MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee, Tuesday, July 18, 2023

Date	Tuesday, July 18, 2023
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 25m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/2967
- 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 2026-11-03. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:04] Okay. Let's get started. Okay. Supervisors Lusk and Herity. All right. All right. Okay. Go ahead and call this meeting of the board's transportation committee to order. We have five items on the agenda, two for discussion. You'll see on the agenda, there's item number five, which is an information item, depending on whether or not we have any time to spend a couple minutes on that.

[00:00:40] We'll just see, but otherwise, we do have the May 16th, 2023 meeting summary. Does anyone have any changes to that summary? Yes, Supervisor Smith. That one's all right?

[00:01:00] Okay. Nope. No problem. Any changes? Okay. Seeing none, those will stand. All right. We do have the first of two items for discussion today. We'll get a presentation from staff on both.

[00:01:16] The first is Cut-Through Permit Program, something this committee has discussed before. And Mr. Steverson, do you want to have any comments to get started on this? Real quick, sure. And good afternoon, everyone.

[00:01:31] My name is Greg Steverson. I'm the Acting Director of FCDOT. So the first one is the Resident Cut-Through Program. This is a topic that we came to discuss with you back at the January meeting. And so Henry Stein-McCartney is here to kind of give you a little bit more details and tackle some of the questions that you asked at that meeting.

[00:01:52] And so with that, I'll turn it over to Henry. Good afternoon, Chairman Alcorn, board members. I'm Henry Stein-McCartney, Traffic Engineering Section. Today I'm joined by Neil Freshman, our Traffic Engineering Section Chief, Joanna Faust from the Office of County Attorney, and Alan Hansen, FCPD Traffic Commander.

[00:02:18] So today we are presenting an update to the proposed resident cut-through permit program. Cut-through restrictions in residential communities are implemented to -- by VDOT to mitigate residential cut-through traffic on certain residential streets by restricting turns during certain hours.

[00:02:42] With those term restrictions in place, residents are unable to take the most direct route to their homes during those restricted hours. In 2019, the Virginia General Assembly passed legislation authorizing the county to pass an ordinance and develop a program to offer permits to residents whose direct access to their homes is impacted by those restrictions.

[00:03:05] We were previously here in January to present a proposed program and we received your guidance to move forward with program development. So since then, we've developed draft policies and procedures and a draft ordinance that we'll discuss today.

[00:03:22] So first we'll take a look at some of the items we have in the proposed program policies and procedures. The policies and procedures were developed to outline program operation and are more detailed in their program guidance than the draft ordinance.

[00:03:39] So today we'll look at community eligibility, permit zone establishment, resident eligibility and permit fees. And pictured here on the slide is a proposed permit zone for one of the existing cut through restrictions in Mason District.

[00:03:56] So looking at permit zone establishment, there are currently three communities in the county, two in Mason District and one in Drain'sville that have existing cut through restrictions. Collectively in these communities, there are around 350 impacted addresses that would qualify for permits when the proposed program is implemented.

[00:04:17] If these communities with existing restrictions are interested in establishing a permit zone, they would place a request with their district supervisor. And if the supervisor approves, then FCDOT would issue a resident petition to that community.

[00:04:35] And this is the same process that we use to establish our PPD districts. If two-thirds of residents were to sign that petition in support of the permit zone, it could be established by a board action item. For communities that are seeking new restrictions through the joint VDOT/FCDOT cut-through restriction process, those communities already receive a voting ballot to signify their support for the cut-through restriction itself.

[00:05:04] So we're proposing to add an additional question to that voting ballot that would ask residents if they support creation of a permit zone. If two-thirds of the residents vote in support of the cut-through restriction and the permit zone, then the permit zone would be established if and when the cut-through restriction is implemented by VDOT. And there are currently four communities that are actively seeking new cut-through restrictions, and there are about 800 affected addresses in those communities. So for resident

[00:05:41] permit eligibility, to determine the addresses in a community that would be eligible to apply for permits, we'll consider the method by which their permit zone was established. So for communities whose permit zone was established by a petition process, the addresses that were listed on the petition would be eligible to apply for permits. And this is the same process that we use in the RPPD program. For those communities that vote by voting ballot, then the addresses that received a voting ballot would qualify for permits. And to receive permits, all residents in the permit zone

[00:06:20] must provide proof of residency at an address in the zone when applying and they may apply for a permit for each vehicle that's registered at the address development of software will allow residents to apply for permits and manage their accounts online similar to the RPPD program a residents would also be allowed to apply either in person or by mail using a paper application temporary Military permits would be available for new residents or residents with new cars, giving

[00:06:55] them time to meet residency and vehicle registration requirements before the annual permit sticker is issued, and residents who are not required under state law to register their vehicle in Virginia, such as full-time students and military members would be allowed to apply for a permit by providing proof of residency and an address in the permit zone.

[00:07:18] The program policies and procedures also list the various documents that applicants may use to show proof of residency, and that would include a Virginia driver's license, their real estate tax assessment, or a tax bill from DTA, or lease or mortgage documents showing that address.

[00:07:37] So, for permit renewal, like RPPD, these permits would be valid for one year. Since we're proposing an annual permit fee, we would be unable to automatically renew the permits.

[00:07:53] So residents would need to take action once a year to renew the permits for each vehicle to receive an updated vehicle decal. For ease of administration, we're proposing that all permits would expire on the same date each year.

[00:08:08] And if residents renew their permit at the start of the permit year, then they would pay the full proposed fee of $25. that apply later in the permit year would pay a reduced prorated fee based on the month that they apply for the permit.

[00:08:25] And we're proposing to prorate the fee on a quarterly basis at $6.25 per quarter. So when we were here in January, you asked us to return with information on permit fees charged by Fairfax County and other regional jurisdictions for transportation related permits.

[00:08:44] And the only transportation-related permit that we've been able to identify is RPPD permits. So on this table, you can see that the amount charged for RPPD permits varies quite a bit from $5 to $50 for the first permit, and that fee increases in some jurisdictions based on the number of vehicles.

[00:09:08] The average permit fee charged amongst the localities that we surveyed is $24 for the first permit so we believe that our proposed fee of $25 per vehicle is in line with those regional fees. A new ordinance has also been drafted for this program and is proposed to be section 82-4A of County Code. The proposed ordinance would codify various elements including permit zone establishment, set permit fees, and provide penalties for violations. The graphic that you see in

[00:09:42] In the top right of this slide is an example of the proposed permit decal. It will be holographic and to prevent duplication and will be printed with the zone information and vehicle specific information.

[00:09:59] And the permit sticker would be placed in the top corner of the driver side windshield so that it would be easily identifiable for enforcement purposes. So staff has identified the resources needed to develop this program, including new software and equipment and materials.

[00:10:22] So the most critical element is development of the new software, which would allow residents to apply online and manage their accounts. We've obtained an estimate from our third-party software developer, and they've indicated that development, testing, and delivery would cost $225,000 and take 12 months to complete.

[00:10:42] In addition to software cost, staff has estimated that an additional $45,000 in funding would be needed to procure the necessary equipment and materials to produce permits. The largest expense here will be specialty printers capable of printing durable waterproof decals.

