

Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA)

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 9, 2026 1:00 p.m.

Zoom Meeting

Members and Alternates Present:

Voting Members					
Town of Ashland		Charles City County		Chesterfield County	
Beth Mertz-Guinn	X	Sheri Adams	X	Barbara K. Smith, Vice Chair	X
Goochland County				Chessa Walker (A)	X
Austin Goyne	X	Hanover County		Henrico County	
Patrick Longerbeam (A)		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	Daniel Wagner	X
				Andy Boenau (A)	
Non-Voting Members					
GRTC Transit System		CVTA		PlanRVA/RRTPPO	
Frank Adarkwa	X	Chet Parsons	X	Myles Busching	X
Joe Dillard (A)				Dorian Allen (A)	X
		VDOT		RMTA	
VDRPT		Larry Hagin	X	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 1:04 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

There were no changes to the agenda.

5. Approval of January 12, 2026 CVTA TAC Meeting Minutes

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

6. Public Comment Period

There were no public comments at this meeting.

7. Final Round 4 Regional Application Scorecards

Chet Parsons provided an overview of the unallocated funds issue and presented five options for addressing approximately \$48 million in unallocated funds from Round 4.

The first option was to leave the unallocated balance unprogrammed for future commitment, likely in Round 5. The second option would allow jurisdictions with the next project on the list in each category to reduce their request to match available balance. The third option involved funding four projects: Shockoe Valley Street improvements, Fulton Yard layover facility, I-91/I-95 operational improvements, and the Powhite Parkway extension. The fourth option would use the unallocated balance for PE and right-of-way for bond candidate projects to make them shovel-ready, with an estimated \$122 million needed total for six candidate projects. The fifth option, which was referred back from the Authority, involved deallocation funding from three projects meeting deallocation criteria and advancing six projects to full funding.

During the discussion, when Chair Vidunas asked for confirmation about the three projects identified for defunding, Mr. Parsons confirmed that these projects had the opportunity for leveraging for two rounds and were unsuccessful. He clarified that the regional funding framework guidance directs that those funds be considered for deallocation. Importantly, he noted that while TAC's action puts the decision-making in front of the Authority, the framework guidance is designed to highlight certain projects so the Authority can determine whether to keep them advancing or follow the guidance and move toward allocation.

Mr. Parsons also outlined the process and timeline for next steps in Round 4 project selection and allocation. The staff-recommended scenario would go out for public review for 15 days, and TAC could make recommendations on the unallocated balance. A Finance Committee meeting would occur on Wednesday to share TAC recommendations, which would inform the Authority meeting on February 27th.

On motion by Amy Inman and seconded by Sharon Smidler, the CVTA TAC voted to recommend option 5 to the full Authority and the motion failed to pass (roll call vote).

Locality	Member	Vote
Town of Ashland	Beth Mertz-Guinn	Aye
Charles City County	Sheri Adams	Abstained
Chesterfield County	Barbara K. Smith	Nay
Goochland County	Austin Goyne	Nay
Hanover County	Joseph Vidunas	Nay
Henrico County	Sharon Smidler	Aye
New Kent County	Amy Inman	Aye
Powhatan County	Ligon Webb	Nay
City of Richmond	Daniel Wagner	Nay

Barb Smith made a motion to support Option 5A. Joe Vidunas seconded the motion.

Mr. Vidunas then asked if there was any additional discussion on the motion for Option 5A. After confirming there was no further discussion, he called for a roll call vote on the new motion.

On motion by Barb Smith and seconded by Joseph Vidunas, the CVTA TAC voted to recommend option 5A to the full Authority (roll call vote).

Locality	Member	Vote
Town of Ashland	Beth Mertz-Guinn	Abstain
Charles City County	Sheri Adams	Aye
Chesterfield County	Barbara K. Smith	Aye
Goochland County	Austin Goyne	Aye
Hanover County	Joseph Vidunas	Aye
Henrico County	Sharon Smidler	Aye
New Kent County	Amy Inman	Aye
Powhatan County	Ligon Webb	Aye
City of Richmond	Daniel Wagner	Nay

8. CVTA TAC Member Comments

During the TAC member comments item, Daniel Wagner introduced himself as the new representative for the City of Richmond at his first TAC meeting. He expressed excitement about working with the other TAC members and thanked them for having him as part of the group.

Chet Parsons provided a reminder about the public review period that would be starting on Wednesday February 11. He asked each TAC member to coordinate internally with their public information officers and other relevant staff to share information about the public review so that people in their localities would be able to tune in and participate in the process, either online or in person.

Barb Smith brought up a topic related to Smart Scale leveraging. She explained that the Chesterfield County had submitted a project along Route 60 for corridor enhancements in the last round of Smart Scale and received approximately \$22 million in CVTA regional leveraging for that

project. However, the project, which was fairly long, did not score well in Smart Scale.

For the upcoming round of Smart Scale, Ms. Smith indicated that they want to divide that project into smaller pieces so that it will compete better in Smart Scale. She noted that this essentially changes the original project that was requested from CVTA into shorter sections. She mentioned they have options where they can divide it in half and put the bulk of the CVTA money on one half to try to improve its viability for Smart Scale funding, or divide it into thirds and take the CVTA money and put it fairly equally on two-thirds of the project by submitting two projects, which is their preference.

Ms. Smith stated that she was bringing this up as an introduction and did not expect a full discussion at that time. She indicated she would like to talk about it in more detail at the next meeting in March. She framed this as an example of how the leveraging approach in the framework document is intended to work—using leveraging to change the scope or funding to move the project forward.

9. Next Meeting: March 9, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

10. Adjournment

Chair Vidunas adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.