MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee, Tuesday, February 13, 2024

Date	Tuesday, February 13, 2024
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 19m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/3217
- 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 2026-11-02. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:07] Well, I'm the new guy, so the prank was played. We've only got a few of us, the few, the proud. Anyway, I'm Jimmy Bierman, supervisor from the Drainsville District, chair of the Transportation Committee, and I'm going to call this committee meeting to order.

[00:00:24] Thank you all for being here. Looking forward to getting going on my first meeting, and thank you to the Department of Transportation, FCDOT, for helping lead me through this. With that, I'm going to, I guess we do not actually have enough people to vote.

[00:00:41] So we're not going to vote on the meeting minutes from last meeting when I was not on the board. I would defer to Supervisor Alcorn, whether he thinks that they are, they're all good. Thank you, Supervisor Alcorn. And with that, I'd like to jump right into it, which is a discussion of an update to the Fairfax County Resident Cut-Through Permit Program.

[00:01:06] Just so people know, we do have cut-through traffic restrictions in certain neighborhoods in Fairfax County. The question is whether or not there would be a residential permit program that would allow residents to pay a certain fee to obtain a permit, which would allow them to go against what the cut-through restrictions were.

[00:01:30] And with that, I will turn it over to the Department of Transportation. Thank you. Good morning.

[00:01:49] Chairman Beerman, board members, Henry Stein-McCartney, Department of Transportation. I'm joined today by Neil Freshman, Traffic Engineering Section Chief, Joanna Faust, Assistant County Attorney, Scott Caldwell, Fairfax County Police Traffic Commander, and representatives from the Department of Tax Administration in the event there are questions for them.

[00:02:10] Today, we are presenting an update to the proposed resident cut-through permit program. In 2019, the Virginia General Assembly passed legislation authorizing Fairfax County to enact an ordinance and develop a program to offer permits to residents whose direct access to their home is impacted by cut-through restrictions. Cut-through restrictions in residential communities are implemented by VDOT to mitigate residential cut-through traffic and to restrict turns onto certain streets during certain hours. With turn restrictions in place, those residents of those

[00:02:48] streets are unable to take the most direct route to their homes. We were previously here in July of 2023 to present draft policies and procedures and a draft ordinance for the program. Today, we're here in response to Supervisor Behrman's January 23rd board matter to present an update.

[00:03:09] The proposed permit program would be a companion program to the existing cut-through mitigation program, which is a joint program that's offered by FCDOT and VDOT that restricts vehicular access to neighborhood streets affected by peak hour cut-through traffic. Cut-through traffic is defined as traffic that has no origin or destination in the community.

[00:03:29] And it's become much more prevalent because of wayfinding apps, such as ways that will often route traffic onto community streets when traffic is heavy on major routes. The proposed program is a separate program that can only be implemented after a cut-through restriction has been implemented on a residential street by VDOT.

[00:03:51] The permit would allow residents of the affected community to access the restricted street during restricted hours. There are currently three communities in the county, two in Mason and one in Dranesville District, with existing cut-through restrictions.

[00:04:09] In the three existing communities that are shown here on the slide, there are approximately 350 addresses that are impacted and that could initially seek permits if this program were implemented. The proposed permit zones for the existing restrictions are shown here on the slide in blue, and they capture every address on the restricted street and on streets that are accessed by the restricted street. The two existing Mason District restrictions have been in place since the early 90s, so they have been around for quite some time. The restriction in Drainesville District is fairly

[00:04:47] new. It was implemented in 2020, and it lies along the border between Fairfax and Loudoun counties. And that particular restriction also impacts approximately 30 addresses in Loudoun County whose residents have expressed an interest in receiving permits through this program also.

[00:05:06] In addition to the existing cut-through restriction areas, there are currently three communities that are actively in the process for restrictions and four other communities that are currently on hold. And here, you can see those communities that are in process or that are on hold.

