MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee, Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Date	Tuesday, January 31, 2023
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 19m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/2726
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-11-04. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:05] All right, let's go ahead and get started here in a minute. If folks could go ahead and take a seat. All right, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[00:00:23] Let's go ahead and get started. I'll call this meeting of the Board's Transportation Committee to order. We have a summary of the December 13, 2022 meeting. Are there any changes to that summary? Okay, I see none, so it will stand.

[00:00:42] All right, we have three items on the agenda. we are going to try to move through these pretty quickly uh so that we can uh be done by 12 30. we don't want to have uh hangry uh committee members this afternoon and it is going to be lunchtime so um i would turn it over mr bashodney if you would like to introduce the first item on residential cut through permit program as a concept thank you mr chairman this is a carryover item from the december meeting it is a topic we've discussed with the board previously, but we wanted to bring it back and ask for any direction the board had in terms of

[00:01:21] moving this program forward or not moving this program forward. So I'm going to turn it over to Henry Stein-McCartney, Neil Freshman, and Eric Teitelman for today's presentation. Henry. Good morning, Chairman Alcorn, board members. I'm Henry Stein-McCartney, Traffic Engineering Section. I'm joined today by Neil Freshman, Traffic Engineering Section Chief, Joanna Faust, Office of County Attorney Eric Tiedelman, Capital Projects Division Director, and also representatives of the police department, I

believe, may have stuck around to address enforcement of this program. Today, we are presenting an update to the

[00:02:00] proposed resident cut-through permit program, which is not displayed. Okay, great. Cut-through restrictions in residential communities are implemented to mitigate residential cut-through traffic by restricting access onto certain residential streets during certain hours. With these restrictions in place, residents are unable to take the most direct route to their homes during restricted hours.

[00:02:34] In 2019, the Virginia General Assembly passed a legislation authorizing Fairfax County to pass an ordinance and develop a program to issue permits to residents whose direct access to their homes was impacted by restrictions. We were previously here in December 2019 to present a proposed resident permit program and today we'll provide an update and seek your guidance.

[00:02:59] This permit program would be a companion program to the existing cut-through mitigation program, a joint program offered by FCDOT and VDOT that restricts vehicular access to neighborhood streets affected by cut-through traffic. Cut-through traffic is defined as traffic that has no origin or destination in the community.

[00:03:18] Cut-through traffic has become more prevalent because of wayfinding apps, such as Waze, which sometimes delivers routes drivers onto neighborhood streets when traffic is heavy on major routes. The proposed permit program would not change the cut-through mitigation program or the community process to get these restrictions.

[00:03:36] It would simply offer residents a permit to give them direct access to their homes when restrictions are in place. There are currently three communities in the county, two in Mason District and one in Drain'sville, which are impacted by existing cut-through restrictions.

[00:03:59] Collectively, in the three existing impacted communities, there are approximately 350 addresses that could qualify for permits if the proposed program were implemented. The proposed permit zones for the existing restrictions are shown on the slide in blue, and they capture every address with a driveway on a restricted street or on a street that intersects with a restricted street.

[00:04:21] The two existing Mason District restrictions have been in place since the 1990s. The restriction in Drainsville District was more recently implemented in 2020 and lies along the border between Fairfax County and Loudoun County. This restriction also impacts approximately 30 addresses in Loudoun County whose residents have expressed an interest in receiving permits if the board approves.

[00:04:47] In addition to the three existing cut-through restriction areas, there are currently five pending cut-through mitigation projects in various stages of the process. Here we see the five pending cut-through mitigation projects, and they are located in Drainsville, Providence, and Sully districts. If these pending projects are all implemented at a future date, an additional 800 addresses in these affected communities would be impacted by restrictions and could be eligible for permits. We would anticipate having a total of around 1,200

[00:05:22] permit eligible addresses countywide in future years if these pending projects are all implemented. From our experience in administering the residential permit parking district's program, we would anticipate issuing around three permits per address if this program were implemented.

[00:05:49] Staff has identified a number of steps and resources needed to develop this new permit program, which includes development of new software and a new ordinance in addition to a few administrative tasks. The most critical element to program development is obtaining new software.

[00:06:07] Staff proposes to administer this program similar to the RPPD program, and we would need new software dedicated to the new proposed program. We've obtained an estimate from our third-party software vendor, and they've indicated that development, testing, and delivery of a new software package would cost $225,000 and take around 12 months to complete. Funding has not been identified for that software. Staff could also work on developing additional steps, including finalizing an ordinance, updating agreements, arranging for revenue collection, and procuring the

[00:06:45] necessary materials and equipment for the program concurrently with software development. In addition to one-time funding for software, we would anticipate that the program would require around $30,000 in annual recurring funding for program materials and software maintenance.

[00:07:08] A new ordinance would be required for this program, and we've worked with the Office of County Attorney to draft a proposed ordinance, which would be a new section of Fairfax County Code, Section 82-4A. The proposed ordinance would set forth the program rules, specify the permit zone establishment and eligibility, set fees, and provide penalties for violations.

[00:07:32] When we last presented this program in 2019, the board had expressed an interest in charging residents a fee for these permits. Staff has reviewed fees for transportation-related permits in neighboring jurisdictions, and we found that a fee of $40 per vehicle is in line with other regional fees.

[00:07:52] These fees could help defray the recurring cost of the program with revenue dependent upon the number of permits that are issued each year. One proposed ordinance revision on which we would like your guidance is the establishment of permit zones. Staff proposes that the permit zone could be established in the cut-through mitigation process and become effective automatically upon implementation of a new cut-through restriction. And this would allow residents to apply for permits very quickly once their restriction is in place. Another option could be that communities could request establishment

[00:08:31] of a permit zone, much like they currently request residential parking programs. And that option could include a petition and a board hearing if that is what the board wishes. Permits would only be available for verified residents of addresses in the designated permit zones and the permits would be vehicle specific. There would be no limit to the number of permits that could be issued to each address provided that all of the permitted vehicles are registered there. Residents who are not required by state law to register their vehicles in Virginia or residents who drive

[00:09:10] vehicles owned by others would be allowed to apply for a permit by providing some documentation and showing proof of residency in the permit zone. One limitation of this program is that permits would not be available for any non-resident. Our state authority allows permits only for residents of the designated area. Non-resident motorists would still be able to access the residential community during restricted hours by taking another route into

[00:09:41] the community. Development of software would allow residents to apply for permits and manage their accounts online, similar to the current RPPD program. Temporary permits would be available for new residents or residents who have purchased new cars, giving them a little time to comply

with the state requirements for vehicle registration and residency. Enforcement would be performed primarily on a complaint basis. Vehicles that turn onto a restricted street without a permit

[00:10:18] would be cited for disregarding a highway sign. We've mentioned the need to develop a new proprietary software application to manage the permits for this program.