[00:11:02] So that gives us a total of $270,000 in one-time funding that is required for us to initiate this program. And in addition to one-time funding, we also believe we would need $45,000 in annually recurring funds to cover operational expenses, including program materials and software and equipment maintenance.

[00:11:28] The funding requirement for operational expenses could be potentially higher in future years if the program grows and the number of permits that we issue each year were to increase significantly. We've also identified the need for new transportation planner two position to administer this program and a new curbside management program that's currently in the planning phase.

[00:11:52] The annual funding commitment for this position would be at the prevailing midpoint and benefits, which is currently approximately $140,000 per year. So we're seeking approximately $185,000 in annual recurring funding for program expenses and the needed position.

[00:12:13] So now we seek your feedback and guidance. Do you support considering one-time funding and recurring funding and a new position to support this program? And do you have any specific guidance regarding our proposed program implementation?

[00:12:34] Very good. Thank you very much for that presentation. I do, actually, before opening it up for questions, I do have a question, probably Captain Hanson, probably for you. Welcome. So these cost estimates don't include FCPD estimates for enforcement or discussion of that.

[00:12:54] Can you share any thoughts you might have on enforcing this proposal? Yes, sir. Again, Alan Hanson, Commander of Traffic Division. So, yeah, so recurring expenses, so if approved, you know, obviously we would be out there.

[00:13:15] It would be part of our normal enforcement as able. What we would anticipate is we try to, you know, certainly for the first few weeks of this going active, we'd want to be out there enforcing and reinforcing, educating the public on these.

[00:13:32] So there would be a push, and we might need to use overtime to support that. So I haven't done a cost analysis of it, but there would be an impact if we were to utilize overtime for it. And then for sustaining this type of program, again, we would put officers out as able as complaints come in.

[00:13:56] Obviously, during the rush hours or when there's backups on 495, we would try to put officers out. A challenge would be, it's typically during the busier shift times. So overtime would be a better solution to have someone dedicated to support it.

[00:14:13] So we would just have to figure out, you know, what that would take. It depends on how many zones, how many people affected. Okay. So I'm thinking primarily, honestly, of the McLean area, just because of the challenges with the American Legion Bridge, and that causes that tremendous backup in those neighborhoods up in McLean.

[00:14:34] Okay. And I know you know the McLean area well. Yes, sir. So one follow-up question, and I know we don't have the legal authority from the state to do this, but presuming that maybe one day we did automated traffic enforcement of this kind of program, is the technology, are there systems out there that could do this?

[00:14:55] I'd have to research that to some degree. I'm not familiar with that. It would depend on a number of different things. The easiest would be to have somehow the license plate connected. So if it was an LPR that was associated with this enforcement, the LPR could determine whether or not this vehicle had a permit.

[00:15:18] And if it didn't, then it could automatically enforce. That would be probably the easiest avenue, I would think, if this type of legislation were allowed. It's easier than photo enforcement because that involves quite a bit more back-end work to make it work.

[00:15:37] So I think having this tied to a license plate in a database that was searchable by this camera would be the best solution. Okay. Well, if we do move forward with this idea, that's something perhaps we could get some more information on, at least technically and sort of programmatically, with the understanding that we don't have authority to do that under the state law.

[00:15:59] But thank you very much, Captain. Thanks, sir. Okay, Chairman McKay. Just, I think, an easy question. But on the regional transportation permit fee review chart, we're zeroed out on there for the RPPD.

[00:16:16] Is staff not making a recommendation at all as to whether or not there should be a cost associated with obtaining the permits, and if so, what would that be? The zero reflected on this chart is not a recommendation that we do not charge for RPPD.

[00:16:36] It's a reflection of the current state of the program. The program currently does not charge a fee for RPPD permits. If the board wishes us to charge fees, we would be happy to look at that. I'm not suggesting it for the RPPD program.

[00:16:53] I know that's in here as an example. What I'm suggesting it for is this specific program that's being presented here. Does staff have an opinion about whether there should be a charge associated with it or is the opinion there shouldn't be because historically for these traffic calming or restrictive initiatives, we've not charged?

[00:17:12] Okay. I'm sorry. I misunderstood your question. For this program, we are recommending a fee of $25 per vehicle permit to help cover the cost of the program. And does it do that? Do we know what that would generate?

[00:17:27] The revenue generation will be dependent upon the number of permits that are requested. So as the program were to grow, we would certainly, you know, grow that revenue. We believe in the initiation there are 350 affected addresses.

[00:17:49] our experience that with the RPPD program, that the average number of permits that we issue per address is three. So assuming that we might issue around a thousand permits per year, then, you know, you can extend that out to, you know, roughly $25,000 per year in revenue. But again, totally dependent on the number of permits issued. And the 800 number that was used earlier, that's the number of properties, not the number of residences, is that what that is?

[00:18:22] So, the 800 is the number of communities associated with those four communities that are currently seeking cut-through restrictions. So if cut-through restrictions are approved by VDOT for those communities, then that will add an additional 800 communities to the current base of 350.

[00:18:51] So, you know, we could have potentially 1,200 addresses that are impacted by, that could participate in this program. Okay. And I have an IT question that maybe you can't answer, but it just, is there not a way for programs like this and the RPPD program related, where we, as a process of billing people for their car tax bill, could just include this?

[00:19:20] I mean, do we not have, we know the addresses, we know the cars that are registered at that address, we have that information. I mean, I just can't understand why we don't have a system in place, and it's maybe not a question you can answer and I can get one later, but why we wouldn't have a system in place that would identify that unique characteristic with this property and include it in either a car tax or a real estate bill or something, as opposed to all this extra paperwork, time and energy, inconvenience for the people if something like this were approved, and the staff time and energy and costs associated with it.

[00:19:52] We can park that question and maybe come back to a different committee, but I would like to get some ideas to, because every time we look at something like this, and I'm not shooting the messenger here, your message is clear, but it seems like every time we consider something like this, it's always expensive, it always involves positions, and the costs that we could generate for it never comes close to paying for the cost of the program.

[00:20:15] And I'm not saying that should be the criteria for stuff like this, but it just seems like every time there's a new initiative or something that comes forward, it seems to always come with the associated, we need a position to do this. And I'm just trying to figure out ways that we can cut the paperwork and the administrative overhead cost of programs like this, because it's going to be very difficult to enforce.

[00:20:36] And, you know, it's going to be a hard program if we were to initiate it, but I don't know that we're not making it overly hard on the people who might want to participate in it, too. And that's a question we can, you know, follow up on later. But I just want to put it out there because it just seems like a lot of process here. And that's certainly something that we could have a conversation with tax administration about to determine if that's a possibility.

[00:20:58] Okay. Thank you. All right. Let's start at the end and work our way up. Supervisor Palcic. Thank you. And I'll go briefly because mine is related to the chairman's last question. I appreciate your work on this, and if I'm not mistaken, I think currently the RPPD program, and I can tell you from personal experience, is it is quite, even though there's zero fee, it's quite an onerous process because there are so many different agency steps, databases associated with that.

[00:21:25] So I definitely would want us to make sure that we are making it easier both on staff and on our residents and to help streamline and connect. It seems like DTA is the natural avenue for that to help take

out the staff time as much as necessary, as much as possible, both the RPPD, but before even, I think, considering going forward on this.