[00:05:28] There are approximately 950 addresses in these communities that would be impacted by residents -- by restrictions. If all seven projects were implemented, we would expect to have approximately 1,300 addresses countywide that could participate in the program.

[00:05:52] So staff has identified the required elements of standing up a new program which would include the development of a new section of county code, program policies and procedures, and permit administration capabilities in addition to a few administrative tasks. Staff previously presented an overview of the ordinance provisions and program policies and procedures at the July 2023 Transportation Committee meeting. The proposed ordinance would codify various program elements including permit fees and provide for penalties for violations.

[00:06:29] The policies and procedures outline program operation and include more detailed program guidance on address inclusion and resident eligibility. The most critical element of the program is permit administration software that would provide an online application for residents and permit administration and production capabilities for staff.

[00:06:56] So we're coming to you today with a new strategy for fulfilling this program, courtesy of our friends in the Department of Tax Administration. In the January 23rd board matter, we were directed to work with tax administration on revenue collection options for this program.

[00:07:17] And in those conversations, tax administration recommended that we speak with the vendor that they currently have under contract for the county's parking enforcement software. We are very early in our conversations with this vendor, so there are still many unknowns and details that we need to work out, but we do know that the system that the county currently procures includes a permit module that could be used to administer this program.

[00:07:47] The vendor would provide an online permit application page, permit administration and fulfillment, meaning they'd print and mail the permits directly to the residents, and they would process permit payments. We've been told by the vendor that there would be no additional costs to the county to set up the permit program in the software, in the existing software that the county procures, and there would be cost for payment processing and for each permit that they

[00:08:21] print and mail to residents. We don't have the full picture of exactly what those costs are going to be for printing and mailing, but we are continuing our conversations with the vendor to determine exactly what those costs would be and the requirements to get this program set up in their system. It's our understanding that they would accept the permit fee for each application and deduct the fees that are owed to them for payment processing and for the permit fulfillment and then they would remit the remainder of that fee to the

[00:08:57] county so we would like to return to this committee in june to provide you with additional information on using the vendor so here we've put together some information showing the permit fees that are charged by fairfax county and other regional jurisdictions for residential parking permits. This was in response to a request for information on what our neighbors are charging for transportation related permits. And the one permit that we have found that many of our neighbors issue and charge for is

[00:09:35] the residential parking permit. So on this table you can see that Fairfax County, Fairfax City, and the City of Falls Church issue residential parking permits at no charge. And then the remaining jurisdictions shown in blue charge a variety of fees between $5 to $50 for the first permit. The average

permit fee for the first permit charged by the localities is $24. So we have proposed a $25 permit fee for this program

[00:10:12] program, based on that average fee of $24. So on this slide, you can see the potential gross revenue of the program based on the number of homes eligible for permits.

[00:10:30] As mentioned, vendor costs for permit production, mailing, and payment processing would be deducted from permit proceeds by the vendor, so the county's net revenue would be less than $25 per permit. Currently, 355 homes could initially join the program if implemented.

[00:10:47] If all eligible homes joined the program and obtained one permit, our gross revenue would be approximately $9,000 per year. Based on our experience with our PPD, not all eligible addresses get permits.

[00:11:03] And it's difficult for us to accurately predict the number of addresses that would apply for permits under this program because this program serves a very different purpose. And factors that may impact the number of addresses that seek permits are the cost of permits and also the time of day that the turns are restricted.

[00:11:25] There are currently four total streets with restrictions in the program, and three of those streets are restricted during morning time hours, between 6.30 a.m. and 10 a.m. And it's possible that there's just not a lot of resident demand to make those restricted turns during those morning hours.

[00:11:48] We were also asked to provide information today about how other jurisdictions handle cut through traffic and whether any other jurisdictions issue permits. We contacted the seven jurisdictions shown here and the only jurisdiction that offers a physical permit to residents that allows them to make access a restricted street is the City of Falls Church.

