

Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA)

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 8, 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		Barbara K. Smith, Vice Chair	
Goochland County		Gary Mitchell (A)		Chessa Walker (A)	X
Austin Goyne		Hanover County		Henrico County	
Patrick Longerbeam (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		Dironna Moore Clarke	X
Non-Voting Members					
GRTC Transit System		CVTA		PlanRVA/RRTPO	
Frank Adarkwa	X	Chet Parsons	X	Myles Busching	X
Joe Dillard (A)				Dorian Allen (A)	
		VDOT		RMTA	
VDRPT		Larry Hagin	X	Joi Taylor Dean	
Tiffany T. Dubinsky	X	Liz McAdory (A)		Virginia Port Authority	
Wood Hudson (A)	X			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

There were no changes to the agenda.

5. Approval of November 10, 2025 CVTA TAC Meeting Minutes

On motion by Dironna Moore Clarke and seconded by Larry Hagin, the members of the CVTA Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to approve the meeting minutes as presented (voice vote).

6. Public Comment Period

There were no public comments at this meeting.

7. Round 4 – Project Evaluation Update

Chet Parsons provided an overview of the updated project scorecards, explaining that these displayed both benefit and cost-benefit scores by project category. He emphasized that the scores were still in draft form, pending updated revenue projections expected from the state later in December, which would affect available funding amounts and potentially each project's standing. Mr. Parsons clarified that while benefit scores measuring project merits are fixed, the cost-benefit scores can change if project costs decrease, since applicants have a one-time chance to revise the requested amounts after reviewing the draft scores.

Mr. Parsons described how projects were ranked by category and explained the funding thresholds set by the percentage of total requests in each category. If no projects fell under the threshold—such as in Bike/Ped, Bridge, and Multimodal—no funding would be allocated in that category for this round. He also clarified that the bond candidate projects were scored and listed but not included in regional funding allocations since they are separate.

Questions were asked by members including one from Sharon Smidler, Henrico County, who inquired if funding contributions from other sources could be brought to help a project fit within a category, and whether the category percentage breakdown was established in the framework document (Chet Parsons confirmed both were possible/accurate). Amy Inman, New Kent County, asked about the cut-off for project revisions and expressed concerns about projects altering numbers to improve their rankings; Mr. Parsons answered that benefit scores are fixed, only the requested dollar amount can be changed, and this revision window closes at the end of December with only one revision allowed.

Another question was raised about readiness and ensuring funding goes to projects able to advance soon; Mr. Parsons responded that project readiness is considered and that the schedule allows time for updates, ensuring that only ready projects receive funding.

There were also clarifying questions about what happens to category funds when no project is under the threshold. Chet Parsons confirmed unallocated funds would go back into the overall balance or be available for other uses.

Lastly, a question was raised about the low mobility/accessibility scores for the Downtown Transit Hub. Mr. Parsons explained this was because the project essentially replaces an existing nearby transit facility, so the metric didn't show measurable improvement in those categories according to the current scoring structure.

Tiffany Dubinsky, VDRPT, joined the meeting at 1:10 p.m. Wood Hudson, VDRPT, joined the meeting at 1:11 p.m. Frank Adarkwa joined the meeting at 1:23 p.m.

8. Off-Cycle Funding Request Update

Chet Parsons began the off-cycle funding request update by summarizing the staff report process and its findings. He explained that the TAC had been tasked by the Authority to look more closely at the City of Richmond's off-cycle Diamond District funding request, focusing on four main areas: validating the need for an off-cycle request (which was confirmed due to the project's timeline requirements), confirming eligibility under the established framework (finding it would qualify as a wildcard project but not a "regionally significant" one), scoring and ranking the project alongside others (showing it fell mid-range among highway projects), and compiling and responding to technical questions from TAC members and the City, with responses included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Parsons also presented five potential funding options for the project, ranging from using local funds or programmed regional funds, to employing CVTA interest income or swapping funds from future city projects.