[00:10:34] Staff that would administer this program and issue these permits currently dedicate 100% of their time to residential parking programs. So the program administration efficiencies provided by software would really be critical to the success of the program because the software would then carry the burden of the program administration and allow us to administer this program along with our existing programs with a small staff.

[00:11:02] The software would also allow for online applications and payment, account management, which are features that provide resident satisfaction with county programs. So now we seek your feedback and guidance.

[00:11:19] Would you like for us to move forward with the program as proposed? And if so, are you comfortable considering funding for it? And finally, do you have any specific guidance regarding the proposed implementation of it? Thank you for your attention, and we're happy to take your questions and feedback.

[00:11:37] Thank you very much. I'll turn it to Chairman McKay. Thank you, Chairman Alcorn. I appreciate the presentation. This is a real problem in these neighborhoods. There's no doubt about it. And so I am certainly okay with us moving forward with this. I guess a couple of questions I have.

[00:11:53] One, in these particular subdivisions, do we know if any connector or school bus routes would be affected, and would they be exempted from this restriction? I believe that buses are exempt from the restriction currently, also emergency vehicles.

[00:12:13] Well, yeah. Yeah, of course. I just want to make sure buses are exempt, too, just because travel time is a big issue, and we want to make sure they're still allowed to go through. The second question I have is because we have a mitigation program now, and I don't remember all the criteria in here, but these are in the program already.

[00:12:33] So what we're really considering is do we allow these to go into this new tier, for lack of a better description, that allows these decals to be purchased and used. I guess the question is do we want to differentiate those two moving forward? because we have three today, and we want to make sure that, you know, we're strategic about where these are, we can identify a real problem, and that it's not just something somebody wants to do.

[00:12:59] And so when we have our tiers for cut-through mitigation qualification today for the signage, are we thinking about a different threshold for qualification for the DECAL program, or are we thinking anyone who qualifies under the cut-through mitigation could then also come forward and want to participate in the DECAL program?

[00:13:19] We would anticipate that any resident that is in the, you know, directly affected by the mitigation program that has already been implemented for their community would be allowed to apply for permits.

[00:13:34] But only those residents whose direct access to their homes is impacted by the restriction. Okay. So I'm asking just, you know, forward thinking. We might want to think about for the ones that have not already been established, do we want to have tiers of qualifications for them or not?

[00:13:54] Do we want to rethink what some of the thresholds are to get into the program to begin with? I just want to make sure that we protected ourselves from this growing into a much larger program than we can potentially manage longer term. So, Mr. Chairman, I think if the six or five districts that are being considered would go through and the board agrees to advance this program we would include them in the in the program unless they said they didn't want to but right but yeah I'm just thinking beyond the six you know we have our criteria to be in the program today I don't know if this extra layer makes us want to

[00:14:33] think again whether the initial criteria is still the criteria we want to have given the new burden that's going to be on county staff of administering the decal program chairman okay I just want to clarify one thing and that is this program is sort of an add-on to the cut-through program the cut-through mitigation program is also based on is actually based on VDOT criteria right so the criteria to get into the cut through mitigation is based on the volume of vehicles cutting through the percent of total traffic that's cutting through that would not change with this program okay I guess we want to monitor and think about whether or not it should

[00:15:13] I guess is one of the questions I'm asking and I just want to make sure we're we have the right thresholds in place because this is a new layer that we don't have right now it's one thing to go through the process and post signs it's another for the county to administer a decal program and I just want to make sure we're helping the communities that need it the most and maybe we do want to think about there being an extra layer of criteria maybe the volume needs to be even higher? I don't know. I'm just thinking long-term beyond these, trying to protect our interest in making sure that we're not going to be getting requests for these all over the place

[00:15:48] and then have to deal with the ongoing administration of the decal program. The other question I wanted to ask is, if you live in one of these communities and you don't want to pay the $40 per vehicle, then the only risk associated with that is if there was enforcement done, you would be stopped, and then presumably you would show your driver's license, which had your address, that proved you lived in that community, and then you would be on your way.

[00:16:14] In other words, you wouldn't be getting citations. That's, I think, an important thing we need to understand. If you didn't have the decal, you would get a citation. Even if you lived on the street? I just want to, can we get a... I mean, you would still have other ways to get into your neighborhood.

[00:16:31] You wouldn't be precluded. You just couldn't make that restricted turn without having the decal. I just want to make sure that's, is that the intention of the police to do enforcement that way? So Captain Allen Hanson, the commander of traffic division for Fairfax County Police Department. So discretion enters in into ticketing for officers.

[00:16:50] And so, yeah, so understanding that the permit exists, we would talk to the community member about that and inform them of that and make sure they're aware of it. But if they had proof that they lived on that street, a warning may have been more appropriate than a citation.

[00:17:08] So there's no mandate that we issue a citation on these types of things. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that was the case, because there are situations where one might not have it, and there may be

situations where people might not be able to buy those permits for all of their vehicles.

[00:17:25] And I just wanted to make sure we're not, you know, if they live on that street, they're the people we're trying to help. They're not the people we're trying to cite. I mean, they're the people who are, you know, just trying to get home, and I don't think you should have to purchase a decal to be able to use the street to get to your home if everybody else who does have a decal can, and I just want to make sure that discretion is out there.

[00:17:47] I'm not encouraging people to do that because it's aggravating enough and time-consuming enough to be stopped and then have to explain that. That should be enough incentive, but I just want to make sure on the enforcement that we're going to exercise that discretion. Yes, sir, that would be certainly our guidance within the department to do so.

[00:18:06] But again, to his point is that we're steering people towards the permit just so visibly they won't have to be stopped and have to confirm that. So I would speak to the challenge of enforcement for this because we focus on life safety issues, and this would be, frankly, low on our priority.

[00:18:31] And this type of program would count very heavily upon enforcement. So I just want to make sure that that is understood as well. You actually answered the next question I was going to ask. As I said earlier, I am okay with this because I do think there's a real problem in these communities.

[00:18:49] But I also think we need to make sure we manage people's expectations. Because I know as soon as people are starting to pay to get details, they're going to be expecting immediate, around-the-clock enforcement. And that's not, you know, what this program is or what we're capable of doing. And so it's really, it's a good neighbor thing.

[00:19:06] We're hoping people follow the law. If you catch people who aren't, you know, you can obviously cite them. But ultimately, you know, this is not an around-the-clock enforcement operation of the FCPD by any means. The challenge in this as well is if people start to see vehicles turning, the impulse is to follow the vehicles, especially it's a path of least resistance.

[00:19:27] So that could be a challenge as well. Yeah. Okay. I appreciate all that. Thank you. Okay, we'll start at the end and work our way up. Let's go with Supervisor Faust. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I asked this a long time ago.

[00:19:45] We as a board endorsed it as part of our legislative program, and we got a local senator and House of Delegate member to introduce the legislation, and it passed. So we have the tool. Why do we do that?

[00:20:02] You know, we're not changing in any way the cut-through program. It's there. But unfortunately, it applies to the residents who live on the street as well as the Maryland commuters who are going through their neighborhoods every night.