[00:12:14] They offer a drive-through permit for residents that are impacted, including residents of two apartment complexes in the county, right at the county city line. And those permits are offered free of charge, and they never expire. So it's a very simplified program that the city operates.

[00:12:32] They don't track the total number of permits that they've issued, so they were unable to tell us the number that they've issued over time. but they were able to show that they issue about 20 permits per year and those permits are issued by the city's police department. The town of Herndon also allows residents to access restricted streets without a permit. Those streets are only one block long and they serve four homes so it's very easy for enforcement if they're sitting out there and a resident makes the turn to see if that

[00:13:08] car is going to a home on that street. So they do not issue an actual permit. At the July 2023 Transportation Committee meeting, we were asked to look at programs in the City of Richmond and Town of Vienna. And we've learned that neither jurisdiction offers cut through restrictions or permits. The Town of Vienna previously implemented turn restrictions on some streets in town, but they no longer offer restrictions at all. So now we seek

[00:13:43] feedback and guidance. Do you have any specific guidance regarding the information that we presented here today? And we're happy to take your questions. Thank you very much. And thank you to the Department of Tax Administration for swooping in and helping us out as well. I will defer my questions till the end. Mr. Chairman, any thoughts or questions? Sure. Thank you, Supervisor Beerman.

[00:14:13] Just a couple. One is on the page where you list the communities that have requested cut-through mitigation projects, the four that are on hold or inactive, why are they on hold or inactive? Have they already gone through the process and been approved, but we just don't have a program?

[00:14:30] Or what is the status of that? Thank you, Chairman McKay. This is Neil Freshman with the Department of Transportation. The reason a neighborhood might be on hold is this is a community-based process. we work with the task force sometimes the task force doesn't want to move to the next phase maybe they are concerned with will it pass or they're just not ready so we don't necessarily put a project to bed it just remains on hold until they come back to us and say they want to move forward

[00:15:01] if it's enough time we generally then go out and collect new data okay um and then obviously you enforcement expectations were something that was heavily discussed last time we talked about this and probably more question for the police. But I'm a little bit confused in the permit versus non-permit on the jurisdiction cut-through review chart on page 10. I know from experience in the town of Vienna, for example, that they have turn restrictions, but they do not issue permits.

[00:15:38] But people who live on those streets are able to make those turns. And so on the ground, what are they doing? They're pulling over every car if they're doing enforcement and checking people's driver's license to see if they live on that street. I mean, help me understand how the enforcement on this would work and how we can manage people's expectations in terms of the enforcement.

[00:16:00] Sure, I can't speak to what another jurisdiction is doing for enforcement. I would not know. So for us to enforce something like this, obviously, if we're seeing a permit, it'd have to be something visible enough that we would be able to see it in a car.

[00:16:16] You are the only participant. Otherwise, we're just kind of guessing. Just based on preliminary what I'm hearing, it would probably be difficult to enforce. Yeah, so, I mean, that's one of the concerns I have.

[00:16:31] Obviously, these other jurisdictions have gotten to resident permit no, a majority of them. And I just have concerns with that in Fairfax because I don't think we want our police checking every car that comes down a street during a certain period of time to verify residency.

[00:16:49] I mean, to me, there's a whole lot of problems with that. It puts you in an awkward situation. So one thing I would like to know further is for those jurisdictions that have turn restrictions, Herndon, Alexandria, Fairfax City, Vienna, but have no permits, why did they decide to not offer permits?

[00:17:08] and then how do they do enforcement? Because to me, that's a really critical question here. If you're going to have a community go through this process, which is, I think, a tool that we have that the General Assembly has given us that we should offer communities that source of relief, they're going to have some expectation that that means something.

[00:17:28] And how it disrupts their own lives, I think, is something we're going to have to sort out. So I'd be interested in hearing why these jurisdictions have term restrictions but do not have permits and what that means for their enforcement mechanisms. And then the last question that I have is on the vendor cost piece.

