



*Turkey Island Creek Conservation in Varina,
Henrico*

Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)



NOTES

This meeting is open to the public. Members of the public are invited to attend in person or virtually. Please alert the CVTA at information@cvtava.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 information@CVTAVA.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. Please indicate by raising your hand (in-person participants, where applicable) or through the Q&A/Chat functions on Zoom (virtual participants) if you would like to comment. When acknowledged by the Chairman, please clearly state your name so that it may be recorded in the meeting minutes.

Powered By:



Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA)

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Agenda

Monday, December 8, 2025 - 1:00 p.m.

Zoom Meeting

If you wish to participate in this meeting virtually, please register via Zoom at the following link:

[ZOOM WEBINAR LINK](#)

1. Welcome and Introductions

(Vidunas)

2. Roll Call

(Nyamweya)

3. Certification of a Quorum

(Nyamweya)

4. Consideration of Amendments to the Agenda

(Vidunas)

5. Approval of November 10, 2025, Meeting Minutes – page 4

(Vidunas)

Requested action: approval of meeting minutes as presented (voice vote).

6. Public Comment Period

(Vidunas/5 minutes)

7. Round 4 – Project Evaluation Update – page 9 (supporting documents will be distributed separately)

(Parsons/20 minutes)

Discussion item.

- 8. Off-Cycle Funding Request Update** – page 10
(Parsons/30 minutes)
- a. Validation of need for off-cycle request**
 - b. Confirmation of eligibility type**
 - c. Review of submitted TAC questions**
 - d. Potential funding sources to consider**

Action requested.

- 9. Regional Spend Down Plans Update** – page 16 (supporting documents will be distributed separately)
(Parsons/15 minutes)

Discussion item.

- 10. CVTA TAC Member Comments**
(Vidunas/5 minutes)

- 11. Next Meeting January 7 2026, at 1:00 p.m.**
(Vidunas)

- 12. Adjournment**
(Vidunas)

Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA)

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Meeting Minutes

Monday, November 10, 1:00 p.m.

Zoom Meeting

Members and Alternates Present:

Voting Members					
Town of Ashland		Charles City County		Chesterfield County	
Nora Amos	X	Sheri Adams	X	Barbara K. Smith, Vice Chair	X
Goochland County		Gary Mitchell (A)		Chessa Walker (A)	X
Patrick Longerbeam	X	Hanover County		Henrico County	
Austin Goyne (A)	X	Joseph E. Vidunas, Chair	X	Sharon Smidler	X
New Kent County		William Hardman (A)		Gilberto DeLeon (A)	X
Amy Inman	x	Powhatan County		City of Richmond	
		Ligon Webb	X	Dironna Moore Clarke	X
Non-Voting Members					
GRTC Transit System		CVTA		PlanRVA/RRTPO	
Frank Adarkwa	X	Chet Parsons	X	Myles Busching	X
Patricia Robinson (A)				Dorian Allen (A)	X
		VDOT		RMTA	
VDRPT		Larry Hagin		Joi Taylor Dean	
Tiffany T. Dubinsky	X	Liz McAdory (A)		Virginia Port Authority	
Wood Hudson (A)				Barbara Nelson	X

The technology used for the CVTA TAC 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](#).

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Chair, Joseph Vidunas, presided and called the CVTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) regular meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Mo Nyamweya, CVTA, took attendance by roll call.

3. Certification of a Quorum

Mo Nyamweya, CVTA, certified that there was a quorum present.

4. Consideration of Amendments to the Agenda

Joseph Vidunas, Chair, proposed an amendment to the agenda to change item 8, Validation of Off-Cycle Funding Request Update, from an information item to an action item. The purpose was to authorize staff to proceed to step four in considering the City of Richmond's off-cycle regional funding request. He clarified that, as chair, he had the authority to make this change without needing a motion and a second, and then asked if there were any other amendments, to which there were none.

5. Approval of October 6, 2025 CVTA TAC Meeting Minutes

On motion by Sharon Smidler and seconded by Sheri Adams, the members of the CVTA Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to approve the meeting minutes as presented (voice vote).

6. Public Comment Period

During the public comment period, Jack Stumpf from the Timmons Group spoke in support of Ms. Dironna Moore Clark's upcoming item (the City of Richmond's request). It was also mentioned that DJ Mulkey from the Economic Development Authority (EDA) was available online to speak if needed.