[00:21:53] And I don't know if the chairman was going there, but around the fee, yeah, I think unless we really improve that system, I feel uncomfortable imposing an additional fee on something that will probably be quite uh difficult both for staff and residents um i'd rather remove the fee but improve the uh the it side of that so i don't know if there's timing around this um but thank you for the research on it and and if we could have a list of the communities that you've mentioned both the ones that are currently approved and the ones that are awaiting approval i'm sorry if i

[00:22:28] missed that or eligible okay and that's uh i can certainly send that list out great thank you you're welcome all right uh supervisor faust thank you well i know it sounded like a broken record i've been supporting this since we as a board unanimously minus one went to the uh virginia legislator and asked them to pass this legislation for us which they uh very responsibly did uh given us this authority which we need to exercise in my opinion this is not it doesn't

[00:23:05] necessarily impact everybody in the county, but those that are impacted are severely impacted. Anybody who wants to visit the overflow of traffic through the neighborhoods caused by the disaster we know as the American Legion Bridge is welcome to make an appointment with me. I will take them, but we will be walking because your car doesn't move. People park their cars at the end their street and walk a block or two to get their houses because of Maryland cars that are blocking

[00:23:39] them and they can't get out of their driveways. It's very, you know, it's, to me, I don't know what I'm missing. I mean, to me, this is the most obvious thing. We have an opportunity to, you know, it's placemaking. It's creating the type of communities we want to have in Fairfax County, not communities where you can't move you are because of maryland traffic that's the one place i mean i have one of these in my district now it's out in herndon area i mean i they had a problem

[00:24:15] and we did a uh a cut through restriction uh i have several communities who are impacted by the American Legion Bridge traffic who want to do this but don't want to have to go along with everyone else out of their way to get to their houses. So this is the only way, you know, we're not changing anything. We have a program that says thou shalt not turn on that, onto that

[00:24:50] neighborhood street. We have that program, that stays the same. All we're doing is saying unless you happen to have spent, you know, uh, whatever annually on property taxes and everything else that it costs you to live in Fairfax County. If you actually have a home there, then you can turn onto that street. It was intended for you to turn onto that street. It's that simple. And, uh, you know, the, whoever opposes this needs to say why, you know, I, I understand the cost element. You

[00:25:28] don't want to impose a fee on people. They're imposing it on themselves. They don't have to do this. They can do a cut-through restriction and not impose the fee for a license. Or if the community imposes it, they don't have to buy the license to make the turn. They can go out of their way and come back. So, you know, we're not doing that. We said $140,000 a year for a new transportation planner, come on. I mean, if we see a thousand permits, we have a computer program

[00:26:05] that's going to spit them out once a year on the same day, and we're going to have a $140,000 planner sitting around the rest of the year. I don't buy that. But in any event, the revenues aren't reflected here, which there will be fees, not much, unless there's a whole lot of people take advantage of this but in

every everything we do we always uh look at you know like cameras but school bus cameras you know how are we going to pay there's fines you know that's not reflected

[00:26:44] on here either there's nothing there's no revenue reflected here this is going to be close to a wash i think because people will violate this and they will get fined so anyway i think uh I mean, I just think it's, you know, if you want to have the types of neighborhoods that are attracting people to live here, I mean, can you imagine coming here as an executive looking for a place to live and having a real estate agent sitting for a half hour to get three blocks to show you the house?

[00:27:21] They ain't going to come. So, yeah, this is an opportunity to solve a problem. We need to do it. All right. Thank you. We heard a point. Now let's hear a counterpoint. Supervisor Gross. Thank you. I have had problems with this proposal since we first started talking about it quite some time ago.

[00:27:45] Yes, I do have two locations in Mason District. One that dates back to before I was on the board, so I think it goes back to probably 1993 or 94. And then the other one is part of what we had done as a traffic calming measure.

[00:28:03] just east of the Mason District Governmental Center in, I think it was early 2000s. Both worked very, very well. Everybody in the community that advocated for these restrictions admitted and recognized that the restrictions would apply to everyone, not just to some.

[00:28:27] And I've gotten almost no complaints about these restrictions at all over many, many, many, many years. I have a concern, especially now, about where's the equity in this. And if we're going to have permits that cost money, you know, I think that makes a huge differentiation between neighborhoods that can afford to apply and those neighborhoods that may not be able to afford to apply.

[00:28:59] I think what this does basically, if we move forward with this, is create a bunch of gated communities that we don't have in Fairfax County, but the folks who want to restrict people from turning, you know, it essentially makes it a gated community.

[00:29:19] I think that in these tight budget years, it doesn't make sense to fund it and commit to the recurring expenses for a program that would serve just a few communities in the county. And quite frankly, I would have to disagree with my colleague, Mr. Faust.

[00:29:37] This is not a program that is going to pay for itself. Everybody thinks that tickets will pay for themselves. Tickets will fund the entire police department. They don't. We know that they don't. I think this is opening a proverbial can of worms with cost, with enforcement, with equity.

[00:29:57] And I am not supporting this effort at all. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Gross. Supervisor Walkinshaw. Thank you. I, too, am kind of struggling to figure out the staff requirements, a full-time position to deal with maybe a handful of neighborhoods that choose to go down this route.

[00:30:21] But I guess the question, and I obviously understand the burdens and staff challenges that FCDOT has now, how many homes or neighborhoods would cause you to recommend two positions?

[00:30:41] In other words, you've got a handful of neighborhoods that maybe would be eligible and you're saying, I need a full position. If there were 30 neighborhoods, would you need two positions or three positions? Is there a per-neighborhood or per-permit or per-home number that you think one full-time position can manage?

[00:31:01] Or did we just say it's a new program, so we're going to need a full-time position, and they could handle a huge number of neighborhoods? Okay, Supervisor Rock Control, I'm Neil Freshman, Section Chief for Traffic Engineering. The position you're asking about, we actually envision that position to work both on this and the managed parking planning that we're currently doing for Tyson's.

[00:31:24] So it would actually be, since those are both new programs that we'll be implementing, we view this position as taking the lead on those programs. As to whether... So hold on, just so I understand, the $140,000 would be split, their time would be split between Tyson's and this.

[00:31:43] Correct. So when you're talking about the total recurring funding for this, it's not actually 185, it's maybe half of the 140. Correct. I mean, that's a way to look at it, yes. Okay. As to your second part of your question about how many neighborhoods before we would add another position, I mean, if we look at RPPD, we do have a planner working on RPPD and also someone issuing permits, and they are doing several thousand permits.

[00:32:17] I don't remember the exact number. But, yes, we would be far away with 300-and-something houses and possibly another 800 from not having the capacity with this position to service that.

[00:32:33] Okay. And then I guess, you know, just my two cents on the fee. You know, I think the equity issue is cut multiple ways here. I mean, you know, there's the equity issue of can people afford the fee, but there's also the equity issue of if we fund the program, we're asking the entire county to fund a program that a handful of neighborhoods maybe need and could benefit from. My inclination would be to go toward the higher end of the average fees that we see for transportation permits around the region, especially given that it is

[00:33:12] an option for people, right? I mean, those folks in the neighborhood, I'm sure very inconvenient right now, but they're getting to their home somehow, and this permit would be an option to get there in a way that's faster and more convenient. And I think if you do that, if you get the permit closer to the average of the region or on the higher end of the region, and then acknowledging that the new position is actually split between the Tyson's program and this program, you might be able to break even at some point, depending on how many are in it.