[00:17:47] First, I appreciate that DTA has come forward with a solution. I think when we last met on this, it was kind of a mess in terms of how much it was going to cost to implement something like this, and

from a people power standpoint, it's great. If others are administering the program, I would just say whatever fee we might charge for this program that it be as you have suggested in this presentation highly consistent with what is being charged for similar programs in other jurisdictions the only downside of having an outside vendor is making sure that we can control their cost so they're not gouging

[00:18:23] you know our constituents and doing this in a fair way so that's just the only comment that i would make about that but i still i think the program is presented uh is much better than what we saw before. I think this is an instance where the General Assembly gave us authority. We asked for that. We probably should use it, but I do have concerns about making sure we understand what that means from an enforcement standpoint, because what I don't want to do is put in place a program and then have our constituents angry that the program isn't working and we don't have the people power to be able to do the enforcement that's necessary. So that's my outstanding piece

[00:19:01] that I'd like to get a little more clarity on before we would take action on this. Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Alcorn. Thank you. So, yeah, this is definitely an improvement. Appreciate the work that's been done on this.

[00:19:18] A couple issues. One, on the enforcement, I know one of the other things that we spoke about briefly, I believe, at the last meeting was, I know we can't do this in Virginia yet, But looking at possible options for automated traffic enforcement and what those might be.

[00:19:37] I think coming back, if we're going to get additional information, this vendor that does the permitting, that's fantastic. But I'd be interested to know if somewhere somebody might be using some sort of automated traffic enforcement.

[00:19:53] And maybe you have that in me. Supervisor Alcorn, I am unaware that any other jurisdictions are using automated enforcement for this type of program. However, the vendor that we are discussing permit administration with, they also offer an automated enforcement type of system that could be implemented with a fixed camera that would be installed at the turn restriction sign.

[00:20:26] It would scan every tag that passes by and looking for tags that are not in the system with a permit. If it has a permit, it says, you're okay. It doesn't have a permit, it says, nope, you're not okay. And this is the same vendor that currently offers the, or that fulfills the cameras at school zones and also on bus arms.

[00:20:55] We've had the county attorney look into whether we currently have the authority to enforce the program in that manner. And there would be, we would need to seek some additional authority from the state in order to do that.

[00:21:12] However, if the board were interested in this program being an automated enforcement type of situation, there is the option there through the vendor to set something up, provided that we sought additional authority.

[00:21:30] And that would incur some upfront costs for the cameras and installation and such. Okay, thank you. That's very helpful. I'm not sure we would jump immediately into automated traffic enforcement, but technology is an amazing thing.

[00:21:48] So clearly there might be some options here for us at some point. So thank you very much. That's helpful, and maybe that's something in a future legislative program. I don't know. Who knows? The

other question I have really gets to the overall challenge that we have in some of our neighborhoods, the reason why these cut-through restrictions are there.

[00:22:09] My understanding is, and I experienced this in Hunter Mill in a particular situation, where VDOT is trying to implement a policy of connecting neighborhoods in more than one connection to either primary roads or basically just connecting outside of the neighborhoods.

[00:22:34] We have a number of neighborhoods in Fairfax County. There's only one way in or out. but we've run into situations where VDOT has basically pushed little infill developments to create road connections that are not in our comprehensive plan.

[00:22:53] Frankly, were never intended to be cut-throughs. And I know this is something my office has been looking into, had some initial conversations with some folks at VDOT. Mr. Steverson, I don't know if you have or if anyone else has any additional, Because this is clearly we want to head off situations where we're being asked to implement programs like this.

[00:23:17] What is the status of that policy? Good morning. Greg Steverson, acting director of FCDOT. I think what we really have to kind of work through on this is just getting VDOT to understand, number one, that this isn't a full-time, all-day situation, first and foremost.