7. Town of Ashland Project Agreement – FLT Wayfinding

Chet Parsons introduced the item, explaining it was a request from the Town of Ashland for recommendation of a project agreement covering wayfinding costs, and that similar agreements had previously been done for Henrico and Hanover counties. The goal was to allow Ashland to get their signs fabricated and paid for.

Ms. Nora Amos from Ashland clarified that because of the small amount, an RFP procurement process wasn't needed; they just needed a couple of quotes and had obtained vendor information from previous projects in Hanover or Henrico.

Amy Inman, New Kent County, asked whether Ashland would be using the wayfinding destinations identified during the earlier planning process for the signage. Ms. Amos confirmed they would be using whatever destinations and information were developed through that earlier process, although she wasn't sure of all the specific destinations. Ms. Inman specifically mentioned the Secretariat Monument as a major destination and hoped it would be included. Ms. Amos reiterated they would order signs as per the previous process.

On motion by Nora Amos and seconded by Joseph Vidunas, the TAC voted unanimously to recommend CVTA Project 0065 for review by the Finance Committee (voice vote).

8. Validation of Off-Cycle Funding Request Update

During the discussion of the City of Richmond off-cycle funding request item, the following key points, questions, and answers were made:

Introduction and Background:

- Chet Parsons explained that the City of Richmond requested \$12.9 million in regional CVTA funding for roadway improvements related to the Diamond District project. He outlined the formal five-step off-cycle funding process, noting this was the first time the process had been used.
- Dironna Moore Clarke, City of Richmond, emphasized the economic development initiative, regional impact, and multimodal benefits of the project, describing the specifics of the proposed improvements. She clarified the project's intersection with major corridors and the city's intention for the funding to be considered under the "wildcard" category for highways.

Timing and Process:

Joe Vidunas laid out the proposed schedule: if action was taken to move to step four, staff would report back with details on funding availability, eligibility, scoring, and ranking at the December 8 TAC meeting, with Finance Committee review on December 10 and an Authority vote on January 23. It was confirmed this timeline met the City's needs.

Questions and Discussion:

- Sharon Smidler, Henrico County asked when the application materials would be distributed and pointed out the need for at least 48 business hours to review materials and submit questions after receipt (noting the proximity to a holiday).
- Ms. Smidler requested clarification on when the project scoring would be ready and what exactly the TAC would be voting on. The motion was then clarified: authorizing staff to proceed with step four (eligibility, scoring, ranking). Scoring would be presented at the December 8 TAC meeting.
- Ms. Smidler and others asked about exploring other available funding sources and whether the City could reprioritize its own projects to cover the shortfall—these were to be submitted as written questions for the City to answer.
- Amy Inman and others requested timely distribution of all application materials, including cost information and memos, for review.
- TAC members emphasized wanting enough time for a thorough review and clarity on the process and schedule.

It was discussed and agreed that questions from TAC members would be due by noon on Friday, November 14, with the City to respond in writing by November 25 to allow inclusion in the December agenda package. Dironna Moore Clarke stated a desire for all submitted materials to be shared with the TAC and noted that approval of the wildcard allocation in round five was still up for consideration, depending on the funding arrangement.

Significant Comments:

- There was a consensus that timing justified the off-cycle request.

- The use of the wildcard allocation for this request and its implications for future cycles was debated but not fully resolved ("up for consideration" per the City).
- Several members stressed the importance of balancing expedience with thorough review and the need for process transparency.

On motion by Dironna Moore Clarke and seconded by Amy Inman, the TAC voted unanimously to approve CVTA staff to move forward with step four—determining year-of-need funding, and conducting eligibility, scoring, and ranking relative to round four, with the understanding that materials would be sent out promptly and the report would return to TAC for the December 8 meeting.

9. Regional Funding Approach Criteria

Discussion on this item focused on how to define and prioritize “big regional needs” for use of CVTA regional funds and whether the current process and framework continue to meet the region’s goals.