[00:33:48] So I would argue for slightly higher on the fee. Thanks. Supervisor Stork. I'm not going to go the fee route at the moment. I'm going to say that there's clearly areas that are coming on board in terms of their gridlock.

[00:34:05] And anybody who's talking about the American Legion Bridge, we can definitely talk about the Woodrow-Wilson Bridge. And maybe it isn't every single day, and I would not want to live through what they live. There's enough days of the year now at the Woodrow-Wilson Bridge that we are getting closer to the point of gridlock.

[00:34:22] And definitely on days with bad weather, it is in gridlock. So I see that there are other communities that ultimately will want to acquire or have the ability to do this. I think we have to have some capability to do this. I don't accept the cost of the program because I don't believe that the systems that are being suggested have to be the way they're designed.

[00:34:45] And I don't, I'm not there where you all were, but I also know, I think the chairman mentioned clearly systemized ways of doing this where there's, it's people in certain, obviously the setup time is the setup time. I agree that that's going to take a little bit of time, but once the system's done, it shouldn't take

ongoing effort to have somebody have, be authorized or not authorized based upon their location and be offered that as part of their personal property taxes or some other means to do that.

[00:35:21] So I think we need the capability. I believe that the cost to me is not acceptable the way it is. I'm looking for some way of achieving both while recognizing that there probably still needs to be some fee to pay for it. So that's, I'm in.

[00:35:38] Okay, Supervisor Smith. Thank you. I understand the piece with wanting to solve people's issues and trying to get them home. I share concerns about the cost of the program. The other thing that I think is always a tricky thing is how you do enforcement, right?

[00:35:54] Somebody sees somebody make the turn. Do they just start following them? I don't know how you deal with that piece, but I think we need to have a better solution about how the program, how people pay, the issues that people brought up about the cost issue, I think is kind of prohibitive.

[00:36:10] Thank you. Yes, Mr. Chairman, go ahead. Yeah, I do want to ask one question, because regardless of the fees and, I mean, obviously, you know, if we can do something to help in these neighborhoods, we want to do it. On the flip side, I think the lingering concern I have is one that I know was brought up before when we talked about this was not brought up today, but I am concerned.

[00:36:33] We have no control over applications like Waze, other wayfinding GPS systems that send people around construction and incidents and traffic gridlock in certain areas of the county and they're going to direct traffic the way they want to have it directed and so have we given any thought to if we did a program like this is part of the criteria going to be looking at are we just moving this problem to somebody else's neighborhood and somebody else's street and we have no way to influence the gps applications that i know of but they are routinely sending people in this county

[00:37:12] across the country. They are sending people through roads that were never built to handle the kind of volume that is going and following these applications. I mean, you can bypass I-95 by going down ditch section rural two-lane roads with no lighting. It will take you that way.

[00:37:31] And so I guess my question is, is part of the criteria that we would use looking at these is whether or not we're just moving the problem one street or one neighborhood over so that it's somebody else's problem and how would these restrictions appear or would they even appear on an online application or a gps application if you were following ways or some other device would it tell you that you're not allowed to turn left on the street but then send you down it anyway okay um so that's neil freshman again so um two parts first part about whether this would

[00:38:06] impact other neighborhoods that's really looking more at the cut through program which is already in a program that is in progress and neighborhoods can request it. It is hard to get that approved. We have to go through a pretty intense process of examining the cut-through and then are there alternate routes and then having VDOT approve it and we also have a public hearing. But yes, that is one of the possibilities if certain neighborhoods have a cut-through restriction that drivers will find other routes, especially if those other routes are not restricted.

[00:38:42] As to whether the wayfinding companies put this information into their databases, we've done some checks, and the answer is no. In other words, when I look at some of the restrictions we already have and go to various apps, I have not found them telling drivers not to do it.

[00:39:02] However, there are signs out there saying no right turn, 4 to 6 p.m., or whatever the restriction is, and we would still expect drivers to follow traffic signs regardless of what their wayfinding app is telling them to do. And so let me ask one last question, because I believe, and I could be wrong about this, so I would open to being corrected, but I believe this program exists in the town of Vienna.

[00:39:26] Do we know what experience they have had with that, if their program works, if it's in place? I mean, I know there are streets that have turn restrictions, but for the people who live on them. I don't know if they issue them permits or how they administer it, but I believe we have a program just like this right in our backyard, and I'm just wondering, has there been any analysis of that?

[00:39:48] does it work how is it administered how do they do it um we have not checked with the um town of vienna i did talk to someone a while ago in town of herndon and they also allow people to do this but it's a smaller town and their police officers just know who is allowed to enter that's what they said so i mean obviously that's not going to work in fairfax county so yeah i would just be curious

[00:40:18] I think the question we should ask as part of our ongoing debate about this is, and I know specifically of a big one in Vienna, and I'm just wondering if with this program in place, do they regularly enforce it? Do people generally honor it?

[00:40:35] How does that work? Do they have aggressive enforcement? Is it just, you know, pray for the best? I mean, I would love to get some sense of the success or failure of that program in Herndon with it being right here, or I'm sorry, in Vienna. with it being right here in our backyard as a part of the ongoing data collection on this, because I would like to know the answer to that before we're having to decide on this.

[00:41:00] All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, heard several things. I guess at this point we've heard requests for more information. Mr. Faust, Supervisor Faust, what is your pleasure as the chief advocate for this idea? What would you want to do?

[00:41:17] Yeah, I mean, I'm going to do a consideration item to ask to put the money into the carryover. And I think we need to get moving. We've waited four years, I think. So we'll either decide whether we're going to do it or not.

[00:41:33] But, you know, it's not conceivable to me that we would walk away from an opportunity to help our community. But we say something as small as this. Okay. Supervisor Palcic? Thank you.

[00:41:49] And seeing Captain Hanson here, and I know there are several programs we've been working on. And my big concern with this really is I'd be curious as to the impact on the enforcement, our police that are already, especially in our McLean District, being called for quite a few things.

[00:42:05] And I know we're down our traffic police and others. So I don't know if that's – I know it's been asked, but to me that's pretty critical, what the impact would be there. So, yeah, again, it all comes down to competing priorities. So it would be something that would need to be managed.

[00:42:23] Again, that's where the overtime, if, yeah, if we can do it just through our existing overtime budgets or if certain monies can be allocated towards supporting this, yeah, depending, yeah, just on what the board approves or authorizes.

[00:42:41] But, yeah, it would be challenging. But, again, I think it would be interesting to the chairman's point about automation. That might be something that if legislation could be written in such a way to

allow for automated enforcement of this, I think that would be a very good way to do it.

[00:43:03] But otherwise, again, we hit it hard for a few weeks and then try to hit it sporadically throughout. So there's, you know, if it gets busy again, clear signage is one of the most important things to make sure that people understand that residents are authorized to make that turn.