[00:20:21] And therefore, they have been reluctant to adopt it because once those signs go up, you can't turn. You can live 100 feet away from that sign, but you can't turn onto that street.

[00:20:36] uh you have to find another way to get home uh and that's you know just not fair uh it's a double whammy for these people they got to cut through traffic and they can't get to their house so anyway uh we adopted it uh and uh you know i i don't think a 40 fee is unreasonable at all uh i do uh i do think that

you know our board has an opportunity to really and do something significant to protect these neighborhoods.

[00:21:15] I'm telling you right now that I have heard multiple times about people who are trying to get to their house because of cut-through traffic. They park their cars, get their kids out, and walk along the side of the street to get home. And then when rush hour is over, they'll go back and get their cars.

[00:21:31] That's how bad it is. If you don't live through it, you don't appreciate it. It is bad out there. So it's not about the neighborhoods that already have this. They certainly probably figured out a way to live with the restrictions, and they may or may not even care to take advantage of this new legislation.

[00:21:55] But there are lots of neighborhoods where, you know, they have to have this program in place or else they add 45 minutes to their commute getting home because they have to find an alternative way to get to their house if they have cut through restrictions. So anyway, there are very few things we can do that have immediate positive neighborhood improvement impact like this program.

[00:22:25] So I have supported it for years now, and I continue to support it. All right. Thank you, Supervisor Faust. Let's go to Supervisor Gross. Thank you. In my district, we've had restrictions for nearly 30 years in one neighborhood, and for almost at least 25, more than 25, in another neighborhood right next to my office.

[00:22:55] It works very well. The residents understood the restrictions. They are usually willing to abide by them. They go around. You're not gating the entire community. You have other ways of getting into the neighborhood.

[00:23:11] There was an enforcement done at Old Columbia Pike and Downing Street in 2019 as a result of the request of the community, and I don't know what was going on, but they issued in that enforcement period, I don't know what it was, 73 tickets for trying to turn left from Old Columbia Pike onto Downing Street.

[00:23:33] And it's sort of interesting because once you get in there, I'm not sure where you were going to go to Columbia Pike because then you would turn right. You really can't turn left because of the amount of traffic. So I'm not sure what was going on, but it certainly showed that some people were trying to violate the turn restriction.

[00:23:54] But it has worked very well in Mason District. So I really have great difficulty with this whole idea of a decal or a permit. This is a situation, you can't have your cake and eat it too.

[00:24:11] And so if you want restrictions, then everybody abides by those restrictions. It isn't restrictions for some and no restrictions for others. I'm trying to figure out how this affects our One Fairfax policy, quite frankly. A $40 fee per vehicle seems to be very high.

[00:24:32] Maybe in the Drainsville District, they can afford it. In the Mason District, that would be a real difficult situation for a lot of my constituents. I mean, you don't even pay that much for your yearly inspection sticker. So I understand the rationale.

[00:24:50] Now, I certainly would support people being able to have restrictions in their neighborhoods, but I think that everybody has to abide by the restriction. It's not that you live in this neighborhood, you get to turn against the restriction, but since I don't live in the neighborhood, I don't get to turn because everybody can find another way to get into the neighborhood.

[00:25:11] I think it's an enforcement nightmare. I am concerned about the cost. Would the $225,000 cover only the cost of the software, and would there be an annual recurring funding needed to maintain the program? Yes. Supervisor Chris, we anticipate $30,000 annually in recurring cost to maintain the program software, to purchase materials to support program as well.

[00:25:46] So the initial layout or initial outlay is $225,000 and then a recurring anticipated $30,000. Right. Actually, the initial outlay for both the software and the first year of equipment and materials just to stand up the program would be a total of $255,000.

[00:26:11] So $2.25 for the software, plus $30 to allow us pay for startup cost on materials. And so my other question would be about staffing. Would, you know, do you have staff to manage the parking permits?

[00:26:31] Also, do patrol stations have the resources to enforce it? And then I have one other question after those responses. Okay. For staffing, this program would be administered by the same staff that currently administers residential parking programs. We would anticipate that our staff that manages permits for the RPPD program would also manage permits for this program.

[00:27:02] So from the police perspective, staffing is a challenge currently. And so were we back to full strength um this is something that we would may be able to periodically enforce um you know um if this was something that was we're just trying to get off the ground perhaps we can do it for a short very short duration at the initial but it's not something that we can sustain it's not something currently with the current staffing that we could do that's that's what i thought um then the the On this particular location that we're talking about, Thomas, what is it?

[00:27:41] Anyway, it's Fairfax and Loudoun. There are 12 houses in Fairfax County. There are 28 households in Loudoun County. I'm trying to figure out, you know, where's the, who goes, would Loudoun County residents then go to Fairfax County for the permits if this goes through?

[00:28:03] I mean, I think it gets very murky. The Loudoun County residents are impacted by a restriction that is located in Fairfax County. Only Fairfax County has been authorized by Virginia General Assembly to implement such a permit program.

[00:28:25] So the idea is that those Loudoun County residents are impacted by a restriction that is located in Fairfax. And they have expressed an interest in receiving permits from Fairfax County to allow them to directly access their homes, just like the Fairfax County residents.

[00:28:44] Okay, but my question is, is that legal? Is that something we would do? I mean, Fairfax County issuing permits to somebody in an adjoining jurisdiction, that gets murky, fuzzy, everything.

[00:29:03] Supervisor Gross, Joanna Faust from the County Attorney's Office. The enabling authority is broad enough to issue, subject to the Board's approval, for the Board to issue those permits to Loudoun County residents because the designated area is the VDOT designated area.

[00:29:19] And VDOT has designated an area that crosses the board or between two. Loudoun County could not institute this program, though, if the restriction was on their side because only an urban county executive. All right. Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I do not support this special carve-out.

[00:29:41] I think that the restrictions have worked very well, certainly in my district, for the last almost 30 years, and that everybody understands the restriction is the restriction. You don't get passed to, you know, some people have to stop at a red light and the rest of them get to go through. I mean, that's what we're telling people is you can ignore the restriction because you're special, and I really don't support that.

[00:30:05] Thank you. All right. Thank you, Supervisor Gross. Other comments? Supervisor Smith. Just a question about the fine for the disregarding a highway sign. It's been a little while since I've written that, so I apologize.