[00:23:37] They are very big on connectivity and we understand that but I think this is less of a Situation where there would be no connection at all and more of a time of day situation where things can't can or can't happen And so I think it's just more about getting them on board with the understanding of what this really represents They're already on board with the concept of cut through restrictions Maybe not everywhere, but they're already familiar with the concept of cut-through restrictions.

[00:24:08] In the end, really, this is just about giving the opportunity for those who live there to be able to make that turn outside of that time frame. Okay. Yeah, thank you, Mr. T. I know that's the issue in front of us here, but just for the board's awareness, we're looking at a policy where VDOT is actively trying to make additional connections to neighborhoods that were never planned to be that way.

[00:24:35] So, anyway, that might be a future topic for discussion, but thank you. Supervisor Wachachow. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Really appreciate the interagency work that took place here.

[00:24:51] this kind of thing that I always fear, you know, doesn't happen. So thank you all for having that conversation and finding a better solution. And thank you to Supervisor Beerman for bringing this back. You know, I think we should move forward. The one kind of cautionary note I have, and maybe it's for the 10 of us more than for staff, to the extent that this permit program makes cut-through permits more appealing to communities, right?

[00:25:24] Because there are communities who look at it and say, well, if it applies to us, we don't want to move forward. I think we want to avoid a huge proliferation of cut-through restrictions across the county because, quite frankly, the enforcement is going to be a huge challenge.

[00:25:42] And if we have 100 of these, we're going to have 97 calls a month to PD saying, I just saw someone who's not my neighbor cutting through, and we're just not going to be able to keep up with that. So I think it's incumbent upon all of us to be discerning about moving forward with these.

[00:26:02] Just, you know, the chairman asked a question about a couple of them that are on hold. One of them that's in Braddock that's on hold, I think is, I hope, indefinitely on hold because the issue was

addressed with a spot improvement at the intersection that kind of cleared up the traffic flow and reduced the number of people cutting through.

[00:26:22] And that's probably, although more expensive, a better solution because it's addressing the cause, not just the effect of the cut through traffic. So I think we've got to try whenever possible to focus on those kind of solutions rather than proliferation of cut-through restrictions and permits.

[00:26:42] That will be very difficult to enforce. Thank you. I appreciate that comment and making sure that we, you know, right-size or size the improvement for what the situation is. And I think that's going to be very important to make sure that we understand what really constitutes a cut-through issue.

[00:27:00] And I think that's something that the team is always very cognizant of and that we try and be very careful about is to make sure that what we are fixing with a cut-through restriction is truly a cut-through issue. And so I really appreciate that statement, and I think it's something that we definitely should make sure that we keep track of.

[00:27:20] Supervisor Jimenez? Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for your presentation. You know, my questions were kind of answered. They had to do with enforcement that Mr. Chairman McKay asked right at the top. I think that's on everyone's mind is how can we enforce, right?

[00:27:38] And how much police effort can go into something like this? It could be very time-consuming. So we want to make sure that your time is spent wisely and everyone's time is spent wisely. But as the chairman mentioned, with the state having given us this authority, we also don't want to just push it aside going forward and looking at the June meeting when you'll have numbers from the estimates of the mailers, et cetera.

[00:28:07] A couple of quick questions. One, you said it would approximately be $9,000 a year in revenue. Where would that go? It's our understanding that the revenue will go into the county's general fund.

[00:28:23] Okay. You know, just an idea out here. It might be great to try to steer that money toward pedestrian safety issues in the county. Obviously, that's something that impacts all of our districts, especially Mason District. So just a thought out there on that.

[00:28:41] But looking forward to the numbers that come back in June and looking forward to your presentation then. So thank you for working collaboratively and looking forward to seeing what's next. Thank you. Thank you. Seeing no more questions, just a few questions about the other jurisdictions.

