CA-MPO

Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee
Draft Minutes
November 19, 2025

A recording of this meeting can be found at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6kwbMQ2TpHI

OFFICERS		STAFF	
Sarah Medley, Charlottesville, Chair		Taylor Jenkins, TJPDC	x
Donna Chen, MPO – Vice-Chair	x	Gretchen Thomas, TJPDC	x
		Sarah Simba, TJPDC	x
		Gorjan Gjorgjievski, TJPDC	x
		Christine Jacobs, TJPDC *	x
VOTING MEMBERS		**GUESTS / PUBLIC**	
Stuart Gardner, MPO	x	Paul Grady	x
Jose Gomez, Albemarle County	x		
Patrick Healy, Charlottesville	x		
Ethan Heil, Charlottesville	x		
Lee Kondor, Albemarle	x		
Marty Meth, Albemarle County			
Nathan Moore, Albemarle County	x		
Danny Yoder, Charlottesville			
Peter Thompson, Albemarle County	x		
Yong Yeul Ahn, Charlottesville	x		
Vacant, MPO			

** online participant*

Call to Order (Minute 0:04)

Chair Donna Chen called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

1. **Attendance (Minute 0:33)**
   Sarah Simba took attendance.

2. **Matters from the Public (Minute 1:18)**
   Paul Grady, citizen of Albemarle County, said he asked previously if he could make a presentation to the committee and he was told that he could be on the agenda and have as much as 20 minutes. He said he would still like to do that in the future. He said that 25 years ago, he made nearly 10 presentations to the committee.

   General Administration (Minute 2:33)
   Acceptance of the Minutes of September 24, 2025 minutes

Lee Kondor explained in an email to Sarah Simba, which she read, why he abstained from the motion on the bike/ped motion. He also said there was a spelling error on the next paragraph. Mr. YY Ahn said his name was misspelled in the minutes.

Motion/Action: Patrick Healy made a motion to approve the minutes with the above changes. Jose Gomez seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. **Acceptance of the Agenda**

Ms. Simba noted a change in the next meeting date. It will be in 2026, not 2025.

Motion/Action: Lee Kondor made a motion to approve the agenda with the updated meeting date. Patrick Healy seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. **New Business (Minute 6:16)**

Structure of the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee

Taylor Jenkins noted that there is a memo in the agenda packet that covers three scenarios for the future of CTAC. Scenario 1 has CTAC as an Advisory Committee for the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Scenario 2 has CTAC as Outreach and Education support for the MPO for the public participation plan, Title IV implementation plan, the annual Unified planning Work Program (UPWP), the LRTP, and SMART SCALE submissions. Scenario 3 concludes CTAC as a formal committee.

There was a question-and-answer session about clarity on what each of these scenarios means for CTAC.

Mr. Kondor feels he can provide better technical data than the Technical Committee does, but notes that CTAC members are not allowed to be on the Technical Committee or provide meaningful technical information. He said if the Technical Committee cannot provide useful technical input, then CTAC has to do it.

Stuart Gardner said it is important that the citizens still have a way to give feedback. As long as there is a path for communication and feedback, CTAC may not be necessary. If there is no path for feedback, CTAC needs to remain intact.

Donna Chen said the public does not typically go to transportation meetings, especially the ones during the workday, so this committee may be one of the only ways to get feedback submitted.

Nathan Moore said Scenario One and Two might be acceptable.

Ethan Heil asked for clarification between Scenario One and Two, which Donna Chen provided.

Patrick Healy asked to explain what “matching the cadence” means for Scenario One.

Mr. Healy also said that there is representational value in CTAC for citizens.

Mr. Ahn said it is important to determine what the focus needs to be on in the committee, whether it is technical or if it is more focused on transit and transportation in general.

Peter Thompson said the MPO only covers a smaller region (more urbanized) of the TJPDC and is told that TJPDC and the MPO do not advocate for positions. They are more advisory entities. He said there is a great deal he would like to get done (bike paths, transit, smart traffic lights, etc.) and CTAC

is not the place for those things. He also said depending on what the focus is of this committee depends on how we constitute the group and who is recruited to be members.

Mr. Kondor said a fourth Scenario could be that CTAC is an Advisory Group. Mr. Thompson said that he didn't think that was feasible. Mr. Kondor said there needs to be another independent voice to give ideas and feedback.

Mr. Gardner suggested that perhaps there are citizens added to the Policy Board. Ms. Jenkins said that the Chair of CTAC is a non-voting member of the Policy Board. She also noted that the Policy Board's structure is decided at the state level.

Mr. Healy said there is advocacy in CTAC, but there is no reception for it. Each of the members is appointed, but when you go to advocacy, it gets political. The concern is that the elected officials may choose the appointed members based on political leanings. He said because of that reason, CTAC should be limited. He is leaning more towards Scenario one.