[00:30:23] Traditionally, I think it was something around $60 to $75. Okay. I would have to look that up, though. Okay. That's just basic. I just wanted to talk about the Hidden Meadow. that happened started in 2018 and so it went through the process and in 2019 the community found out what they had to do and they haven't done anything since then so I would think if they wanted to do this again they probably have to start the process all over again thank you okay actually let's go back to Supervisor Stewart I thank you mr. chairman I'm not I just want to

[00:30:59] understand if this applies to a safety situation so you have an intersection that if people are turning left, again, it's the same concept that it's cut through, people turning left. And there's been a number of accidents at this intersection. So currently we're working, I'm working with VDOT to address that. And one of the things that they're considering is no left turn and no left turn potentially during certain hours, et cetera. You know, would that, I mean, if you wanted to differentiate between residents who live there versus people who are cutting through. Is that an option? Again, this is probably a safety issue. Roland's Road is

[00:31:39] in particular the area that I'm talking about, so I don't know. I just wanted to get an understanding of how this might apply to that. Okay, Supervisor Stork-Neal Freshman. This program would only apply to term restrictions that were implemented under the cut-through program. If there are term restrictions that are implemented due to safety concerns or other concerns, capacity or such, These permits would not apply to that.

[00:32:03] So could you have a variable policy on a road that is impacted by cut-through, but the safety issue is no left turn during certain times of the day? In other words, is there a hybrid?

[00:32:21] Is there an option to do both with this? I would say we really haven't thought through that, but right now we don't have any of those situations. There are places where turns are restricted by VDOT based on, let's say, site distance or safety. And there are other locations that a turn is perfectly fine from a safety point of view, but from a cut-through point of view, it's restricted based on the fact that they went through the program, the VDOT program that is administered by the county. So first and foremost, you'd have to do the study to see if there's a cut-through issue, and then maybe it

[00:32:59] might apply or might not. So that might, it may be an option for the community if they don't want to restrict all left-hand turns to go through the cut-through program, and maybe there may be an option for them to permit residents to be able to turn left while others could not during certain times of the day.

[00:33:17] If they qualified for the cut-through program and this is approved by the board, then, yes, they could qualify for permits to be able to do that. But if they didn't qualify for the cut-through program, if it was only a safety issue, this program would not apply.

[00:33:35] Thank you. Okay, Supervisor Palchuk, and then we wrap up. Thank you. I appreciate the conversation. I'm just trying to understand, and I want to thank you and your team who have helped many in my community, especially I know Alan Av has been working on their cut-through for years. So I have two quick questions.

[00:33:50] One, what is the difference between our existing cut-through program and what this would implement? And then number two, I know I don't go through many streets in the city of Falls Church because they have a cut-through program, I'm wondering if we've gotten information from how theirs is working in providing this proposal.

[00:34:14] Supervisor Palchik, the existing cut-through program would not be impacted by this. This would be an add-on. For the existing cut-through program, there have to be certain criteria met, a request from the community that comes through the board office, certain traffic volumes have to be met, and then there's a ballot.

[00:34:30] That program exists, and it would continue to exist. This program would be an add-on to that. It could encourage more neighborhoods to come through the cut-through program, but it would not make getting a cut-through restriction any easier or any different.

[00:34:47] So you still have to go through those policies. And then ultimately, just to be clear, on the cut-through program, VDOT has a role in that. VDOT has a role in ultimately deciding if a cut-through restriction can be implemented. This would be something that is added on on top of existing or future cut-through restrictions.

[00:35:11] And have we gotten any data or input from how it's working in either Falls Church or surrounding jurisdictions that have been maybe doing a more similar program? I'm not aware that other jurisdictions have a permit program.

[00:35:32] They might have a cut-through restriction. Right, but not with a permit. So the main, just to be clear with the community, the main difference here is the permitted part of the program. Correct, correct. So, I mean, I'm supportive. I think it's, I'm seeing quite a few, quite a bit of this cut-through program in our community, especially if they're trying to, connecting to highways, to Gallows, to Tysons, et cetera.

[00:35:59] Some of these communities are very, very much impacted, especially with use of Waze. And so I'd be open to moving forward with it and just monitoring how it's going and understanding if we're seeing a huge increase in need. I think the more tools that we're able to have in our toolbox to help assist communities that are so impacted by some of this cut-through traffic.

[00:36:22] I don't know how much the toll lanes are or not impacting this traffic. You may have data on that. I have only anecdotal data on that. I think moving cautiously and understanding the impact, the software, your team do an incredible job, and I want to make sure that they have the software they need and that we continue to see if there's new software that can help decrease the people power needed to make this happen.

[00:36:49] But to me, $30,000 a year is much less than having to hire additional FTEs for that. So if we're able to lower the FTE number as this program grows with appropriate software, I think that's a huge improvement.

[00:37:04] I think it would be important to understand any impacts this is having on our enforcement, on the communities, et cetera. But I'm supportive of knowing that we have to get legislation to be allowed to do this, that we begin the program and just monitor how it's going and the impact of it to our communities.

[00:37:24] all right thank you very much supervisor paul check so what i think we are hearing is a request for an action item to come back to the board uh for additional discussion possible uh vote so um um so mr machadi does that sound we can do that just one clarification there was some discussion about the 40 fee is the board comfortable with that or do you want a different fee i would say If we could have a range, then the board could discuss it.

[00:38:00] Mr. Chairman, I think it's important in the board item to have a chart that shows what other jurisdictions meet, how you arrived at that amount, and then also show us what other jurisdictions are charging just to make sure we're in that proper round. Can we see what other fees we currently charge for the programs that we administer, if any?

[00:38:18] Thank you. We can put that in. Okay. All right. Thank you very much. All right, we have 35 minutes to get through our last two items. Mr. Bishadny, if you could introduce our second item. Sure. The second item is a presentation from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

[00:38:36] This is the companion to the I-495 Southside Express Lanes Project. This is the Transit TDM study that is integrated into the implementation of possible implementation of future express lanes between the Beltway and I-495 and the American Legion Bridge.

[00:39:01] So we have Todd Horsley from the Department of Rail and Public Transportation to make the presentation. Todd? Wonderful, and welcome, and thank you for setting up so quickly. All right.

[00:39:17] Well, good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to provide this update on the status of our i-495 south side transit and tdm study that is being conducted by drpt i'm todd horsley director of northern virginia transit programs at drpt i work in drpt's nova office in alexandria literally just a few blocks from this corridor so while this study is being conducted directly by drpt and it's independent of any other studies it was initiated to complement and informed VDOT's I-495 Southside Express Lane study, which I understand was presented to this committee back in the fall.

[00:39:55] The VDOT study is a NEPA-compliant environmental assessment to analyze potential impacts of alternatives to extend the I-495 express lanes from Springfield across the Woodrow-Wilson Bridge into Maryland. As I begin, I want to emphasize that DRPT has conducted a study.

[00:40:13] The document that we will produce as a result of this effort is a study. It's not a plan. we believe it will provide a solid foundation for a future planning effort if or when there is a funded capital project in the corridor to actually plan for.

[00:40:29] So therefore, our study is an evaluation of current and potential future multimodal solutions that could be implemented in the I-495 Southside Corridor to reduce congestion, improve trip reliability and regional connections, enhance existing and planned multimodal mobility and connectivity.

[00:40:45] And the goals of our study align closely with the goals of the VDOT study. Our study area, which is highlighted in yellow on this map, is the same study area as the VDOT study. It includes 11 miles

of the southern section of I-95, I-495 between the Springfield Interchange in Fairfax County and the Maryland 210 Interchange in Prince George's County.