[00:43:26] And so it differentiates it. So just making sure the signage is clear, no left turn, these hours, except for residents with permit, you know, something of that nature. I think my main concern is we already know speed enforcement is something that we desperately need more of.

[00:43:44] And I know we see it across the district, especially in the clean area. So I would want to make sure that, you know, actually if we had the extra overtime, I would want to put it to speed enforcement if it were me. But that's my big concern. I'm not opposed to it, but I just am very cognizant that we already are calling our captains constantly to try to get extra staffing.

[00:44:05] Okay, Supervisor Fowles. Yeah, I just, you know, somewhat confusing two things. One is we have the cut-through restriction program now. That is what the police are supposed to enforce now. They won't be enforcing against individuals who have this sticker.

[00:44:27] You know, so maybe a little less work for you. You have to look for the sticker. And then in terms of pushing traffic into other neighborhoods, we have this program now. These people who live on that street are not going to have to go into other people's neighborhoods to get back to their house.

[00:44:47] They're going to be able to turn onto their street, getting them off of the neighborhood street. So, you know, it's pretty simple. Okay. So let's wrap this part up. Supervisor Sal Baus said he's going to be putting together a budget consideration item.

[00:45:04] Correct. Correct. So we do not take votes in committee, but at that point, I guess we'll see how the votes lay out. Thank you. All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate the staff's work on this and also answering those questions that we had as soon as you came.

[00:45:22] All right, let's move on to our second item. Mr. Severson, back to you on spot improvements. And I believe there's a presentation also. Yes, that is correct. So next on the agenda, as you stated, is an update on the spot improvement screening program.

[00:45:40] We came to talk to you about this back, I want to say, in 2021, about establishing sort of a methodology for prioritizing locations in the county for spot improvements based on criteria such as safety or equity. And we've since developed this methodology and looked at a very large subset of the intersections within the county using that methodology. And so Vanessa Holt is here to talk to you a little bit about some of those results of that work. Vanessa? Thanks, Greg. Good afternoon. My name is Vanessa Holt. I'm an engineer in the traffic engineering section at FCDOT, and I'll be giving you an update on the

[00:46:18] spot improvement program. As you all are well aware, we receive a high volume of resident requests for various improvements, and the county currently has the transportation priorities plan, the TPP, and the $100 million allocated by the board for active transportation projects to fund new improvements. Smaller scale spot improvements are currently part of our TPP process, but that process is updated every five to six years, and other requests are considered on an ad hoc basis.

[00:46:48] The number of requests that we receive typically exceeds the resources and funding available to address them all. So we initiated the SPOT Improvement Screening Program to provide data-supported

information to assist us in responding to these requests. We identified safety, equity, and vulnerable users as important focus areas. The screening developed a list of priority locations.

[00:47:12] However, we have not yet developed a list of proposed improvements. We could use the location priorities to inform future project selection under existing funded programs like the TPP and the $100 million list, or we could implement a standalone program to address the high-priority locations with identification of future recurring funding.

[00:47:33] This is something we would like your feedback on, and I will discuss it in later slides. We developed three overarching goals for the Spot Improvement Screening Program. to provide a means to identify and prioritize locations for improvements using a data-driven and equitable approach, prioritize safety as a metric used for evaluating transportation projects in the county, and provide information to be responsive to resident concerns.

[00:48:03] So as I said before, this program is a data-driven process to be used for evaluating and prioritizing intersections countywide. It allows us to use data to better understand high priorities on an ongoing basis. We first developed the framework for the program, which we presented to the Board Transportation Committee in June of 2021. The framework established the data and the process that we are using to identify and prioritize spot locations. In 2022, we completed a pilot screening in Annandale to test that screening process. And now in 2023, we have identified and prioritized

[00:48:42] spots for the entire county using the screening methodology that we developed with the framework, And we will discuss the preliminary results with you today. So the framework establishes the methodology for identifying, scoring, and prioritizing the spot locations.

[00:49:02] As we developed the framework, we sought input from local partners, including various divisions within FCDOT, Fairfax County Police, VDOT, and the county's chief equity officer. We also sought input from other localities who have implemented similar screening processes, including Washington, D.C. and Loudoun County.

[00:49:23] Stakeholder input was used to inform and refine the scoring criteria, which is shown in the pie chart on the right of this slide. Overall, the scoring for each spot location is calculated based on 50% safety-related criteria, 25% equity, and 25% other multimodal criteria.

[00:49:42] We used numerous data sources to define the scoring, including speed limit, locations of fatal and severe crashes, the county vulnerability index, and the presence of existing facilities such as bus stops and pedestrian walkways. The process for developing the spot locations and priorities, as outlined in our framework, included three primary steps.

[00:50:09] The first is the screening where we use the data to prioritize locations. We have just completed this screening, and I will discuss in more detail on my next slide. The second step will be to finalize the spot priorities. This is the step that we're beginning now and where we will be asking for all of your input to guide our refined results.

[00:50:30] And then the third step would be evaluation and implementation. This would be a future step to implement proposed projects that I will discuss on a later slide. As I stated, the first step in the process was the screening, which included identification of spots and prioritizing them.

[00:50:50] That process was rooted in GIS analysis using numerous data sets. We identified spots at signalized and unsignalized intersections, trail crossings, and all locations where fatal crashes have occurred in the past five years, including mid-block locations.

[00:51:08] We then used GIS analysis to assign a score to each location based on that safety, equity, and multimodal scoring criteria. The locations were prioritized based on their score to determine high, medium, and low priority spots. I wanted to note that often roadways form the border between districts in Fairfax County.

[00:51:30] So where we have spots located on those border roadways, we assigned the spot point in GIS to only one district, so we're not double counting. However, in the list that I'm going to provide you for each of your districts and the accompanying maps, we have included those spots on both lists because we know that both districts would want to weigh in on those priorities.

[00:51:56] So the prioritization of spots as high, medium, and low allows us to have a prioritized list of locations to guide future project priorities. The highest priority locations are more likely to have a high number of crashes, have multimodal facilities where vulnerable users are present, and be located in higher vulnerability index areas. The analysis identified 3,966 spots countywide. 7% of those spots were identified as high priority, 43% as medium, and 50% as low. And I understand you all will be very

[00:52:33] interested in the list of locations for your districts. And after my presentation, I have a list and a map of all locations for each of you. We compared all of the spot locations to programmed and funded VDOT and Fairfax County projects, including projects shown in VDOT's six-year plan as well as Fairfax County's TPP. Of the 3,966 total spots, 46 percent have a nearby programmed project. And of the 287 high-priority spots, 46 percent of those as well already have programmed

[00:53:09] projects in their vicinity. So as we move forward, we could choose to remove spot locations and priorities that already have dedicated funding through other programs to allow us to utilize our resources more strategically or fund other locations more quickly. But those types of decisions would only be made with board guidance based on your knowledge of your district needs and priorities. So that brings us to where we are today. We are on the second step of the screening process. We have completed the initial screening using the data and we now would like additional

[00:53:45] context to inform the finalization of those spot priorities. And that context includes your priorities for each of your districts, the goals of the county, and feedback from residents potentially. After you all have had a chance to review the initial spot location lists and maps for your districts, we would like to meet with you individually to discuss your thoughts and comments and to finalize the priority rankings for the spots. After we finalize the priority locations using your input, the next step would include study and implementation of improvements for priority locations if the board determines you would like us to move forward. Additional

[00:54:25] funding and resources would need to be identified to complete this step. We would need to perform studies to develop improvements for priority locations, which would include public involvement, and then subsequently we could design and construct the improvements identified. In summary, our program recommendations include focusing on the high-priority spot locations, continuing to coordinate with VDOT to strategize funding and implementation for spots where we can, and focusing county resources on higher-priority spots where there are no programmed projects currently.