During the discussion, Chair Vidunas, Hanover County, emphasized TAC's role was to judge the technical merits according to the framework, not to critique the City's political or administrative strategies. Dironna Moore Clarke Clark, City of Richmond, clarified that Richmond couldn't currently commit local CVTA funds and was mainly seeking new regional dollars or a mix, such as combining new funds with smaller contributions from out-year existing regional projects. She said options A and B (local allocations or previously programmed regional funds) were off the table per City administration, while options C, D, and E (including new regional funds, interest income, or swaps) were open for discussion. She indicated a willingness to explore a proportional mix but couldn't make commitments about the local share.

Sharon Smidler raised a concern about fairness in regional benefit—nine other highway projects scored higher than the Diamond District, and she cautioned against dedicating too much regional funding to a lower-benefit project. Chessa Walker, Chesterfield County, and Amy Inman recommended Richmond consider some form of local contribution, perhaps from out-year regional allocations, to reduce the regional burden.

Ms. Inman also commented that the earlier off-cycle request for the Fall Line Trail didn't go through as much scrutiny and hoped the process would remain fair and consistent. Ms. Clarke reiterated that City staff had honestly

represented available options and could not alter administration's local funding directive but was open to smaller contributions or swaps from existing regional allocations.

A technical question was asked about the balance entry target for CVTA regional funds and whether exceeding the target was possible; Chet Parsons confirmed that \$1.7 million could be accessed while meeting targets, but exceeding them (up to \$9.4 million) would require legal or policy consideration at the Finance Committee level.

Ultimately, Chair Vidunas put forward a motion to recommend that 80% of the Diamond District funding should come from CVTA interest income and 20% from Richmond (from any source), with the City forfeiting its wildcard project slot for Round Five. This motion was seconded and approved by roll call vote after confirming the 20% amount and a brief clarifying discussion.

On motion by Joseph Vidunas and seconded by Sharon Smidler, the TAC voted unanimously to recommend that the Authority support the off-cycle City of Richmond Diamond District project request.

The TAC recommendation is to support 80% of the project cost using CVTA interest income and have the City of Richmond source the remaining 20% of project costs.

In addition, TAC recommends that the city forfeit their wild card slot during Round 5 project evaluation (roll call vote).

Locality	Member	Vote
Town of Ashland	Nora Amos	Aye
Chesterfield County	Chessa Walker	Aye
Goochland County	Patrick Longerbeam	Aye
Hanover County	Joseph Vidunas	Aye
Henrico County	Sharon Smidler	Aye
New Kent County	Amy Inman	Aye
City of Richmond	Dironna Moore Clarke	Aye

9. Regional Spend Down Plans Update

During the regional spend down plans update, Chet Parsons reported that an updated spend down plan, reflecting nearly all localities' project commitment timelines and regional allocations by quarter, had been sent to all members and would also be shared with the Finance Committee and the Authority. He explained that this plan will be updated twice a year, with the next update scheduled for July or August, and it helps everyone see how regional funds are committed and monitor progress across jurisdictions.

Mr. Parsons noted the positive impact of fully funding projects through Smart Scale partnerships and said the spend down plan is meant to provide transparency on project progress. He encouraged members to suggest improvements to the database if needed and thanked everyone for their timely updates.

During discussion, Amy Inman asked whether VDOT had weighed in on the allocations, especially regarding moving out-year dollars for the GDI project. Mr. Parsons confirmed that Larry Hagin from VDOT had already submitted input and that the numbers reflect the latest thinking. Chessa Walker then asked about the deadline for revising Round Four project requests based on the draft scorecards. Mr. Parsons replied that revisions should be submitted by the end of December.

Sharon Smidler followed up, confirming that updates should be sent to CVTA staff by year-end, and requested a current, ranked Excel or PDF version of the projects, which Chet Parsons confirmed was already sent and offered to resend or provide in a different format if needed.

10. CVTA TAC Member Comments

There were no member comments during the meeting.

9. Next Meeting: January 12, at 1:00 p.m.

10. Adjournment

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