[00:41:06] In addition to I-495 itself, the study area includes multiple rail lines in Virginia, including the Metro Rail Blue and Yellow lines and the VRE Fredericksburg and Manassas lines. We've engaged a diverse set of stakeholders during the development of the study, including the 16 entities that you see here who are all members of our technical advisory committee.

[00:41:27] That includes 10 Virginia entities, four partners in Maryland, WMATA, and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. We've been pleased and impressed by the tax level of engagement. I want to thank county staff for their engagement and input throughout this study effort. So in our engagement process, we have gathered input from both the public and interested stakeholders throughout the study process.

[00:41:51] Our TAC has met three times with a final meeting scheduled on February 9th. We've hosted two virtual public information meetings, and we've participated in VDOT's public information meetings. We've held two rounds of pop-up events to publicize the study, the public meetings, and our two online public surveys that were conducted in conjunction with our public meetings.

[00:42:10] We published a draft summary report in advance of our public information meeting in December, and we are accepting written comments on the draft report through February 22nd. We also held briefings with county and city of Alexandria staff back in the fall to review our draft recommendations.

[00:42:26] Some common themes we heard from the public during our engagement include interest in more transportation options in the corridor, the importance of travel time, reliability, and connections to multimodal facilities, interest in both rail and bus, as well as improved bicycle and pedestrian connections interest in enhancements to both existing transit services as well as new services frequent service so that transit is an attractive option and then the importance of coordination with the vdot study our study kicked off in may of 2022 shortly after the vdot study got underway as usual as usual with these types of studies we

[00:43:03] first assessed baseline conditions and needs using that information we then identified some preliminary strategies. Those were tested, refined, and prioritized into recommendations. And we did use the latest version of the MWCOG regional travel demand model to conduct our testing and refinements. And then as noted earlier, throughout the study process, we worked with our technical advisor committee and several stakeholder groups. We gathered public input through our virtual public meetings and surveys. We have another attack meeting coming up. We're accepting written comments on our draft study through February 22nd. And then after a period of review and

[00:43:42] consideration of those public comments that we receive, we will plan to finalize and issue our draft report in March. So here you see a summary of the baseline conditions currently present in the corridor. Transit services in or near the study corridor are currently provided by several transit agencies as shown on the map. There's limited bus service along I-495 itself and across the Woodrow-Wilson Bridge, but there is parallel local and Metro Rail feeder bus service in Alexandria, Fairfax County, and Prince George's County provided by Metro Bus-Fairfax Connector

[00:44:18] and the bus in Prince George's County. The rail network, which is shown in the black lines on the map, includes the Metro Rail blue and yellow lines and the VRE and Amtrak that operate parallel to 495 in Virginia. And there are a variety of commuter assistance programs that exist at the statewide, regional, and local levels that encourage alternative modes of transportation, but none are specifically targeted at this corridor. The baseline conditions assessment revealed several needs that guided the conduct of our study. Some of those were to provide and promote convenient and flexible travel choices for all. We specifically saw a need for options

[00:44:53] to support travel throughout the day, not only around the peak times, to reduce congestion, improved trip reliability, and we heard a strong desire for faster and more reliable travel times in the corridor regardless of mode. Others were to improve safety, to accommodate future regional growth, and to provide consistency with local and regional plans. Recommendations to address the identified needs and to meet the purposes of the study were grouped in three categories, basically transit services, commuter assistance programs to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes other than single occupancy vehicles and technology solutions to encourage the use of

[00:45:30] transit and other alternative modes to support a modern travel experience and to assist with travel decision making. So at this point, I'll again emphasize that this is a study. It's not a funded service plan. While we did make some assumptions related to routing and potential stops for the purposes of developing our transit recommendations, we primarily identified origin and destination pairs that showed the most potential for transit connections.

[00:45:59] Specific operating decisions relating to routing, stops, headways, the actual operator of any services would be made in a future-focused planning effort after corridor improvement decisions are made. Following the development of our transit commuter assistance program and technology recommendations, we grouped them into three investment packages that you see on this slide.

[00:46:23] For the study, near-term recommendations are strategies that can actually be implemented now or before 2030, which is the horizon date chosen for the opening of the potential express lanes. They represent strategies that, again, could be effective if implemented now or during any future construction project.

[00:46:42] The midterm investment package are strategies that would be recommended to be implemented in conjunction with the opening of the express lanes or phased in within the first several years of their operation. And then the long-term recommendations are strategies that would be recommended for implementation after several years of express lanes operation as the transit markets mature.

[00:47:00] And any recommendations from the later improvement packages could be advanced if resources were made available to do so. So the transit recommendations that were ultimately chosen for inclusion in our study include three different types of bus service. And those are express bus that would operate all day with more direct services and fewer stops.

[00:47:18] commuter bus, which is similar to express bus, but operates primarily during the peak commuting hours or peak commuting times. And then local bus, which operates all day with more stops compared to express and commuter bus. So a big question is, what about rail? So rail was always going to be a consideration in our study, and especially since VDOT has committed that none of the alternatives that it is evaluating as part of the I-495 Southside express lane study will preclude a future rail alternative

or alignment. However, we were aware and we acknowledged that WMATA has put considerable effort into its blue, orange, silver capacity

[00:47:58] and reliability study that has several alternatives among which there is a potential build alternative in this corridor. So we've consulted with WMATA on multiple occasions and we understand that WMATA staff plans to present an update on the blue, orange, silver study to the WMATA board probably sometime later this year. As Metro would be the most likely operator of any rail transits in the study corridor, we chose not to duplicate WMATA's planning efforts and look forward to seeing the alternative that is ultimately recommended by WMATA. If WMATA's recommendation

[00:48:35] impacts the corridor, then the RPT will work with VDOT to ensure that it is appropriately addressed in the environmental assessment. So even though we're generally going to defer to the Wilmata study on rail, a rail option was tested as part of our study. However, our testing and evaluation did not yield any single travel movement or groups of origin destination pairs that warranted a level of service such as rail. From a demand standpoint, we tested a rail scenario, specifically a metro rail connection between Huntington and Branch Avenue with intermediate stops at National Harbor and Oxon Hill and we found a

[00:49:12] rail extension in this corridor would only carry slightly more riders per day than the recommended package of bus options and that's about three to four thousand additional daily trips. So in short the level of demand for new rail that we found is something that could likely be supported by bus modes. Also while it's wouldn't traverse the entire corridor or crossing the Maryland we also acknowledge the planned improvements to VRE service on the Virginia side of the study corridor.