[00:55:02] We're recommending to perform corridor studies for those roads that have multiple high-priority spot locations. We're recommending that we update the program every three to five years, and all that would entail would be obtaining updated data sets to revise the priorities.

[00:55:21] We have already developed the scoring and the system and the GIS, and so we would not, you know, those costs were one-time costs. And then we would need to identify funding and resources if we decide we want to perform studies, design, and implement spot improvements, whether that's in conjunction with the TPP process or as a standalone feature program. So the feedback that we are asking from you is first feedback on the priority locations for each of your district. We're planning to meet with each of you to discuss the priorities that we've identified in your district after you have had

[00:55:58] a chance to review the lists and maps of priority locations. And we would like your input on finalizing those priorities for the identified spots. And then as far as next steps, we'd like to know if you would like the public to have input on the locations that are ultimately categorized as high, medium, and low, or would you prefer that we solicit public input at the future evaluation and implementation step when we get to building and funding projects?

[00:56:30] We believe that if we do the step of evaluating and implementing projects, we obviously definitely want to get public feedback at that point. We believe that if we did that public feedback concurrently with public involvement for TPP updates, that might be a good streamlined way to solicit public feedback, but we welcome your comments on that. All right. Thank you very much.

[00:56:55] And let me just ask a couple of quick questions relating to the comments you just made. If you could go back to slide two, put that up there. In terms of getting public comment, I think public input is going to be critical for this I think to make sure that we're really focusing on the right places and and this graphic that's an excellent graphic that I think something that in my own head I was kind of struggling with is how does this effort fit in with what's going to happen with TPP as we update that list and also the active transportation funding and those

[00:57:30] projects so um yes i i i mean i'd be interested in hearing if any other board members had any other ideas but maybe concurrently with the tpp update um i think it is going to be important to message this and communicate it carefully so that the public doesn't get confused and maybe the fewer times we go to the public with uh requests for you know what are your scary spots maybe the better um so um that's kind of my thinking the other thing is and if you could go to slide eight on this and i i thank you very much for putting together the list i know uh each of us going to

[00:58:09] be very interested in and looking at that by the way if you look at hunter mills this does underscore the point there's really not a lot of extra uh treatment for whoever chairs the committee uh here but but uh but but that said in terms of these data and you mentioned also updating the data sets the data sets here are basically where there have already been crashes where there are already been fatalities i i would hope and i i realized for the first go around we may not be able to include formally other data sets say of near misses um you know whether they're crowdsourced

[00:58:46] data sets or maybe VDOT camera data, you know, various artificial intelligence type of analyses that I think are coming, if not, you know, already here. So, but hopefully during the public input process, we could make sure that we get data that others are managing and to identify where at least maybe members of the public might see priorities.

[00:59:12] So I think we can capture that. But I would say in future updates for this, you know, to look to see where we can get maybe additional data sets into the system. But this is great stuff. I really like the process, the drivers being data-driven, equity-focused, and safety-focused.

[00:59:31] So great work. Thank you. Comments, Mr. Chairman? Yeah, I think this is excellent, too. I think, you know, one piece on the safety is understanding why there was a fatality. I know that when there is a fatality, DOT works with police and others to try to get to the route and immediately, if it's a design issue, can make some recommendations.

[00:59:53] I just want to make sure that, you know, unfortunately we do have fatalities in some corridors of the county where it's not a road design issue at all. It's a human behavior issue or a speed limit issue, and maybe you want to incorporate that in design. But I think if the bar for the highest priorities are fatality, It's important to understand why and if this would solve that problem or not.

[01:00:16] And so I do want to emphasize that point. The other one is, you know, we have this comment in here about whether there's a nearby program project. I guess the concern I have is making sure that we're strategic about some of these projects, too.

[01:00:32] In other words, if one is falling into the medium priority category, but there is another project right next door that's unrelated to it, Do we have efficiencies of scales to just knock out both while we're there? And so I think one of the criteria is, you know, probably that we need to look at is strategic in terms of location and not just the one bar of safety or fatality.

[01:00:55] And I do think that we do need to go to the public on this because there are observations that come up from the public that may be different than our own that make us want to look at an intersection or a spot improvement a little bit differently. On the flip side of that, we have to manage expectations because in the low priority or in the high priority list here, there's 287 projects.

[01:01:18] We know how much a lot of these projects cost. We know going through active transportation, what that is. I appreciate and love trying to partner with VDOT, but I don't think VDOT's going to come to the table with some massive sum of money that's going to knock out all of our high priority locations in the next couple of years.

[01:01:36] And so I just think we have to, if we're going to go to the public, I agree with trying to do it strategically with something else, but I think we have to make sure people understand what our capacities are and what this exercise is. It is frustrating for someone to go through a process and for us to presumably spend a lot of money on design, studies, all these things, and then tell them that the project is probably 15 or 20 years away.

[01:02:05] So I just want us to be cognizant of that in the way we message, because I look at the last bullet and it says identify resources to perform studies, design, and implement spot improvements. And I just want to make sure we're not spending so much money designing and studying things and not as much money actually doing things.

[01:02:25] All right. Thank you, Chairman McKay. Supervisor Palczyk. Thank you. I'm happy to follow that because I read out and I'm thinking the STAR studies, beautiful studies, but there's no funding. And so while I guess going back to the process of only looking at the fatalities, I know we have the Commonwealth, I believe it's the highest 5% crash rates, as well as, I don't know, that one day of studies at intersections was done months ago now.

[01:02:59] So I don't know how far we are from getting that analyzed data back. I can't think of the name, the camera program that was out on it. You're talking about the street simplified work? Thank you. That's the word. So I feel like that's been done, and it'd be great if that could be incorporated before this is finalized.

[01:03:15] Yeah, so in that vein, I think with all of these things, there's, I think, a lot of data points out there. And to Chairman Alcorn's point, finding other sources and other ways of trying to tackle data, I think as we move this forward and continue to do this, the more pieces of data that we can apply to this in terms of whether it's the safety part or any of the other parts, I think, will be important.

[01:03:40] And so we are planning to come talk to you all fairly soon about some of the Street Simplified results and some of the things that we worked on there and some of the path forward with respect to those things. So stay tuned for that. Okay, so that might be included or not? I don't know that it will be included specifically in this process, but I think it can be included.

[01:04:02] If we continue to do the program, if we continue to do this at other locations, what I think it can also do is if we tackle a location that's in either the medium or high, and we can use that to supplement the analysis, so if we're seeing crash information but we don't know what's going on, or we need a little bit more information about understanding what's happening, or it provides us some information to go to VDOT and say, this is why we want to do the specific improvement that we want to do, I think that's where it's going to get a lot of its bang for its buck.