[00:29:00] So in Fairfax City, it says the city has six restrictions in commercial areas that they do not offer permits. So that just means that nobody can break a cut-through restriction, correct? That's correct. And in the town of Vienna, there were five existing restrictions, but they've decided they're not implementing any more restrictions.

[00:29:21] and it's still the same that you can't break the restriction that's correct no motorists are allowed to to access the restricted street during the restricted times is our understanding from the city even the local residents are not allowed to break the restriction that's our understanding yes so okay so though chairman mckay knows some who do sometimes yes um okay got it got it so um and in the town. Yeah. So I guess I'll just offer a comment. If the restriction's there and it says

[00:29:57] do not enter three to seven, my feeling is that even without a ton of enforcement, a lot of people do follow the law. They do follow a speed limit. They do follow these things. If you send somebody

out once a month, that would obviously help you. The question here is whether or not you have a permit that would allow certain people in that neighborhood to basically go through. And if the police officer's there and they can see the permit on the car, they go, okay. If they don't see the permit and then they pull over the person who's broken the restriction. In my view, enforcement is

[00:30:35] not as big a challenge in my view, because the fact of the matter is if they've got the permit on their car. The officer will likely see that. Or more likely, if the police officer is sitting there, the person who lives in the neighborhood will drive up, roll down the window and say, hey, just go into my house over there. I still think that even if there were no officer to come by ever, this would still help with cut-through traffic because a lot of people just don't want to drive the wrong way on a one-way street. And that's basically what a cut-through is.

[00:31:10] And I also think that these issues are issues that we have with the existing program anyway. We already have cut-through restrictions. And obviously, like in the town of Vienna, we have people who break those cut-through restrictions. This would allow them to be breaking the cut-through restriction but not actually breaking the law, which would be better for local residents.

[00:31:30] So I think it's an improvement. But I also hear what Supervisor Walkinshaw is saying, that we don't necessarily want a world in which there are hundreds of these neighborhoods. I just think that in order to do, we need to see how this goes and then decide whether or not there need to be added restrictions to when you get a cut through sticker.

[00:31:51] I had someone, Mr. Thompson, who may or may not may have left, walk up to me right before this meeting and go, how can I get this in my neighborhood in Hunter Mill? so he'll be calling. So I think this really would be helpful to a lot of neighborhoods and a lot of residents. With that, we're only seven minutes behind schedule in my first meeting, so I'm going to thank everybody up there and especially thank you for working, as Supervisor Walkinshaw said, across county departments, Department of Tax Administration working with FCDOT. That's

[00:32:29] exactly how this should work and thank you very much for all of your work so um with that we'll move on to the next uh topic of uh business which is uh for 495 next uh coordination um with miss coelho and while uh martha's coming up i'll just sort of tee it up a little bit uh obviously the 495 next project is one that uh we've had our eye on and continue to have our eye on in terms of how things will work in connectivity with Maryland, how the project will work, and how we coordinate with the project.

[00:33:06] Martha and her team do a lot of the liaising between FCDOT or the county and VDOT on this project, and I know there were some concerns just about how VDOT is handling this. We were at the last meeting, and there were a lot of discussions about how Mega Projects was working on that, so Martha's here to kind of talk us through a little bit of our coordination aspects and how we tackle those things. Good morning. Martha Kowal for Rex County Department of Transportation. So yes, this presentation is directly related to the January

[00:33:42] 23rd board matter, and that board matter had two major elements. First, for staff to draft a letter requesting that VDOT address not only our previous letter, but also concerns related to coordination, to proposed ramps, as well as deforestation concerns that have been brought up. The second element of that board matter also requested that staff present a plan for future coordination with VDOT and MDOT, and in particular, work on the coordination of environmental concerns, again, related to that

deforestation. So to touch that first item, the letter is in your package for review, so please, you know, take a look at that when you have the opportunity.