[00:49:40] So with my remaining time, I'm just going to run through briefly a high-level overview of our study recommendations and investment packages. Near-term transit recommendations include two express bus routes in addition to commuter assistance and technology recommendations. Again, the near-term recommendations could be effectively implemented now or during the construction of any potential express lanes extension. Our near-term transit recommendations include a new express bus route providing service between Alexandria and Tysons with connections at Huntington, Van Dorn Street and locations in Tysons. And then the other one would actually extend the length of the study corridor from Maryland and on to Tysons with connections at Branch Avenue in Prince George's

[00:50:18] County, the Eisenhower area of Alexandria and locations in Tysons. And I want to note here that those transit ID numbers you see up in the right hand corner of this slide, they really mean nothing for this. They don't actually represent route numbers. They were just simply how we labeled the transit alternatives in our study. So our midterm package, the midterm investment package contains the most transit investments out of the three packages. These recommendations are candidates for implementation dependent on future funding in conjunction with the opening of an expanded express lanes network in the study corridor. The near-term transit services

[00:50:58] would continue to operate, and five new express or commuter bus routes would be added. Additional trips would also be added to the Metro Bus NH1 and NH2 routes, which both operate today, to provide more frequent connections. The new bus lines would provide improved connections to several major regional activity centers, including connections between Clinton, Maryland, Oxon Hill National Harbor, and the Navy Yard in D.C., a connection between Northern Charles County and Prince George's County to Alexandria, the Pentagon, and Roslyn. A connection between Northern Charles County and Prince George's County to Union Station and Noma in D.C. In Virginia,

[00:51:37] a connection between Huntington, Van Dorn Street, and Dunloring-Merrifield. And finally, a connection between Branch Avenue, Oxon Hill, National Harbor, and then on to Tyson's. And then the long-term package contains recommendations that would expand and supplement the areas served by transit that could be phased in over time. This includes a midday or off-peak service between Northern Charles County and the D.C. Corps, a connection from the I-66 corridor in Virginia to Alexandria, specifically to the Eisenhower Avenue and Braddock Road areas, a connection from Tyson's to

[00:52:12] Alexandria's Eisenhower and King Street areas, and then a connection from the I-95 corridor in Prince William County to the St. Elizabeth's campus in D.C. and to the Southwest waterfront. And so each of these investment packages also has commuter assistance program and technology recommendations.

[00:52:30] So commuter assistance programs are designed to promote travel alternatives to driving alone. The near-term and the mid-term timeframes are really the most critical times to invest in commuter assistance programs to encourage the use of new travel options. And then the draft recommendations are here, just marketing of corridor-specific mobility options, targeted residential outreach, targeted employer outreach, and then carpool and van pool formation programs and then finally our technology recommendations are also included included in each investment package and are tied to the new to new or expanded transit services in those time frames draft recommendations for technology would include transit priority

[00:53:10] technology real-time travel and transit information real-time passenger load information commuter parking information systems transit payment integration and incentivization zero emission bus charging infrastructure, and automated and connected and shared mobility options.

[00:53:27] So even though our current study effort is nearing an end and with a report will hopefully be published in March, DRPT will remain actively involved in supporting VDOT through its environmental assessment. We will participate in any future outreach by VDOT.

[00:53:42] We'll be available to all of our stakeholders to answer questions. We will also remain engaged with WMATA as it completes its blue, orange, silver capacity and reliability study. And if necessary, we will work with VDOT to accommodate any metro recommendations that may affect the study corridor. And if or when a capital project is approved in the corridor, we will work with stakeholders to identify funding sources that could be used to implement new transit, commuter assistance, and technology improvements.

[00:54:12] And we will be available to lead or assist in transitioning this study effort into an actual plan for implementation. And while we are nearing the end of our study, it's not over yet um as i noted earlier we will accept written public comments um through um through february 22nd and the information for submitting those comments is listed on this slide and with that i am happy to um take any questions thank you very much mr horsley appreciate that just one quick question did your study uh look at longer trips basically amtrak express bus and integration with those uh type of transit systems so most of the study recommendations that we actually have

[00:54:51] our kind of longer express commuter bus type trips um we did um certainly um acknowledge and consider the the improvements that are being made through the transforming rail in virginia for amtrak and vre so that is part of our study okay because i know there are a lot of folks that go up and down the east coast and some of them start and end in this area too so um thank you any any comments

questions from uh mr harry kind of on that and what i noticed in in all of the short near term and midterm and this springfield's not in the springfield district but that's that's where

[00:55:25] the amtrak vre hub is at springfield and i noticed none of that they didn't have any options it's also north and south to get up the 95 corridor and we've i don't know how many bus routes we've got going in and out but i know it it is a transit hub and i was just a little surprised on those options that i didn't see and is that difficulty getting in i'm sure there's a good reason but or is there a good reason again to get to your point tying into VRE trying into Amtrak and that

[00:56:00] north south into the Pentagon those are key corridors I think that's something we really if we haven't taken a look at we need to take a look at sure we can go back and we'll certainly take that comment under consideration and see see what we can come up with but most of the new the the transit routes that we have identified, again, are utilizing the corridor, the I-495 corridor, the south side corridor. They're new services. These origin and destination pairs are not served right now, so we were looking at new services. But overall, I think it's, I mean, that getting

[00:56:36] those express lanes on that section of 495 is going to be key to finishing that network of express lanes that we've got that really can lead to some, getting people to take transit that want to get there quicker, and we'll take it because they can get there quicker.

[00:56:53] So, Supervisor Herity, we're preparing a set of comments for the board to consider on the 21st, so we can include your comment as part of that. Great. Thank you. Supervisor Welchhoff. Yeah, just following up on both Chairman Alcorn and Supervisor Herity's comments, am I understanding it correctly that the study took, as a baseline, just with respect to VRE, for example, the planned service improvements related to transforming rail in Virginia the expansion of service additional trains was was assumed in the study even though

[00:57:32] they don't exist a got it okay thank you Supervisor store and I think explicitly here you mentioned the bridge and in the dedication if you will master and so land on the bridge is that something that's advocated for in here reinforced in here? Because I know with the Southside study, I think there's a lot of concern that others might be arguing that we should do something different.

[00:58:02] So the study certainly acknowledges that when the Wilson Bridge was reconstructed, it was done so in a manner that would support a future rail alternative. So certainly that's acknowledged. And then also VDOT has, you know, they've committed to any alternative that they are studying would not preclude a future rail connection in the future. Like I said, we did model a rail connection um from huntington basically across the bridge over into maryland it didn't really show in the short term a you know a huge benefit ridership that we felt like um the express the express bus and commuter bus routes that we um that are in our study would you

[00:58:41] know would it would basically um accommodate you know what we were showing as a future this future demand so there's no if you build it they will come clearly with that so and i and i think that's Part of the concern that our community would feel about that is that if we're not going to make that commitment, then people aren't going to build and develop accordingly.

[00:59:05] I think that's clearly the opportunity to better connect, if you will, the far eastern and southern part of Fairfax County to the rest of the county. We have poor connections now. Anybody who lives in the Mount Vernon, our communities, to get to Tyson's or even to get to Fairfax is difficult.