[01:04:31] Clearly, we're all anxious to see our list, so thank you. Okay, Supervisor Lusk. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think Supervisor Palchuk stole a little bit of my thunder there as well. On the street simplified, I was going to make the point that we certainly should be incorporating that data-driven process in the analysis for us as well.

[01:04:51] I do appreciate on slide 8 this kind of breaking out high-priority, medium-priority, and low-priority. I think I got clearly from you what the high-priority items are, a large number of crashes, most vulnerable communities, and then other safety concerns.

[01:05:09] But I'm not so sure I might need help with the medium priority and the low priority, how we're defining the measures for each of those, because I think that's going to be important for us to articulate it when we talk to our communities. And I'm going to also agree with Supervisor Alcuin and the chairman that, you know, we definitely got to go out to the community.

[01:05:29] And one of the things I'll want to do once I know which are the projects in my district is to get some interaction with the community on kind of the prioritization of those. I am grateful, by the way. I did notice something when I looked at the list.

[01:05:44] I'm number four in total number of spot locations, but on the high priority, I'm number one. And then my colleague here to the right of me is number two. So I did sort of catch that out and acknowledge, you know, I do want to understand, again, the process for each of those designations.

[01:06:02] But I look forward to working with you once we have the conversation about which ones are in my district and going to the community to talk about that. Thank you. Next, going to Supervisor Walkinshaw, then Rose.

[01:06:20] Thank you. I appreciate the work on this. You know, one thing I'll say just for all of us, probably for me more than anyone, is I think we need to do a better job of continuing to bang the drum that VDOT, and it's not VDOT's staff fault, but VDOT has a responsibility on these issues as well.

[01:06:44] And I've had several instances recently where VDOT and or members of the General Assembly have told constituents that, oh, well, that's a pedestrian issue. That's Fairfax County's job to deal with. And the fact that we have made the decision to take on the responsibility of doing more with respect to pedestrian and bicycle safety isn't because there's anything, you know, on a tablet or a stone tablet, I mean, not a tablet, or the Constitution of Virginia or anywhere else saying that VDOT and the Commonwealth can't.

[01:07:21] They've just made a policy decision and a budgetary decision not to. And they have no dedicated funding source that's not federal or local for pedestrian and bicycle safety. And that's a job for me and all of us in the legislative committee.

[01:07:38] I think we need to do a better job of teeing up that issue that long-term, VDOT's got to play in this arena also. So I'll take that responsibility to work more on that.

[01:07:55] Just one thing, you know, that we're dealing with and probably others as well, as people start to see and learn more about rapid flashing beacons, everybody wants a rapid flashing beacon at every crossing and mid-block crossings and unsignalized crossings.

[01:08:15] And I, you know, maybe it's incorporated behind the curtain of the spot improvement process and the metrics that you're using, but I haven't felt confident that I have a good way of telling communities that this is a good location or not a good location. I don't feel like we, I feel like we need some metric-based way to tell people that this is a crossing that could be eligible or not,

[01:08:49] or we have 1,000 requests for rapid flashing beacons around the county, and some of those crossings have 100 pedestrians and bicyclists a day, and some of them have 11. But I don't feel like we have a process whereby I can ask you all to do that analysis so we can go back to them.

[01:09:11] We're kind of in the position of saying, well, we can't do them everywhere and not quite sure that this will work. So maybe you've incorporated that here, but I think moving forward, even beyond the spots that you've analyzed, we're going to continue to face that with community after community saying, I want a rapid flashing beacon, I want a rapid flashing beacon, and we have to be able to give them an objective answer as to why it might or might not be something that could happen there in the future if funding is available.

[01:09:44] I can respond to that a little bit if you'd like. So we did not, there's not a specific metric for RRFBs baked into our methodology because we don't really have a data point for that, but we did give weight to not only fatal and severe crashes overall, but also to bike and pedestrian crashes specifically to help us identify.

[01:10:04] But as far as guidance for locating RRFBs, VDOT does have what's called an IIM. It's an informational and instructional memorandum that our active transportation staff is required to follow their process. It sets out a process based on the volume of a road, the configuration of a road, whether there's a median, as to whether or not VDOT will even allow you to consider. Yeah, I understand that, but that's like the first screen, right? Is it eligible from an engineering standpoint for an RFB? Given that we're now making the decision to fund

[01:10:40] some, we've got to have a separate layer, an additional layer of metric saying, okay, these are the situations where we'll consider it, right? If there are, maybe it's a combination of pedestrians and vehicular traffic, right? But if there's only a small number of pedestrians, sorry, we can't consider it, right? I don't know that we have that kind of process beyond what you've done here? Not yet that I'm aware of, but that's something that I can talk to our active transportation team about as we are, I know, funding more RRFBs. We can maybe talk about

[01:11:18] establishing some kind of county criteria for which ones that pass that first VDOT check to consider. Yeah, I think it's important because, you know, obviously we want to be able to say yes, but there are times where we're going to have to say no. But we've got to be able to have some metrics to base when we're going to say no, especially if VDOT says from an engineering perspective, sure, you can do it if the county wants to pay for it, which is what they tell people very explicitly, and the General Assembly tells people that we're going to be in the position of having to say no. We've just got to have hard metrics to justify when we need to say no.

[01:11:55] Noted. Thank you. Okay. Supervisor Gross, then we're going to... You know, we have done... We are done no favors by our adjacency to Alexandria to Arlington, to Paul's Church, and to Fairfax City, which all operate their own roads and can put in these kinds of devices without nearly going through the machinations we have to.

[01:12:17] So I'm anxious to see the list, but I do have two quick questions. One is, are the lists generally for public right-of-way, or are there some that would include land that's privately owned?

[01:12:36] And then also, do we need to take into consideration the NEPA process? And I ask that question because in one situation, a pedestrian signal was planned for a very long time in downtown Annandale.

[01:12:52] One of the four legs was on a gas station property, and it took forever to get them to finally agree to have a mast, you know, right there. And then our effort on Beauregard a number of years ago to put a concrete median down Beauregard to alleviate the cross-turnings, a concrete median on top of asphalt, and it triggered a NEPA process that took us three years to get the response back about, yes, you can do this.

[01:13:24] So I'm really concerned about the NEPA process. Maybe it's triggered by federal funding. I'm not sure. But sometimes the weirdest things come into play and that we never thought of. So we might want to also incorporate that idea.

[01:13:41] We have not incorporated potential NEPA processes in this screening, but I'll make a note of that. Sort of what triggers the NEPA process. Let's be real careful about triggering the NEPA process. Thank you. All right.

[01:13:57] Supervisor Herity, then Supervisor Faust and Supervisor Smith. A couple of things. I appreciate the upfront comments on fatalities and doing a whole bunch of money on studies without actually getting the money spent on projects because we saw that with stormwater and don't need to repeat that there.

[01:14:18] I don't see anywhere in here. We used to do spot improvements for congestion relief, put in a right-hand turn lane that significantly improved congestion in people's lives and getting to and from work. Is there no place in the spot improvement program for that anymore?