Ms. Chen said many folks had mentioned advocacy, but if it is not allowed, then perhaps the committee should be dissolved.

Mr. Gardner said CTAC could dissolve and each member of CTAC could provide public comments at the Policy Board meetings.

Mr. Heil said even if the committee can't do the advocacy, there is still value in the committee meeting.

Motion/Action: Patrick Healy moved to accept Scenario One. YY Ahn said this discussion should be incurred on the principle of the group. Nathan Moore said he thought Scenario One said CTAC was initially made for Scenario One. There was a discussion about SMART SCALE and LRTP.

Mr. Heil said Scenario Two does more of what the group does now, but it means the group would only meet once a year.

Mr. Gardner asked to continue this discussion for the rest of the meeting.

Ms. Jenkins asked to allow the invited guest, David Cook, to give his presentation.

<u>Active Transportation Counting in Virginia (Minute 1:00:25)</u>
David Cook, VDOT, introduced himself to the committee and presented the technical and practical reasons for transportation counting including a lack of reliable and consistent data and scale mismatch. He said there is also inadequate network representation and limited model sensitivity.

He continued by saying there has been counting of nonmotorized trips since 2018 managed by VDOT's Transportation and Mobility Planning Division. He noted that there is a network of VDOT maintained automated counters and local partner counters with some dating back to 2012. He said that VDOT uses eco-counters to count pedestrians, cyclists and micromobility users and that VDOT performs before and after counts on roadway configurations, supports active transportation investments, measures performance of newly built bike/ped projects, and analyses year-over-year trends.

He listed the active transportation count activities in Virgina and detailed the counting equipment used for the counts.

He shared the Virginia statewide active transportation county map. This map can be found on the VDOT website. He said short duration, loaner and technical assistance counts are provided by TMPD to provide support for local, regional, and statewide active transportation.

Mr. Cook shared how they use count data for safter crossings and complete streets and showed the example of Braddock Road in Alexandria. He also showed how count data was used to support a new multimodal bridge in downtown Richmond (Mayo Bridge Replacement). He also shared how they used count data to support permanent closure of roadway after a pilot period (Free Bridge Lane in Albemarle County). He also shared how they used count data to support a road diet (Franklin Street 2-way cycle track extension in the City of Richmond).

He said he knows that Albemarle, the City, and TJPDC are interested in counters in the future. He said this information is presented at the Bike/Ped committees in the localities. He said the only way to see the bike/ped counter information is to go onto the website and subscribe to their newsletter. There is a link in the newsletter called "Request Form for Bicycle and Pedestrian Eco-Counters on Loan" to request the information.

<u>Performance Safety Targets (1:29:35)</u>
Tabled.

<u>Structure of the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (Minute 1:31:10)</u>
There was a return to the initial discussion.

Motion/Action: Mr. Heil made a motion to accept Scenario Two.

Mr. Gardner said perhaps there is a recommendation to the Policy Board to delay the decision. Mr. Thompson said he felt the Policy Board was ready to make a decision. He also said the committee has not really had time to discuss the future of CTAC as a committee.

Mr. Gardner said delaying it will not be catastrophic and feels the decision could safely be delayed.

Ms. Chen noted that the scenarios presented in the memo do not accurately describe exactly what the CTAC does.

Motion/Action: Mr. Kondor made a motion to stress a level of advocacy for CTAC.

Ms. Shackelford said when she was with the MPO, it was creating the LRTP and there was a great deal of input from the members of CTAC.

Motion/Action: Mr. Heil made a motion to request more time for the CTAC members to decide how to move forward. Ms. Chen said she would like to add the advocacy component to either Scenario One or Two.

Mr. Shackelford said Richmond's CTAC decided to go towards Scenario Two, so there is precedent for that choice.

There was continued discussion about which scenario might be the best with which to move forward.

Mr. Ahn said it is important that CTAC focus on values instead of technical issues.

Motion/Action: Mr. Gardner made a motion to recommend to the Policy Board that the CTAC believes they should exist, however they would like to dedicate their next meeting to what CTAC's scope will be. Patrick Healy seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5. **Staff Updates and Meeting Schedule**
   CAMPO Policy Board Activities
   Tabled.

   Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Study
   Tabled.

   Next CTAC Meeting Regular Meeting is an all-virtual meeting on January 28, 2026, from 7 – 9 p.m.

6. **VDOT Updates on Projects & Studies**
   STARS
   Tabled

   Pipeline Studies
   Tabled

   SMART SCALE – Round 7
   Tabled

7. **Roundtable Updates (Minute 1:56:44)**
   Ms. Shackelford said the surveys for the Pipeline and STARS studies are online. She encouraged everyone to take it and forward it on any social media platforms folks may have.

8. **Additional matters from the public**
   None.

   The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.