[00:59:27] And the only way you can do it is to go into Lillie, Alexandria and kind of come back out. So I know long-term for Fairfax County, I think that has to be a critical part of it. I recognize the first stage of that, the first part of that could easily and probably should be, you know, using, you know, bus transport, et cetera.

[00:59:45] But I think we have to be looking at, so if we're looking at, you know, 2030, 2045, and we're not even looking at how that's going to fit into what's after that, i.e. heavy rail or some other purple line or some other iteration of that, I think we're making a big mistake.

[01:00:02] So one thing I would say, like I said, we, you know, we are kind of waiting on WMATA to let us know what's in their blue, orange, silver capacity study. If something comes of that, we will certainly work with VDOT to own their environmental assessment.

[01:00:18] But I know a lot of effort has gone into that, and so we didn't want to necessarily duplicate that. But point taken, understood. Thank you. All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Horsley. Appreciate you being here today. Sure. We do have one more item.

[01:00:33] We have visualize 2050, and I would say if we could visualize 1230, because that's about 13 minutes away, 12 and a half perhaps. So, Mr. Bishadny, if you could start us off. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Visualized 1250 is probably a little easier than 2050, or 1230 is probably easier than 2050.

[01:00:59] But anyway, this is a briefing on an effort that the Transportation Planning Board has underway to update the regional long-range plan. And the last time the plan was updated, the planning board decided that this next update they're going to go to a zero-based plan.

[01:01:21] And so that means that everything that's in the plan kind of gets stripped out and we start over. So we wanted to brief the board on that effort, and then there'll be time for us to have some more direct conversations with you before we ask you to endorse anything later on this spring.

[01:01:39] Malcolm Watson is here to make the presentation. Welcome. Good afternoon, Chairman Alcorn and other members of the Fx County Board of Supervisors. My name is Malcolm Watson. I work in Coordination and Funding, and I'm going to brief you on the Transportation Planning Board's Long Range Plan, Visualize 2050, and the 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Plan.

[01:02:01] My first couple of slides, I'm going to give you some quick background information on the Transportation Planning Board, And then I'm going to kind of go over some of the changes that are happening with the long-range plan and the planning process for the region. And then I'm going to try and summarize the timeline so we can get out of here.

[01:02:18] We don't want no hangry people around here. The Transportation Planning Board is the federally mandated metropolitan planning organization for the Washington, D.C. metropolitan region. They primarily developed the region's constraint long-range plan and the transportation improvement plan.

[01:02:38] And essentially, these two documents ensure our federal partners that revenues to build, maintain, and operate the transportation system in the region will be available for the next 25 years. All regionally significant projects go into the plan regardless of funding source.

[01:02:58] For instance, the I-66 express lanes, they're in the plan, but sidewalks are not in the plan as most of them don't have federal funding on them. A critical component of the plan is the air quality

conformity determination, and this analysis is intended to determine whether or not emissions that are generated by on-road transportation emissions are within the motor vehicle emissions budgets established by the air quality goals of the region.

[01:03:28] This analysis considers nitrogen oxide and volatile organic compounds, but it does not consider greenhouse gases, which is carbon dioxide. In August of 2022, our federal partners informed the Transportation Planning Board that the conformity determination for Visualize 2045 had been approved.

[01:03:53] This essentially restarts the clock for the conformity determination for the region, and the TPB must demonstrate conformity again in August of 2026.

[01:04:05] The current plan that the region is under right now is Visualize 2045, and while we were updating that plan, the TPP passed a resolution instructing staff to initiate another full update of the region's long-range plan after the Visualize 2045 plan was approved by the federal partners, and they wanted that plan to be completed by 2024.

[01:04:34] This new plan, Visualize 2050, resolution informed that it will be a zero-based budget plan whereby all projects in the plan will be stripped out of the plan and all jurisdictions have to resubmit their projects for the Transportation Planning Board's consideration.

[01:04:52] Prior to 2021, all projects in the plan were traditionally just carried forward, and the only changes to the plan were if we were going to input a new, reasonably significant project to the plan, or if we were going to delete a project from the plan.

[01:05:12] The new plan horizon is 2050, so the financial component of the long-range plan will have to take into consideration this five-year extension. Additionally, the revenues associated with inflation and the revenues associated with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act will also have to be considered in the new financial component of the plan.

[01:05:37] Circling back on air quality conformity, the Transportation Planning Board will have to develop new motor vehicle emissions budgets for this plan. This is going to be a heavy lift for TPB because EPA informed them that they would have to use the new emissions model, MOVES 3.

[01:05:55] Additionally, they're going to have to develop motor vehicle emissions budgets for the 2008 state improvement plan and motor vehicle emissions budgets for the 2015 ozone standard. In addition to these things for Visualize 2050, the Transportation Planning Board is going to have to re-estimate the vehicle mix.

[01:06:17] with electric vehicles becoming more affordable to average citizens, this vehicle mix is going to have to be re-estimated, and this is going to have a positive impact on air quality. I mentioned the zero-based budget process, and I'll speak on that in the next slide. The new plan, the TPB will consider multiple build scenarios and their impact on the plan's goals and targets. The TPB developed a synthesized policy framework and a summary of past scenario studies, and they're encouraging

[01:06:53] jurisdiction staff to use these two documents to inform the projects that they're going to submit into the region's long-range plan. Now, the resolution that was passed was explicit about its definition for exempt and non-exempt projects. Projects that currently have funding on them or are under construction are exempt from the zero-based budget process. Projects that are still in the development phase will not be

exempt from this zero-based budgeting process. We've worked with TPP staff to identify all Fairfax County projects in the plan, and 25 projects will be exempt from

[01:07:33] this process. 33 projects will not be exempt, and we're going to have to have a deep dive conversation about whether or not those projects are right for this version of the plan. All of those projects are in your attachments. Visualize 2050 also has a climate change mitigation component.

[01:07:56] Between the months of February and April, the TBB sent out a questionnaire to its members and asked for their input on two climate change elements that ultimately became a part of Visualize 2045 and a part of the planning process. So with the adoption of that resolution, the TBB adopted regional voluntary on-road transportation sector greenhouse gas reduction goals. The first goal is 50% below 2005 levels by 2030. That matches Fairfax County's community-wide

[01:08:32] energy and climate action plan. The second goal is 80% below 2005 levels by 2030. And in scope, that's kind of similar to the county's plan as well. In addition to those goals, the TBB adopted two sets of strategies, and they're encouraging jurisdiction staff to use these strategies as they consider projects that are going to go into the plan.

[01:08:56] The first seven strategies have been adopted, and we're all encouraged to use those strategies. The last seven strategies are strategies that conjured up a lot of debate, and the TPP felt like it merited further coordinated discussion.