[01:14:38] We did include vehicular traffic metrics in the multimodal piece of that pie chart. Ultimately, we did not give it a lot of weight because traditionally county project selection and funding had been so focused on congestion management that we decided to focus more so on safety and equity, but we did not want to disregard it.

[01:15:05] So we did include delay for all signalized intersections as a metric, meaning that if an intersection had a higher delay, it would increase the score and make it a higher priority. And then for unsignalized intersections, we don't have delay data, but we do have average annual daily traffic data.

[01:15:24] So we included that as a metric in that 25% multimodal piece as well. And speaking of the criteria for equity and multimodal, can you share those with us? Not necessarily here, but can you send us what you actually used? I can, yes.

[01:15:39] The specifics, because I'm just curious what they look like for equity and for multimodal. I will. Okay, thank you. Supervisor Faust, then wrapping up with Supervisor Schmidt. I'd like to be clear on this.

[01:16:01] When we talk about spot improvements and road improvements and adding turn lengths and so forth, That's not what we're using the $100 million that we approve for pedestrian and bike for, right? That has to come from another funding source. You're not looking at spending that money on road improvements.

[01:16:20] No, that's correct. We are not. Okay. The concern, I mean, I think, you know, I don't know how you do it, how many hours there are in a day, but you're managing an enormous amount of data, and it seems to be coming out at the end in a very good, organized fashion, leaving me without many projects, but that's okay. I guess the one concern I have, and it's like,

[01:16:54] we're so big, you know, 1.2 million people, enormous county. And, you know, to prioritize a life-saving, you know, crosswalk, you know, in anyone's district, you know, on a county-wide basis is really difficult to do. I mean, I know we could, every single one of these that you come up with, we could find people who would argue with you about whether it is, you know, a number one

[01:17:27] priority. I don't know what the answer is, but I do know that in 2013, I think it was, we did the first cut of the transportation funding priorities plan, TPP or whatever it was, and that was an amazingly good process to actually, you know, get the people who knew, who walked through the streets every day, who, you know, whose kids walked to school every day, and to identify. So, I mean, I'm not sure what the right answer is. I'm just saying, consider that, you know, we really need

[01:18:07] to hear from people who are living this day to day about the safety issues. It was, I see, Its terminology is a little bit different.

[01:18:22] I'm not sure it makes any difference, but if it does, I just wanted an explanation here. It's safety, equity, and multimodal. In one place, safety, equity, and vulnerable users. In another place, vulnerable users and multimodal don't seem interchangeable to me.

[01:18:45] I'm looking at pages two and five of your printout. So we use the term multimodal in that pie chart. To include several data points, which includes the location of bus stops, whether or not a location is in a commercial revitalization district, whether or not a location is in a transit station area, the presence of pedestrian walkways, pedestrian user facilities, and then, like I had mentioned before, delay or AADT.

[01:19:22] And so we just called it multimodal on this pie chart to group them together because they were not safety or equity. But I'm happy. I will send out the breakdown of exactly which data pieces are included in each piece of this pie chart so you have a better understanding of that.

[01:19:39] Vulnerable users are definitely a criteria that you're considering, I take it. Yes, that's correct. I mean, I know we did an amazing change for a bus stop for a captain who had been, you know, injured in Iraq.

[01:19:54] I mean, there's no way this thing could have picked that up, but it was tremendously important so he could get to the hospital every day by bus on his wheelchair. So do that, and I mean, I think it's good.

[01:20:13] My office really enjoys working with you guys. We think you're very responsive, and, you know, we're moving in the right direction. We just need to put that remaining 70 million bucks as 100, right? Thank you, Supervisor Powell.

[01:20:28] Getting things done. Thank you. Supervisor Powell. Thank you. You know, when you talk about the public feedback and how we get public feedback and what the time is, I think it's clarity of what we want in all these programs we have. We talk about the $100 million.

[01:20:45] We talked about Street Simplified. we talked about active transportation. And then you're talking about these projects are developed based on data. And so I don't feel like I have clarity about timing and talking to the public and what we're looking for, right? Because I think if you've picked the projects based on all these data points, are we going to the public first and explaining these are the data points we picked?

[01:21:11] What did you think? Did we miss anything? Or is it a discussion? These are our data points. And when we get to the point of doing projects we get more information you know I think we sit here and we see all the needs that we have and and how do we get that done and so I think part of that piece of going out to the public is ensuring that we know what we're trying to find out and that we're educating them enough about the different things we do and what this is you know because the public that's walking these things sees the problems we just need to take their problem and put it in the

[01:21:44] right bucket to solve it. So as I envision it, and I think the feedback that I'm hearing today is we would like to get public feedback on the priorities themselves before we ever get to developing a project. And so that way we would be able to incorporate public comment into what we are calling high, medium, and low priority. Because while we have designed this as a data-driven process, and we do believe there's great value in that, we recognize that data analysis is not perfect when we have that human element in transportation safety, right? And so that's

[01:22:21] why we would want to consider the feedback from the public before we even got to the project phase. And then after we prioritize and if the board decides they want to fund projects at certain high-priority locations, then obviously, just like we do now, we would go back to the public and ask for feedback on specific improvements or projects.

[01:22:40] And I'll chime in with one other quick thing. In terms of, we were talking about the $70 million dollars for for pedestrian improvements you may find that on your high priority list that there's a location in there that has a pedestrian based concern and you may want to say oh this might be a location to include in that 70 million dollars for pedestrian improvements because it's high priority on the on the list

we've heard about it in the past and people have talked about this from a pedestrian perspective and it might be something you would want to include on that list

[01:23:11] And so I think what this does is it provides us information so that we can look at, whether it's the TPP, whether it's the $100 million for active transportation projects, or whether it's this, see where those things combine and say, oh, well, I've got one that's on all three of these lists.

[01:23:27] That's got to be my first thing. Or I've got one that's on two of these lists. I really want to move that forward. And so this provides you all with another piece of data that allows you to cross-reference things and say, oh, yeah, this is on a couple of lists. This is definitely something that should be high priority for my district.

[01:23:46] Yeah, very good question. Thank you very much. Hopefully you got what you needed from the board on this. Just one quick minute before we conclude this meeting. We do have, as an FYI, the Blue-Orange-Silver Line Capacity and Reliability Study that Metro is working on.

[01:24:05] It's gotten some media attention in the last few days. Just a couple of points. First of all, this will be something that Fairfax County will be submitting comments on. We're going to be looking at that, I believe, in September. So expect the board members to see something come to the board for review.

[01:24:27] But two quick points on this. First of all, this is a long range of view. We still have the whole fiscal cliff thing that we're looking at for the shorter term. But the other piece is this is much of this work is really looking at the capacity constraints of at Roslyn and in terms of the inability to have another through point at Roslyn, another Roslyn tunnel, which affects not just the reliability of service currently on the orange and blue lines in particular, but also in the silver line, but also the ability to expand.

[01:25:07] network in fairfax county so uh anyway i think we may look at it a little differently than some others in the region but this this certainly is looking at some of the very important long-term infrastructure issues associated with metro rail so just as an fyi okay if there is no other business before the committee uh we are adjourned

