

---

**COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MONTHLY REPORT TO THE TPB**

April 15, 2026  
Tim Davis, CAC Chair

The April meeting of the CAC was held virtually and in-person on Thursday, April 9. The committee received a briefing and discussed the DMVMoves work plan. The briefing was on the assessment of regional safety activities. They also held their “Act Locally” round robin. Chair Tim Davis opened the meeting with remarks about the role of CAC members in their local jurisdictions. He mentioned his over 25 years participating in Bike-to-Work Day and his communication as a member of the Frederick County Planning Commission on the links between land use and transportation.

**REGIONAL SAFETY ACTIVITIES AT TPB**

Janie Nham briefed the CAC on some of the activities local jurisdictions have undertaken to combat regional crash trends, and in particular, the efforts around Automated Traffic Enforcement (ATE). These initiatives arose from a safety resolution the TPB adopted in 2020. Her presentation touched on four themes, including: most jurisdictions are adopting safety planning and agency cultural norms; speed reduction is the countermeasure used most frequently by local jurisdictions; impaired driving and unbelted driving countermeasures are typically led by police departments; and there is common ground among all levels of government to address distracted driving. Her presentation also touched on the recommendations staff are making to continue progress on these initiatives.

The CAC had a number of questions and comments on details in the report, who is involved in the implementation, and further resources that might be used to assist the efforts. Some questions included the following:

**Why does Virginia make seatbelt enforcement secondary?**

In addition to staff, CAC members provided information on this question. Reasons include the difficulty enforcing the law, questions about equity, and debate over government overreach. Members referenced a new law that passed in the Virginia legislature that provides for all occupants in a car to wear a seatbelt.

**Are insurance companies involved in the efforts to address these safety concerns?**

They are engaged nationally. There are cross-sector efforts that include many public health interests. We’re not aware of any local efforts, but it’s a good suggestion to reach out to insurance companies.

**Is there interest from the self-driving car manufacturers in these efforts? They are busy trying to roll these products out. It seems as if they would have data.**

We’re not aware of the involvement of self-driving car manufacturers in the efforts locally, but they may be involved in the national dialogues.

**Was road rage looked at? Is there any connection between road rage and the age of the driver?**

Road rage was not particularly looked at, but road rage behaviors, such as speeding, reckless driving, etc. were. Driver age and these behaviors were not considered particularly. There is some correlation between driver age and injuries/fatalities.

**There is pushback from locals on ATE. How do we promote their effectiveness?**

ATE is implemented in high crash corridors. They are effective in reducing injuries and fatalities on the corridors where they are used. There is data showing the effectiveness of ATE at these locations.

Several CAC members had questions about details on engineering standards for road safety, such as speed bumps, roundabouts, etc. They asked if these engineering solutions work to change behavior long-term and whether they can create more problems. Staff said these are examples of engineering countermeasures that have been implemented. How those are decided includes a lot of factors for the road itself.

**DMVMOVES WORK PLAN**

Pierre Gaunard, TPB staff, provided the CAC with an update on implementation of the DMVMoves work plan for regional transit integration. He briefed the committee on the status of jurisdictional endorsements and the organizational structure adopted to define implementation of the plan. There are active working groups made up of public agency staff for the Regional Bus Priority Network, Service Guidelines and Performance Measures, Fare Policies, Bus Stop Amenities, and Joint Procurement subject areas, with more possibly to come. Many of the actions and implementation challenges being addressed by each working group were detailed. Discussions between working group members are underway with deadlines set for the coming months. A progress report is expected in the fall.

Questions and comments included the following:

**Can you explain the leadership structure further?**

There are two tiers of transit agency leadership represented, an executive group and a coordinating group. These are made up of the principals from the transit agencies. The working groups are made up of staff from transit agencies.

**What about procurement? What is the advantage in pursuing cooperative purchasing agreements?**

Smaller jurisdictions may not always have the negotiating power of the larger agencies. Also, there is the potential for better price and other terms from a group procurement.

**Are there any applications for accessibility and paratransit?**

Not directly. There are related considerations for the bus stop design and amenities efforts, but paratransit is addressed through other programs that aren't part of this effort and is generally managed differently than the transit modes covered in DMVMoves. Accessibility is part of the conversation wherever it applies.

**ATTENDANCE**

Tim Davis, Chair  
Daniel Papiernik, Vice Chair  
Ra Amin, Vice Chair  
Heather Gaona  
Dan Hardy  
Kevin Jiang  
Madeline Kaba  
Monica Martinez Lopez  
Felipe Millan  
Lorena Rios  
Rick Rybeck

Gail Sullivan  
  
Staff  
Laura Bachle  
Marc Moser  
Lyn Erickson  
Rachel Beyerle  
Cristina Finch  
Janie Nham  
Pierre Gaunard  
Thomas Harrington