

**RICHMOND REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**MINUTES OF MEETING
December 3, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT

W. Canova Peterson, IV, **Chairman**..... Hanover County
Steve A. Elswick, **Vice Chairman** Chesterfield County
Parker C. Agelasto..... City of Richmond
Manuel Alvarez, Jr. Goochland County
Jonathan Baliles City of Richmond
James H. Burrell New Kent County
Daniel A. Gecker Chesterfield County
Angela L. Gray RMTA
David Green..... GRTC Transit System
James M. Holland..... Chesterfield County
Wayne T. Hazzard (Alternate)..... Hanover County
Edward L. Henson, III..... Town of Ashland
Patricia S. O’Bannon..... Henrico County
Ivan Rucker (Nonvoting) FHWA
Frank J. Thornton..... Henrico County
Von Tisdale (Nonvoting) RideFinders
Carson L. Tucker Powhatan County
David T. Williams Powhatan County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Cliff Burnette (Nonvoting)..... VDA
Nick Britton (Nonvoting)..... DRPT
Sean M. Davis..... Hanover County
Thomas Fletcher (Nonvoting)..... CTAC
Kathy C. Graziano City of Richmond
Susan F. Lascolette Goochland County
Ryan Long (Nonvoting) FTA
Floyd H. Miles, Sr. Charles City County
Brian Montgomery (Nonvoting)..... EDAC
Michelle R. Mosby City of Richmond
John Rutledge CRAC
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. New Kent County

CALL TO ORDER

TPO Chairman W. Canova Peterson, IV, called the December 3, 2015 meeting of the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) to order at approximately 9:35 a.m. in the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission board room.

CERTIFICATION OF MEETING QUORUM

TPO Secretary Barbara S. Nelson reported that a quorum was present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Peterson introduced and welcomed Wayne Fedora, Acting Federal Highway (FHWA) Division Administrator to the TPO meeting.

At the request of James Burrell, the TPO observed a moment of silence for those lost in the most recent shooting tragedy in San Bernadino, California.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the TPO Agenda

On motion by David T. Williams, seconded by James M. Holland, the TPO unanimously voted to approve the December 3, 2015 meeting agenda as presented.

B. Minutes of the November 5, 2015 TPO Meeting

On motion by Edward L. Henson, III, seconded by David T. Williams, the TPO unanimously approved the minutes of the November 5, 2015 TPO meeting as presented.

C. Open Public Comment Period

There were no requests to address the TPO.

D. Consent Action Items –

Chairman Peterson called for requests to pull an item from the consent agenda for separate consideration and there were none. On motion of David T. Williams, seconded by Edward L. Henson, III, the TPO unanimously approved the following resolutions:

1. UWP Amendment: Budget Correction for Work Task 5.1, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Connectivity and Land Use Analysis

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) amends the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Unified Work Program (UWP) to correct a budget error in the amount of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) Special Allocation of FTA Sections 5303/5304 funds remaining unexpended in FY 2015 reducing the amount available for programming on this work task in FY 2016 by \$1,078 from \$40,552 to \$39,474.

2. RideFinders Funding Sources Report

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) accepts the *RideFinders Funding Sources Report* as work complete as outlined in Element 9 of the FY 2016 Unified Work Program work task 5.5, Regional Public Transportation Services.

E. TPO Chairman's Report –

Chairman Peterson reported that the third annual Regional Transportation Forum is scheduled for March 3, tentatively to be held at the Richmond Harley Davidson facility off of I-95 in Hanover County.

F. TPO Secretary's Report –

1. Report of Fall CTB Meeting

Barbara Nelson reported on the Fall Transportation Meeting held Monday, November 30, from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. at the Eastern Henrico Recreation Center on North Laburnum Avenue. She said following an hour for review of map boards showing HB 2 projects and other information, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Aubrey Layne opened the

question and answer period of the meeting engaging in active dialogue with the audience, discussing State of Good Repair (SGR), the next phase of HB 2 project selection and other matters. Secretary Layne said the SGR phase of HB 2 will focus on bridges and pavement, asset management and extending the life of these investments. Ms. Nelson said TPO staff looks forward to working with VDOT to leverage TPO discretionary funds to advance these projects in the Richmond Region.