[00:34:21] But just to highlight what that letter includes, first and foremost, it is requesting a response through a letter from September 2023. And as a reminder, that letter requested that if there's work happening, an agreement is made between Maryland and Virginia for work that will happen on the Virginia side in Fairfax, that Fairfax County have an opportunity to review and comment on the design and construction elements prior to that agreement's finalization.

[00:34:45] This current letter also recommends a proactive approach to coordination with Maryland and engagement with Fairfax County stakeholders. As we know, there have been some changes in Maryland's project delivery method that have the potential for increased delay for improvements on the Maryland side.

[00:35:02] That also highlights some concerns that we have regarding future traffic conditions in the interim. The letter also requests additional collaboration with staff on the revegetation plan. And not only that, but that any revegetation plan also includes some coordination with the community and outreach to the community. Lastly, it does address the existing efforts between Fairfax County and VDOT to handle some of the cut-through traffic concerns that have also come up to handle that second element of the board matter i want to provide a little bit of a primer on what existing coordination we do have with bdot on 495 next first we do have two monthly meetings

[00:35:42] one meeting one monthly meeting is specifically for project updates we do request updates on the maryland on their discussions with maryland we discuss any ongoing potential design reviews that would be coming to the county we also talk about outreach efforts at that meeting we include the park authority in that meeting as well because of the impacts of scots run nature preserve and the potential work happening for a new kind of parking area that has been already discussed with the park authority with this project we also follow up on concerns related to wastewater or storm water as

[00:36:17] they come up with design reviews as well we have a second monthly meeting that also focuses totally on communications. We use that to discuss any upcoming notifications that are needed for construction work, as well as follow up on any inquiries that we've received, and we coordinate with VEDON any public meetings that they may plan on attending. We use that opportunity to also highlight what elements or what messages need to be amplified to the community in our own social media. You can see on that slide there are a few examples where we've used Facebook, for example, to highlight some changes that will be important for the community to understand. In addition to

[00:36:53] those monthly standing meetings we also have technical meetings as needed these are items that we have noticed things in the field whether it be maintenance of traffic concerns pedestrian issues related to the design and items that vdot may want county feedback on vdot also coordinates with national park service on the construction work ongoing construction work at the george washington memorial parkway fairfax county attends that as well to hear any updates and fairfax county dot staff also attends any meetings that vdot may have with the public that we're made aware of. In terms of review of plans, we've been coordinating with multiple county agencies

[00:37:29] since the environmental analysis. And particularly from an environmental perspective, we continue to go to the Department of Planning and Development and Public Works and Environmental Services to get any comments on designs that we receive related to environmental elements. So just

moving forward in terms of how we can coordinate further on this project, VDOT does have regular meetings with Maryland. We can request the attendance at those meetings. Additionally, you know, we can have a staff further follow-up, since we're having these regular meetings with VDOT, further follow-up with board office staff to kind of give them our perspective and what we're hearing from VDOT. And

[00:38:09] also we recommend, and it's something we've done with other projects, is requesting that VDOT provide direct and regular briefings to both the Drainsville office as well as the Providence District offices, particularly since they're most affected by this project. In terms of coordination on the vegetation plan, we will continue to press for a detailed and comprehensive plan. In addition to the other agencies that we mentioned that we typically reach out to, we will also request specifically comments from urban forestry to help collaborate on comments and work with VDOT on that.

[00:38:41] And that's also kind of addressed in our letter as well, the request that they work closely with staff and address these comments from this variety of agencies that we will have looking at the plan. So with that, we hope to continue this collaboration with VDOT to try respond to these comments and come up with a very detailed plan.

[00:38:58] So with that, the request for feedback here is really, obviously, we have the letter for your review. We'd appreciate any comments that you have by February 29th. And in addition to that, any further guidance that you may have on coordination of these environmental elements or additional coordination with VDOT, we'd also appreciate.