[01:09:13] The timeline for Visualize 2050 is as follows. During the winter months, we will focus on the technical input solicitation document, the call for projects, and the releasing of the two project lists that you have in your attachment for public review. In mid-February, they're going to release the call for projects. This officially kicks off Visualize 2050. In the spring and heading into the summer months, we fully expect to receive a lot of comments on the projects that are on the exempt and non-exempt

[01:09:49] list. TPP staff will start setting up a meeting with Maryland, D.C., and Virginia board members and the technical staff so that we can have a deep dive conversation about the projects on both lists.

[01:10:06] In the interim, we want to come back to our board to get your endorsement of these two lists, projects on the exempt list and the non-exempt list. And all along this process, there's a high-level revenue and expenditure analysis taking place.

[01:10:22] It's a dynamic situation. You can imagine all the jurisdictions are considering projects that are going to be in the plan, projects that are not going to be in the plan. So this financial analysis is happening all along the way. In the summer months and heading into the fall, the date to remember is June 30th.

[01:10:41] That is the day when we have to have our projects, preliminary inputs into the long-range plan and the air quality conformity analysis. There's going to be a reconciliation of projects happening at that time and a reconciliation of the financial analysis results that will produce the financial plan. In the fall, the TPB is going to open up the plan and the air quality conformity analysis for public comment. In the winter months, we're going to be focused on ramping up for the air quality conformity analysis. This analysis takes approximately nine months to a year to complete,

[01:11:21] and after all of that, if there are no major hiccups, particularly on the Virginia side, we hope that in December of 2024, the TPB will approve Visualize 2050 and the FY 2025-2028 tip.

[01:11:38] So with all of that, the background information and the changes that are happening with the plant and what is essentially a two-year timeline, we wanted to come and just start the discussion so that you guys can let us know what additional information we need to bring before you, before you endorse both of these lists.

[01:11:55] Thank you very much, Mr. Watson. You did that with one minute to spare for discussion. So just very quickly, I did want to acknowledge Supervisor Walkinshaw and I both serve on the Transportation Planning Board. Supervisor Walkinshaw is now the second vice chair of that board, and there's a lot that's going on here, and there's been a lot of lively discussion over the past couple years on these topics.

[01:12:22] I think what we probably would want to do is bring back to the Transportation Committee these projects for discussion. Obviously, you're having projects with individual supervisors as well. And also, I think, a little bit deeper dive into the climate change strategies that TPB is looking at, because they're not obvious.

[01:12:42] So just turn it over. I'm good. Thank you. Yeah, Supervisor Smith. I just had a question about the projects that are in development would be part of zero-based budgeting. I'd be curious to know how much revenue and money we put into the development process for those projects already.

[01:13:01] Okay, we can provide that. And I would just clarify that just because the projects are not on the exempt list doesn't mean that they won't be included in the plan. It just means that they will have to go through the formal analysis, particularly on the air quality side.

[01:13:19] But we can bring back additional information for you. Supervisor Walkinshaw. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And first, I just want to start. I want to thank Malcolm for the incredible work that you do, Malcolm, preparing us for TPB, because it is a detail-intensive role, and the briefings that you provide in advance of the meeting are really critical.

[01:13:42] So thank you. I don't say that enough. I don't always respond to the lengthy emails you send me, but I do read them. They're so good, I don't have to respond with any questions. So thank you for that. Just a couple, two questions. One on the list of projects exempt.

[01:14:01] There's three down here that it says projects that are on the non-exempt list that should be exempt. Can you explain what that is? Sure. When we went through the list, we noticed that those three projects should not have been on the non-exempt list. We informed TPB of that fact.

[01:14:18] So we're waiting for them to send us the list that they're going to release to the public so that we can make sure. We're trying to correct TPBs. Exactly. Okay, got it. And then in terms of the decision that we will have to make the projects that are on the non-exempt list, What is the goal? Is the goal to establish a prioritization or is the goal to cut this list of non-exempt down from X to X minus something to submit to TPB? What is our outcome?

[01:14:57] So the goal is to make sure that the ultimate project list that TPB is going to evaluate is one that our board is comfortable looking at from a Fairfax County perspective. There are a number of projects on the non-exempt list that have been in the plan for many years.

[01:15:15] They are all consistent with the county's comprehensive plan, but whether or not they are ready to move forward between now and 2050 is one of the questions that we'll be asking you. So the goal

is just to make sure that what gets in the regional analysis is something that the board is comfortable with.

[01:15:37] I would anticipate that a good number of these exempt projects will be included, but there may be some that have just been carried over in the plan that maybe we, you know, events have overtaken them, and maybe they're not something that people would like to pursue at this point, so we may want to take a few projects out.

[01:15:56] We may also find that there's some projects that are missing that we want to add to the list as well. Okay, and in terms of the greenhouse gas reduction goals, the voluntary greenhouse gas reduction goals that TPB established, and that was a topic of significant debate and lengthy debate at TPB.

[01:16:18] But will there be an opportunity to look at these projects in that context, and how difficult is it to provide that analysis and the modeling project by project that TPB would consider if we were to submit a project from this list or all of the projects on this list?

[01:16:41] So we don't have the resources to actually do the modeling based on the greenhouse gas emissions goals, but we can give you an indication as to how they do or they don't meet the criteria that are in the attached resolution in your package.

[01:16:57] So the 14 goals that TPB established are included. And so we can give you a sense of, you know, these projects will help to meet those goals, Maybe some of the other projects don't meet those goals as well.

[01:17:13] So we can't do it, but TPB would do it if the project makes it into the plan. They have to. Yes, they will. Okay. All right. Thank you. Okay. All right. Supervisor Polczyk. Appreciate that we'll be coming back to this. I think this deserves a lot more conversation.

[01:17:30] Just to better understand, on the background slide, and you may have said this, the last bullet point, the significant projects, example express lanes are not included. Are included, sorry, sidewalks are not unless they're federally funded. Could you just explain to us how that works and if there is any way to be able to get sidewalks included, but I guess only if they're federally funded.

[01:17:55] I just want to better understand that for the public. Typically, sidewalk and pedestrian projects will not go into the plan, but any plan, any project in the region that has federal funds attached to it will be in this plan, and it will be evaluated in the Equality Conformity Model.

[01:18:12] So to understand, it's not our designation, but it's because they are not federally funded? Yes. So the key is whether they're regionally significant or not. And most sidewalk projects are not regionally significant. However, if they have federal funding on them, even if they're not regionally significant, they have to go in the pool.

[01:18:32] We don't use a lot of federal funding for sidewalk. We do have some, but we don't use a lot of them just because of the strings attached with the implementation. Okay. If there ever were to be an earmark for a sidewalk, not that there is, would that be considered federal funding at that point?

[01:18:48] Yes. Then it would have to be in the plan. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Very good. Well, a lot of good discussion at TPB. There's quite a difference of opinion, particularly on the climate change stuff, between the inner jurisdictions and some of the outer jurisdictions, and we're kind of right in between. So this should come back, I believe, to the Transportation Committee or will, that as well as the project list.

[01:19:11] So any other business before the Transportation Committee? If not, we're adjourned as of 1236. Thanks, everybody.