2. Performance Measures Report

Barbara Nelson noted both state legislative mandates and federal requirements under MAP 21 for performance based planning and decision-making process and said that the Executive Committee was provided with a draft of the *Regional Performance Measures – Annual Progress Report 2015* which is posted on the RRPDC website for public comment and under review by the TPO Technical Advisory Committee. Ms. Nelson said this document will be presented for TPO consideration in the first quarter of 2016.

3. TPO October Work Status Report; and

4. TPO October Financial Status Report

Ms. Nelson reported on both the October Work Status and Financial Status reports saying the primary work effort for staff remains the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and work with the MTP Advisory Committee on resource allocation. She reported that a companion effort, the annual Regional Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality program funds allocation process is under way. Applications have been received and the project review, ranking and selection process will begin next week with TAC action in March and TPO action in April of 2016.

G. TPO Secretary's Report –

5. TPO December Work Status Report; and

6. TPO December Financial Status Report

Ms. Nelson reported on both the October Work Status and Financial Status reports saying the primary work effort for staff remains the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and work with the MTP Advisory Committee on resource allocation. She reported that a companion effort, the annual Regional Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality program funds allocation process is under way. Applications have been received and the project review, ranking and selection process will begin next week with TAC action in March and TPO action in April of 2016.

II. OLD BUSINESS

DC2RVA: Alternatives Analysis Update

Ms. Nelson provided a brief update on the November presentation to the TPO by Randy Selleck with the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). She said the alternatives analysis has been completed for the 123-mile rail corridor from Washington, D. C. to Richmond and will be presented at a public meeting at the DMV office on West Broad Street in Richmond on Thursday, December 10 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. with a presentation at 6:00 p.m. Ms. Nelson noted that DRPT has met with impacted localities, the Town of Ashland and Hanover County, the City of Richmond and each of Henrico and Chesterfield counties. She said the screened alternatives will be brought back for TPO consideration in January. Chairman Peterson requested that representatives from

each jurisdiction attend the December 10 meeting so that they will have a knowledge base from which to discuss this matter at the January 7 TPO meeting.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Richmond Regional Bridge and Culvert Inventory & Structural Assessment Report 2015 Update

Sulabh Aryal noted information included under agenda tab five as well as the four-page report summary included with the agenda package saying the website address to the full document posted on the RRPDC website is included in the staff report. Mr. Aryal provided a presentation on the *Richmond Regional Bridge and Culvert Inventory & Structural Assessment Report 2015 Update*. He said this report updates information provided in the original report approved by the TPO in 2014 using January 15, 2015 data to demonstrate the progress over one year. He said the report includes all bridges and culverts in the Richmond Region noting that there are no tunnels in this region. Mr. Aryal reviewed the four categories of deficient bridge conditions – structurally deficient, functionally obsolete, weight posted, and low sufficiency ratings – and provided definitions for each category. He said VDOT inspects all bridges and culverts in the Richmond Region, regardless of ownership, rating each on a scale from 0 to 100, and posts results on the online VDOT Dashboard which is updated daily. He said overpasses, flyovers and at grade level structures are all considered bridges and if a bridge has multiple structures, such as the Mayo Bridge, they are counted as separate bridges. He said the report lists all 1,412 bridges and culverts in the Region by location and by ownership, as well as by decade built or last reconstructed. Mr. Aryal said there are 77 deficient bridges and culverts in the Region with a sufficiency rating of less than 50 which are eligible for federal bridge replacement funds. Mr. Aryal reviewed the resolution proposed for TPO action noting that action would direct staff to work with VDOT and TAC to develop a regional bridge replacement and rehabilitation strategy for TPO review that would address prioritization of regional bridge needs and strategies to address them. There was significant discussion and major points brought forward through discussion and questions following Mr. Aryal's report are as follows:

- It is possible to have a duplicated count in this report with some structures being included in more than one category.
- This report is a snapshot of January 15, 2015 and structures that have been upgraded or replaced since that date would not be reflected in this report.
- Rob Cary, VDOT Richmond District Administrator, noted that this information may change daily and that the VDOT Dashboard is available on the VDOT website providing current information. Over the last year, VDOT has achieved a net reduction of 24 structurally deficient bridges and culverts across the Richmond District and annual state of structures and bridges report which reports from July of 2014 to July of 2015 shows that the Richmond District has an improving average health index with less than eight percent structures being structurally deficient.
- Functionally obsolete may have aspects that are not up to current standards but not necessarily structurally deficient.
- VDOT is required to oversee and report to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that inspection is being done for bridges and large culverts listed in the national bridge inventory, which includes pedestrian and bicycle trail bridges. Local

governments are required to inspect these facilities and provide the inspection reports to VDOT for any bridge or culvert facility with an opening of 36 square feet or larger.

- Any bridge assessed to be even remotely dangerous would be closed until it could be further assessed, maintenance performed or the facility replaced, so that public safety is not in jeopardy.
- Every district will receive a minimum of 5.5 percent of available State of Good Repair funds on a need basis with a maximum of 17.5 percent going to any one district. The Richmond District is slated to receive \$17.4 percent in addition to routine maintenance funds.
- In addition to HB 2, there will be State of Good Repair funds for heavy rehabilitation and replacement of pavement and bridges. A new process is under development for prioritizing projects under State of Good Repair which will be in full force in 2020.

On motion of James H. Burrell, seconded by Patricia S. O'Bannon, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) unanimously approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) accepts the *Richmond Regional Bridge and Culvert Inventory & Structural Assessment Report 2015 update* as work complete; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the TPO directs staff to work with TAC and VDOT Richmond District staff to develop a regional bridge replacement and rehabilitation strategy for TPO review that would include a methodology for prioritizing regional bridge needs, identify a prioritized list of bridge needs, and identify funding strategies to address the infrastructure investment needs.

B. Needs and Gaps Assessment for the Transportation Disadvantaged

Barbara Nelson provided a brief introduction to this work effort identified through a TPO Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Paratransit Services and Programs established in October 2013. Ms. Nelson reviewed ad hoc committee membership noting TPO members Steve Elswick, Kathy Graziano, Patricia O'Bannon and Carson Tucker and members from EDAC, GRTC, DRPT and TPO staff. She said that Dillon Massey, former TPO intern, was a significant contributor in this report. Ms. Nelson said this work effort is identified under UWP Task 5.2, Elderly and Disability Transportation Needs and Services, and she noted information included under agenda tab six as well as the draft report included with the agenda package. She said this report is an update of a 2006 report and includes an evaluation of the future demand for specialized transportation services by the region's transportation disadvantaged – seniors, individuals with disabilities and low income persons – to identify the gaps in available services. The ad hoc met four times with the last meeting held September 14 and Mr. Lantz will review the recommendations included in the report and a recommendation from the ad hoc committee for moving forward. Ms. Nelson said she would review Executive Committee discussion about additional staff work to be undertaken following Mr. Lantz's presentation.

Ken Lantz said the committee's recommendations were stratified into short-, mid- and long-term and he reviewed the recommendations by category. Mr. Lantz said the primary short-term recommendation was for staff to identify an organizational structure and funding resources to support establishing a specialized transportation services

coordination entity to serve as a centralized point of contact for accomplishing the other recommendations included in the plan. This would mean including a work task in the FY 17 UWP to explore such an organizational structure that could coordinate this effort. Mr. Lantz noted the TPO action requested in the staff report and Chairman Peterson asked if there were any questions for Mr. Lantz. Speaking as a member of the ad hoc committee, Pat O'Bannon said this was step one, an organizational structure to support a specialized transportation services coordination entity. She said that for now, that means a centrally located telephone number and how to get to services is what would be worked toward first. Chairman Peterson said Executive Committee discussion supports the resolution as stated. Ms. O'Bannon said economically challenged people don't necessarily have access to telephone "app" technology, but elderly individuals have a phone and can call to provide their zip code to learn what services are available within that zip code. Chairman Peterson requested TPO action on this matter before discussing additional information brought up by David Williams in the Executive Committee meeting.