Key Points Raised:

- Chet Parsons introduced the topic, noting the current regional funding framework was designed to address projects difficult to complete through other means. With experience from multiple funding rounds, leadership wanted to revisit what kind of projects should truly qualify as “regional.”
- Chet presented guiding questions: How do we define a big regional need? Are there other funding sources for projects? Should there be a funding threshold? Should projects below a certain amount be funded locally, reserving regional dollars for larger projects? Should there be more coordination with TPO fund sources? He emphasized this was a discussion only—no immediate changes were being proposed.

Comments and Questions from TAC Members:

- Ms. Clark (Richmond) warned against defining funding solely by dollar thresholds, as smaller localities and rural areas may have transformative “small” projects. She stressed retaining flexibility and suggested considering economic impact in determining project relevance.
- Amy Inman (New Kent) expressed interest in reviewing the current slate of funded projects to see whether they truly meet a “regional” standard. Ms Inman also noted that rural counties often have to use most of their local CVTA funds for single large projects, while some localities do not have to contribute local funds for similar projects—raising equity concerns. She questioned why some projects require significant local match and others don’t, advocating for a more consistent approach.
- Austin Goyne (Goochland) supported the concern that rural localities should not be left out; flexibility is needed (such as the “wildcard” provision). He also expressed concern over capping

local funds for localities, since such funds are also used as match for Smart Scale, and localities need the flexibility.

- Chet Parsons suggested exploring a “one-stop shop” for regional funds (CVTA, TPO, CMAC, STBG) so projects could be advanced based on readiness and regional need, not funding source
- Sharon Smidler (Henrico) noted that some funding programs require full project funding before releasing preliminary engineering (PE) funds, constraining how local, regional, and federal funds can be combined.

10. Round 4 – Project Evaluation Update

Chet Parsons gave a progress update stating nearly all round 4 cost validations and benefit scores were complete except for minor outstanding issues (notably with Henrico), and confirmed that TAC members would receive all benefit scoring data before the December 8 meeting for review.

11. Regional Spend Down Plans Update

During the regional spend down plans update, Chet Parsons provided the following summary:

- The last update of the regional spend down plan was completed in July.
- He has been working individually with all jurisdictions to update their spreadsheets, which track commitments and spending of regional CVTA funds.
- Most updates are already complete; only a few updated pages are still outstanding, and he will follow up with those jurisdictions soon.
- The goal is to have the updated regional spend down plan ready for distribution at the December TAC meeting.
- With all current commitments (through round three), he reported that things are in good shape and the plan will soon be the most current.

Frank Adarkwa, GRTC, asked if the spend down plan process is relevant to GRTC projects. Mr. Parsons responded that it is not: the spend down plan is not structured to track GRTC projects, though GRTC is welcome to provide status updates for informational purposes. He suggested this could be a consideration for future iterations of the plan.

12. CVTA TAC Member Comments

There were no member comments during the meeting.

9. Next Meeting: December 8, at 1:00 p.m.

10. Adjournment

Chair Vidunas adjourned the meeting at 2:06 p.m.

CVTA TAC AGENDA 12/08/25; ITEM 7.

Round 4 Regional Fund – Project Evaluations

Central Virginia Transportation Authority

BACKGROUND: The Round 4 Regional funding process is currently underway and is in the project scoring and evaluation phase. This agenda item is focused on initial review and discussion regarding project benefit scoring, finalized funding requests, cost-benefit scoring, and ranking of those project scores by category.

Based on estimated funding availability provided by VDOT, the draft project award is noted in each category corresponding to the project rankings.

Discussion at this stage is intended to focus on project benefit, cost, and scoring, with secondary focus on the early funding allocations based on scores.

REQUESTED ACTION: Information only.

CAP
Attachments

CVTA TAC AGENDA 12/08/25; ITEM 8.

City of Richmond Off-Cycle Funding Request

Central Virginia Transportation Authority

BACKGROUND: CVTA has received a request from the City of Richmond for consideration of an off-cycle request for regional funds. The CVTA Regional Project Selection and Allocation Framework has an adopted process for consideration of off-cycle funding requests. The steps below are copied directly from the framework document.

Off-Cycle Requests

Off-cycle funding requests for new and existing projects will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Step 1: Applicant submits request to CVTA Executive Director, including all required details for project evaluation

Step 2: TAC will validate the need for the off-cycle project request (i.e., why project cannot wait for formal application cycle);

Step 3: Staff checks to see if funds are available in year needed or if funds can be reprogrammed; TAC action required to move to Step 3;

Step 4: Staff reports on eligibility, scores, ranks and reviews against previous funding scenario; and

Step 5: TAC makes recommendation to Authority.

