dorian Allen /5 minutes)
- 2. April 8, 2026 LRTP-AWG Meeting Summary**
(Dorian Allen /5 Minutes)
- 3. Public Comment Period**
(Dorian Allen /5 Minutes)
- 4. LRTP Progress Update**
(Dorian Allen /5 minutes)
- 5. LRTP Phase 6: Constrained Plan Development – Consensus Scenario**
(Dorian Allen /15 minutes)
- 6. Constrained Plan Project List - Air Quality Conformity**
(Dorian Allen /15 minutes)
- 7. Next Meeting**
*June 24 at 10: a.m. via TEAMS
(Dorian Allen /5 Minutes)*

**RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN ADVISORY WORKGROUP**

Wednesday, April 8, 2026, 1 p.m.

PlanRVA James River Boardroom, 424 Hull Street, Suite 300, Richmond, VA 23224

Meeting Summary

Members and Alternates Present: (12) Present

Affiliation	Name	4/8/2026
Town of Ashland	Bannon Luckert	X
	Nora Amos (A)	
Charles City County	Sheri Adams	
Chesterfield County	JJ Banuelos	X
	Barb Smith (A)	
Goochland County	Patrick Longerbeam	
	Ray Cash	
Hanover County	Philip Kempf	X
	Joseph Vidunas (A)	
Henrico County	Ashley Austin	X
	Sharon Smidler (A)	
New Kent County	Amy Inman	
Powhatan County	Ligon Webb	
City of Richmond	Dironna Moore Clarke	
	Kelli Rowan (A)	
	Atiba Muse (A)	X
	Brandon King (A)	
Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)	Todd Scheid	X
	Liz McAdory (A)	
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)	Mitch Huber	X
	Wood Hudson	
Port of Virginia	Thomas Cross	
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Ivan Rucker	
GRTC Transit System	Guy Roach	X
	Frank Adarkwa	
Ride Finders	John O'Keeffe	X
Tri-Cities Area MPO (TCAMPO)	Zakari Mumuni	X
	Landon Bridges (A)	
Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA)	Chet Parsons	X
Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU)	John Leonard	
RRTPO Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) – Chair	Andrew Bunn	
Richmond Cycling Corp	Emily Monroe	
RVA Rapid Transit	Chad Sanders	

	Stephanie Power (A)	
Southern Environmental Law Center	Trip Pollard	X
Youth Representative	Diana Hall	
	Marisa Perez (A)	
Partnership for Housing Affordability	Woody Rogers	

1. Attendance

L RTP Project Manager Dorian Allen welcomed everyone and asked all Advisory Work Group Members, in-person and online, to state their respective names and affiliation to record attendance.

2. March 4, 2026, L RTP-AWG Meeting Summary

The twelfth L RTP Advisory Workgroup meeting was held on March 4, 2026. Dorian informed the group that the summary of the meeting was included within the agenda packet. There were no amendments to the meeting summary.

3. Public Comment Period

There were no requests to offer public comment.

4. L RTP Progress Update

Dorian presented a review of the condensed L RTP process flow with an overview and timeline for past and upcoming tasks. He explained that PlanRVA staff have completed the Strategic Direction through agreements on Vision Goals and Objectives and Performance measures, identified the regional transportation issues and developed the regions needs assessments, developed the regional project inclusion guidelines which lead into the creation of the Universe of Projects. The Universe of Projects was accepted by the AWG during the December 3 meeting. Currently the L RTP Process is in the Project Prioritization and Implementation phase which is happening parallel to the Constrained Plan development

5. L RTP Phase 6: Constrained Plan Development – Investment Scenario Performance Scoring

The committee reviewed the methodology for evaluating how effectively the proposed scenarios meet regional goals and align with 2050 performance targets. Using the region's travel demand model, scenarios are scored to determine a package's overall regional benefit before funding is applied, ensuring investments target the packages that most effectively drive progress. To evaluate performance, the 2031 travel demand model network—comprising the current network plus projects already funded within the six-year improvement program—serves as the "do-nothing" baseline against which new projects are stress-tested. Following the modeling process, the data outputs for each objective undergo a reasonableness check to identify and correct anomalies caused by methodological intricacies, such as project phasing disorders, trip distribution errors, and traffic assignment issues, ultimately allowing the team to accurately measure the progress made by each scenario.

6. L RTP Phase 6: Constrained Plan Development – AWG Scenario Selection Process

Each of the four financial scenarios was shared with implementing project champions and the broader community. In March and April of 2026, the public was asked to provide feedback on the preferred scenario and any recommended changes. Similarly, members of the local governments and transit operators responsible for implementation were asked to select the scenario which best reflected their agency

interests and identify any priority local projects which may or may not have been included in the scenarios.

Most of the public comment received supported the Mode Shift scenario. This position views the long-range plan as a tool for shaping the region's future, with an emphasis on expanding viable alternatives to driving through a more multi-modal funding approach. Based on the public comments received, those supporting this scenario are cautious about continuing significant highway expansions, out of concern that they could limit flexibility and make it harder to achieve long-term goals around travel choice and system performance. Proponents believe that refining the project list to emphasize transit and active transportation can help create the space needed to advance a broader range of options over time.

The local project champions generally favored the Traditional Usage scenario. This position supports a plan that builds on the region's existing transportation system, recognizing that the roadway network underpins most trips, including transit and freight. This approach prioritizes maintaining and improving connectivity and safety in the near term. Proponents see roadway investments as opportunities to incorporate multi-modal elements where feasible and support ongoing efforts to continue to update project evaluation criteria so that future decisions can better reflect evolving regional goals.

At the April 8 AWG meeting the stakeholders worked through the development of a new consensus scenario which factored in public input and the perspective of project champions. Staff facilitated a consensus building process to reach a compromise plan. This approach used a real-time budget tool to move projects across time-bands and into and out of the plan. The consensus scenario started with 123 projects which overlapped both the Mode Shift and Traditional scenarios. While not all these projects were supported by both sides, they represented the common ground between the two camps from the initial scenarios.

The second step was to remove projects which were captured in the committed project list but also included in the constrained plan. In general, funding and commitments for these projects had been finalized more recently than development of the original Universe of Projects. Examples include the North Gayton Road interchange in Henrico, the Meadowville Technology Parkway at I-295 in Chesterfield, and the Downtown and Northside Transfer Centers that GRTC is developing. These projects were already included in the TIP or SYIP and accounted for earlier in the financial plan.

Finally, local requests for project additions and removals were included in the scenario as a starting point. As the purpose of the constrained project list is to guide which projects are constructed in the region, this step focused on the local champions who make up the RRTPO membership. Projects that are not locally supported are not likely to be developed, regardless of inclusion within the plan. Similarly, local priorities that are not reflected in the plan often require subsequent amendments. This step put all the local priorities into the mix for consideration in the consensus building. At the end of this step, the constrained plan budget was exceeded by approximately \$500 million.

The final step was a negotiated process where the Advisory Work Group worked through the projects to reach a constrained plan. Through extensive discussions, the work group settled on an approach that removed proposed highway widening projects which were not ready or likely to advance or major local priorities while adding a few

active transportation and transit projects. Proposed time-bands were also revisited to better reflect project readiness and priority and address cost escalations. This approach was facilitated by the real-time budget tool. Eventually, the group reached a consensus and achieved a balanced plan which was advanced to the policy board for approval.

7. Next Meeting

Dorian announced that the next meeting is TBD. The agenda and Zoom link will be sent a week in advance of the meeting.