On motion of Patricia S. O'Bannon, seconded by James H. Burrell, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) unanimously approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) endorses the recommendation of the TPO Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Paratransit Services and Programs to include in the FY-2017 UWP a task to explore the organizational structure to support a specialized transportation services coordination entity.

At the Chairman's request, Barbara Nelson summarized the Executive Committee discussion resulting from Mr. Williams' request. Ms. Nelson said Executive Committee discussion acknowledged that while updating the 2006 report provided good data and provides a platform for moving forward, it did not accomplish the objective that the Chairman who convened the ad hoc committee in October 2013 was hoping for. What he requested was a resource guide that could be used by a jurisdiction that has limited or no resources to duplicate a program to provide specialized transportation services to its citizens. This resource guide would provide examples of how paratransit is being deployed within our region or in other regions that could be emulated in rural jurisdictions in the Richmond Region. Mr. Williams said the reason he tasked Mr. Lantz with coming forward with this kind of guidance in a report was because of his experience and background with the paratransit system. He said if Mr. Lantz was aware of a program in another part of the state that had application that could be used by Powhatan County or Goochland or Hanover counties, they could use that information as something to test or adapt in their localities to create paratransit services. Barbara Nelson said that what was agreed to in the Executive Committee was that within 90 days, staff would work to develop that type of report and bring it back to the TPO.

Ms. Nelson said additional discussion related to the motion just passed by the TPO for staff to incorporate into the FY 2017 Unified Work Program a task to explore what existing organizations may fill this coordinating entity role, what funding resources would be required, and how that effort may be launched and bring that information back by late 2016. Ms. Nelson noted that as also suggested by Mr. Elswick, rather than having a brief presentation on the recommendations of the report, that the TPO have the opportunity to have a more in-depth presentation on all of the data included in the report, so there will be several opportunities for TPO board consideration of support for the transportation disadvantaged in the region in 2016. Pat O'Bannon said that when the ad hoc committee knew that the report needed to be updated

and this time they included more of the service providers in the report finding that Charles City and Goochland did have some providers, but there are some that aren't included such as churches and religious institutions that only cater to their membership. She said this is just stage one and that the committee didn't want to recommend expensive measures that may prove not to be the right direction. Chairman Peterson said this would probably come back to the TPO in the late spring time frame.

Parker Agelasto asked if there had been consideration of the specific needs of the ridership other than age or poverty level demographics. He said not all paratransit services are equal and people have different disabilities which require different kinds of accommodation such as service dogs or wheelchairs. He said there needs to be a determination of the specific service needs and offerings to pair people with the appropriate provider. Chairman Peterson noted that Appendix 10 in the report provides a good start on identifying providers and the central agency recommended by the ad hoc committee would have that kind of information to share with riders. Ms. O'Bannon said they did consider what type of transportation a person may need if they use a wheelchair rather than just needing a ride and being able to use a taxi service. Chairman Peterson commended the ad hoc committee for the work that was done and he thanked Mr. Lantz for his efforts and presentation.

C. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2040

Tiffany Dubinsky, RRPDC staff, said no action is being requested of the TPO at this time but that she would update the TPO on the MTP project selection process as part of the fiscally constrained plan and provide information that will assist the TPO in taking action in January on the allocation guidelines that determine how the revenues are divided. Ms. Dubinsky noted that project applications for inclusion in the 2040 MTP were due November 30 and 76 applications were received which are being reviewed by staff. The MTP Advisory Committee (AC) will meet December 16 to finalize allocation guidelines for revenues which will move forward as a recommendation for TPO action at the January 7, 2016 meeting. She said at the February TPO meeting, staff plans to present a recommended fiscally constrained project list as well as an unfunded regional needs list of projects that did not receive funding in the constrained plan, but which are priorities for the region. Ms. Dubinsky reviewed the project selection process incorporating VDOT revenue projections. She said the past process was to look at the amount of funding available and then determine how many projects on the project list could be fully funded, but found during public review that there was a flaw in having a clear methodology as to why these particular projects were selected. This time the MTP AC decided to determine prioritizing the commitment of limited resources by project type and time band. Ms. Dubinsky reviewed revenue projections noting that administrative/maintenance expenses for the existing transportation system are off the top. She discussed funding sources and noted the limited amount of remaining funds to address the region's needs. She reviewed mock scenarios for allocating funds by project type within time bands and where the future transportation investments should be focused.