The TAC and Finance Committee both recommended at their October meetings for the Authority to formally direct TAC to consider the request through the adopted evaluation process. The Authority made that action official at their October 24 meeting.

TAC's responsibility is to work through Step 4 and consider a recommendation for action at the January 23, 2026 Authority meeting.

1. Validation of need for off-cycle request
 - a. The City of Richmond has clarified that the requested funding is needed for the FY 2026 - FY 2027 years to keep the design-build project on schedule. That timeline is well in advance of the project Round 4 allocation year of FY 2032, validating the need for the off-cycle request.
2. Confirmation of eligibility type
 - a. Based on the eligibility criteria contained in the regional framework, this project is not regionally-significant. The primary improvements included in this project are new local collector roads. To qualify for regional funding, those roads would need to be limited access or arterial classifications with future ADT of at least 20,000, or designated as

Corridors of Statewide Significance (CoSS) or on the Arterial Preservation Network (APN).

- b. This project would qualify for CVTA Regional funding as a wild card. Each locality gets one wild card project (falls outside of the stated criteria) per regional funding round.
3. Project scoring and ranking
 - a. As shown on the following page, this project ranks 14th among the Round 4 highway projects based on benefit.
 - b. That ranking includes the six bond candidate projects that could be scored and ranked.
4. Review of submitted TAC questions (City responses in red, CVTA staff comments in green)
 - a. What is the expected duration of the project?

Response: Construction began in March 2025. Construction is anticipated to be completed March 31, 2027.

- b. Estimate reflects a 7% contingency, was inflation factored into the estimation, and should there be CEI?

Response: No, inflation was not factored into the estimation. A separate CEI was not used as under council approved Development Agreement, CEI is the responsibility of the Developer and is part of the proposed cost. All of the transportation-related scope that qualifies for CVTA funding has been bid and is under contract. A 7% contingency has been reserved to address unforeseen underground conditions (utilities not shown on record plans, hidden obstructions, unexpected soil conditions, contaminated groundwater, contaminated soils), design omissions/coordination gaps, regulatory or utility driven changes, unforeseen material price changes, and unforeseen delays, among other items.

- c. Road "J" is mentioned as a new collector, and a cut through between AA Blvd, and Hermitage Rd. What will happen with Squirrel Way? Will it remain, and if so, what plans for the intersection Squirrel way and Road "J"

Response: The current Avenue of Champions, or Squirrel Way, is being demolished along with Sports Backers Stadium to make way for the new mixed-use neighborhood street grid which includes Road J on new alignment as Collector Road. New signalized intersections will be installed where "Road J" meets Arthur Ashe Boulevard and where "Road J" meets Hermitage Road.

- d. Is this proposed funding for all the roadways (Roads A, B, C and J) or just Road J? Will they all be public maintained roadways and not private? Road B appears to be a cul-de-sac and mews for apartments. How is that regional if it a cul-de-sac and/or private? There already is existing Robin Hood Road which links existing arterials between Arthur Ashe Blvd and Hermitage Road. There are no unit quantities or unit costs provided in the estimates. The cost estimates include items that are not roads but playground, park construction, contingencies, etc.

Response: The project scope includes construction of the new mixed-use neighborhood streets inclusive of "Road A" (~920 linear feet), "Road B" (~1,220 LF), "Road C" (~620 LF), and "Road J" (~1,370 LF). All of these roads, once constructed by the private developer, will be deeded to the city and publicly maintained.

Road B is a public road. City of Richmond zoning requirements dictate that a public right-of-way cannot terminate at a private parcel without a cul-de-sac as a means for emergency vehicles to turn around.

The cost estimates provided include the entire Diamond District Phase 1A Public Infrastructure scope, not just transportation-related expenses. The City of Richmond Department of Public Works have conservatively extracted the transportation items which are eligible for CVTA funding to make this funding request.

- e. What would happen if the funding is not provided by CVTA-Regional?