Discussion and questions following the presentation resulted in the following major points being made:

- The MTP AC has not discussed disruptive technologies or technology innovations as a factor in the constrained 2040 MTP where projects are only submitted by local jurisdictions and agencies. The technical report will highlight where Intelligent

Transportation Systems (ITS) and demand services are going and will look at what technology will be expected to have future impacts.

- VDOT is not incorporating disruptive technology innovations in their planning process, but has discussed not needing traffic signals 30 years from now or using self-driving vehicles on demand that would require massive storage lots.
- VDOT is actively involved with Virginia Tech transportation and autonomous vehicle, vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to roadway technology research.
- An important future meeting topic would be to have a presentation by the Virginia Tech Transportation Institute (VTTI) on technology innovations that may need to be considered in long-term planning.
- Projected technology changes may come and go, but the roads and bridges still need to be repaired and maintained.

D. Connectivity and Land Use Plan for the BRT Route

Barbara Nelson said Josh Mallow, lead staff for the BRT Connectivity and Land-Use Analysis, would provide a presentation on this TPO FY 2016 Unified Work Program (UWP) work task supporting the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) effort. She said while the BRT is a significant opportunity for enhanced transit in the region, it focuses on the infrastructure investment. The Connectivity and Land Use Analysis will focus on realizing the full economic potential of the corridor through strategic planning, land use, transit oriented development and walkability. The study is a collaborative effort undertaken by the TPO and the City of Richmond funded by de-obligated FTA Section 5303 and 5304 funds from the Department of Rail and Public Transportation as well as funds from the City of Richmond.

Mr. Mallow introduced Will Sanford, RRPDC Intern, who is working with him on this project and said they are also working with the Department of Planning and Development Review. He shared early findings from Phase I of the project, a demographic and land use analysis which is complementary to the Pulse line (BRT), and will identify opportunities for transit oriented development (TOD) surrounding each station. He explained that TOD encourages car-light or car-free lifestyles. Mr. Mallow identified three study areas. He said walksheds are the distance from a point that can be reached by foot, about a half-mile from each station, illustrating what is accessible within a ten minute walk of the bus. He said the Demographic Study Boundary is a collection of 32 census block groups and is much larger than the walkable network attempting to capture whole neighborhoods. And Mr. Mallow said the Plan Boundary is a land use boundary where the most intensive recommendations will be made. He said it excludes more historic neighborhoods such as the Fan and museum district that offer little opportunity for large scale redevelopment which come with TOD. Focusing on the demographic study area, Mr. Mallow noted demographic shifts are that are indicative of a population that would benefit from transit oriented development. He said almost two-thirds of the city's jobs are located within that study area which holds nearly a quarter of the city's population where millennials, 18 to 34-year-olds, comprise 57 percent of the population with the largest age group being 22 to 29 years old. He said 65 percent of households own one or fewer cars so that many households are seeking alternative transportation. Mr. Mallow reviewed land use trends showing a 23 percent increase in households and a 26 percent increase in housing units from 2000 to 2013 with much of the 111 acres of land within the plan boundary vacant and ripe for development. Mr. Mallow said the whole plan boundary is valued at \$6.9 billion with \$678 million in permits have been issued in the past

five years indicating investment in new construction and improvements. He said one-third of the land area is occupied by surface parking lots which could eventually be redeveloped with reduced car usage. Mr. Mallow shared Infographics used in the analysis and discussed Phase II and next steps in the study. He said they are using transit-oriented Denver's light rail plan to model the analysis including a station-level analysis with readiness scores that will be applied to a Heat Map to and draft guidelines. This will help identify which stations would benefit most from planning, which are nearly ready-to-go and which would require significant planning. He said the study is scheduled for completion on June 30, 2016 and he would provide another update in the spring of 2016. Significant questions and discussion followed Mr. Mallow's presentation with the following major points brought forward:

- The walkability area does not consider topography such as hills, only distance.
- The impact of the VCU student population, which is not separately identified in the analysis, needs to be defined in order to provide a more accurate reflection of likely BRT ridership since VCU offers its own free student transit system which serves as a competing interest.
- The BRT line has useful purpose for VCU students for life destinations other than VCU.
- VCU brings some potential for increased ridership as they add student housing and eliminate student parking privileges, though the competing system will mitigate that potential.
- The study has been a corridor level study to date, but as the study considers each station, it will be more imperative to consult and have discussions with entities such as VCU.
- The VCU buses zig-zag through student and residential areas, not just to limited stops on Broad Street.
- When VCU pulled its support from GRTC to operate their own bus system, GRTC lost ridership and suffered a revenue loss of \$2 million plus a significant amount of additional FTA and state transit funds that were based on the GRTC total ridership.
- GRTC will enhance connections to some of the stations, but all stations are connected through the downtown transfer facility.
- The success of BRT is a lot bigger than just the people living in that area and there needs to be connectivity to the BRT stations getting as many people as possible to it as want to use it including those who cannot walk to it.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. TPO Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meeting Report

In the absence of CTAC Chairman Tom Fletcher, Barbara Nelson referred the TPO to the staff report included under agenda tab 9 and offered to answer questions. No questions were voiced.

B. TPO Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC) Meeting Report

In the absence of EDAC Chairman Brian Montgomery, Barbara Nelson referred the TPO to the staff report included in agenda tab 10 and offered to answer questions. No questions were voiced.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Upcoming TPO Policy Board Meetings and Future Meeting Topics

- Chairman Peterson said during agenda preparation, it came to his attention that there are efforts supported by TPO funds that are not project oriented. While most of the TPO funds go to specific projects and we have analyzed those projects with

how they are going to impact our mission. But within the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding category, there are three groups that receive annual funding that is not project specific and because of that, and because there is limited funding available, it is important that the TPO be certain that what we are spending is effective in meeting the TPO's mission. He said because of that he is requesting the three groups that receive annual funding report definitive data at the February 4, 2016 meeting on the impact of the TPO's investment in their programs on congestion mitigation and air quality improvement. Chairman Peterson requested that Ms. Nelson contact the Port of Richmond, RideFinders, and the City of Richmond to report on their programs in February. In response to a question regarding the Port of Richmond, Chairman Peterson said the TPO provides CMAQ funding to these programs and would like to see what are the results and the measurement sticks used to show that these funds are having an impact on how many trucks the Port has taken off the road with the funds we are providing and is the TPO accomplishing its mission in a reasonable manner. Barbara Nelson reported that the Port Authority Green Operator Program received a recent allocation of \$900,000; the City of Richmond Employee Trip Reduction Program receives \$250,000 and year and the RideFinders program receives \$500,000 a year totaling more than \$1.5 million annually. David Williams requested to know the total amounts of funding provided to these entities not just for this fiscal year, but for all years they have received funding and to show benefits received as well as funding amounts by fiscal year as well. Ms. Nelson noted that the RideFinders program is the longest standing program and have provided detailed annual reports to the staff and reported to the TAC each year. She said these details should all be readily be available. Chairman Peterson requested that Ms. Nelson include Mr. Williams comments in the discussion with these three groups about reporting to the TPO in February.

- Chairman Peterson noted that a presentation will be added to the future meeting topics to have the Virginia Tech Transportation Research group report on upcoming technologies.
- James Burrell stated that he is retiring after 24 years on the New Kent County Board of Supervisors and this will be his last TPO meeting. He said it has been a pleasure to serve. The TPO responded with a round of applause. Chairman Peterson thanked Mr. Burrell for his service over the years.

B. Next Meeting: January 7, 2016

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Peterson adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.