Response: The complete project scope cannot be delivered without supplemental funding given the identified budget gap. If funding is not provided by CVTA-Regional at this time, there will be a delay in the expected completion date of the Phase 1A Roadways & Infrastructure work while additional local funds are secured through the FY27 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The project team will identify the minimum amount of scope required to safely open and provide access to CarMax Park while attempting to minimize the resulting delay in developing the neighborhood private parcels. Given current funding levels, the project team is expecting to provide the necessary public utilities and public access for CarMax Park to open on time. However, without supplemental funding, construction of the remainder of the public infrastructure and development of the private parcels will be delayed indefinitely.

- f. What fiscal year is the funding needed? This project is already under construction.

Response: This project is already under construction. Funds are needed in FY26.

- g. Would the City consider sacrificing CVTA – Regional funding for another City project in the fiscal year needed to fund this project? If so, which project(s)?

Response: The City would consider funding from another City Project only if other regional dollars (such as unexpended cash balance or interest funds) are not available. A specific project will be determined at the time of determination of funding source.

- h. Given that this off-cycle request would have otherwise been considered in Round 5 except for the urgency associated with the request, is the City agreeable to “give up” its wildcard and one if its allotted applications in Round 5? If not, please explain why the City should receive what would amount to an extra wildcard and application.

Response: Given that this off-cycle request, yes the City would be agreeable to “give-up” its wildcard in Rd 5, if it is determined that it is necessary to secure funding.

- i. When did the City determine that additional funds were needed? Please provide date or close approximation.

Response: The Economic Development Authority identified a budget gap in February 2025. While the project team implemented scope reductions and value engineering, it became clear in August 2025 that additional funding sources would be required.

- j. What was the unencumbered CVTA Local fund balance when it was determined that additional funds were needed?

Response: Zero all funds have been allocated through FY27 to local transportation divisions.

- k. What is the current unencumbered CVTA Local fund balance?

Response: Zero all funds have been allocated through FY27 to local transportation divisions.

- l. Has the City considered deferring activities planned in FY 27 utilizing CVTA Local funds, and if not, why?

Response: No, this would interrupt maintenance, as 90% of funds are maintenance and operations until backlog is filled.

CVTA Staff Responses for the following three questions:

- q. What project category does this qualify for under CVTA Regional Project Selection and Allocation Framework and why? It appears to only qualify as a “wild card” under Highway in that every applicant may submit one priority highway project outside the criteria listed.

This project would only qualify for CVTA Regional funding as a wildcard project. It does not appear to be an upgrade to an existing highway project and it does not meet the criteria for new alignments (20,000 ADT and expected functional classification as collector)

- r. Can this be included as a late submittal to the Round 4 applications instead of an off-cycle application?

The project was received after the application window for Round 4 projects. The City of Richmond submitted their quota of 8 project applications, although one has since been withdrawn due to full funding through the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

- s. How does this project score using the CVTA Regional Project Selection and Allocation Framework? How does the scoring compare to Round 3 and Round 4 regular cycle applications?

The scoring matrix for Round 4, including bond candidate projects and this off-cycle requests, has been distributed to TAC members on Friday, November 14. At this time, benefit scores can be reviewed in that matrix. Full scores with costs will be distributed as part of the meeting materials for the December 8 TAC meeting.

- 5. Potential funding sources to consider
 - a. Transfer funds off one of the City’s existing CVTA Regionally funded projects
 - b. Transfer CVTA Local funds allocated to other uses. City staff report local funds are used primarily for programmatic uses such as citywide paving, traffic engineering, multimodal planning, transportation engineering (CIP), etc.
 - c. Regional balance entry funds (adhering to the balance targets there is ~\$1.7 million in the needed years, ignoring the balance targets yields \$9.4 million)
 - d. Interest income (\$13,140,762)
 - e. CVTA Regional funds from another locality project

CVTA TAC AGENDA 12/08/25; ITEM 9.

Regional Spend Down Plan - Update

Central Virginia Transportation Authority

BACKGROUND: As CVTA develops a larger portfolio of regional project allocations, it is imperative that the Authority maintains a consistent, up-to-date understanding of funding allocations by both amount and schedule.

TAC has begun collecting bi-annual updates to the spend down plan for all regional funding, combining local and VDOT administered projects in one centralized database. The last full update by the Authority was in July 2025.

REQUESTED ACTION: Information only.

CAP
Attachments