[00:39:15] So with that, I'll leave it up to any questions that you may have. Similar to before, I'll defer most of my comments until the end, except to say in probably less charitable language than mr chairman has to say i just think it's absolutely ridiculous that we would send a letter to the secretary of transportation in september and we're sitting here in february and never got a response it's just absurd so with that mr chairman uh thank you supervisor bierman and i uh have already reviewed this draft and and approved it obviously

[00:39:51] I'm open to changes, but my approach to that same anger is demonstrated maybe less abrasively, but I said today we've inexplicably not received a response, which to me is sending a message, which is not that we just didn't get a response, but you haven't even given us an explanation why there's not a response, which I think expresses the frustration of this board.

[00:40:16] I would just say a couple things. One, we have to invite ourselves to those Maryland VDOT meetings, impose ourselves on that. And so I think if we want to put in this letter that we are requesting the schedule so that our staff can attend those meetings, that's a change I'm open to.

[00:40:33] Not asking if we can, but saying we'd like the schedule so that we can attend. Secondly, on the environmental pieces, I am concerned about the timeliness. We've spoken in here about asking them to do things, but we really haven't given any timeline.

[00:40:51] So I'm not sure if we want to use terms like immediately schedule a meeting with us to discuss this instead of just coordinate with county staff to explore. I just want to put a sense of urgency in terms of the timeliness. and maybe the instrument is to ask them to set up a meeting immediately with our staff to go over the details of this or come give the Board of Supervisors a briefing.

[00:41:17] Sometimes that is what is necessary to get attention. I would be okay with that suggestion on the comments about the second piece there, which is further guidance on the revegetation plans. But I do

appreciate how quickly staff put together the letter. I'm comfortable with the language in there, but I do think we need to crank it up a little bit on the two items that I just mentioned.

[00:41:41] Supervisor Lusk. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm fully supportive of the letter, and thank you for the content. The question I have is that thinking about the Southside Express study that we're currently under review with as well, I think there are going to be some similar issues that we're going to encounter.

[00:42:01] So I guess I'm not saying we're going to discuss those issues in this letter, but I think we might have to take a similar approach because I'm worried about some of the concerns that have been raised by the community already, which we know we're going to need some answers and responses to.

[00:42:17] I know that the anticipated schedule is that they'll be coming back with community meetings in the spring. But I'm just putting the board here on notice that we might have to take a similar approach as we deal with the issues and the concerns that are going to be attended there as well. So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[00:42:34] Yes, and I'll also say, you know, I think we can certainly take these lessons learned and be a little bit more at the front end, bring to light these concerns we have with the amount of clearing that may occur. Obviously, for 495 South, we're waiting on more of the concept to come through to really understand what the right-of-way impacts are.

[00:42:53] But I think, you know, we can certainly highlight, you know, our expectations in terms of working with us on where clearing will occur and what our expectations are in terms of re-vegetating those areas in the future. Yeah, and if I can, Mr. Chairman, just making one other point here, additionally, we might need to think about the impacts on the local streets as it connects with the improvements that would be made, and then really this point that you just made about the impacts that will be made as a result of the right-of-way that will need to be dedicated.

[00:43:27] We have a number of SSPA nominations that are still in process. They need to understand what those impacts are in order for us to move forward. So there's a bit of moving parts that we're going to have to coordinate. And then last, sorry, thinking about the Maryland piece, understanding what the timing is for the improvements that would be made along the Maryland side is also pivotal and important.

[00:43:51] Because right now, I don't think we have a clear and definitive answer as it relates to that as well. So thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Lask. Questions or comments from anyone else?

[00:44:09] Well, if the letter wants to go even stronger, Mr. Chairman, please do make it even stronger. I want to thank FCDOT for getting this letter together and for informing us about the work that you have been doing.

[00:44:27] I think it's really important to continue pressing the issue, to get as much in writing as often as possible, to not take no for an answer on some of the things like reforestation plans. You know, when we met with VDOT, there was sort of a sense of, well, it's too early to even think about that.

[00:44:46] I think the community is demanding that we think about that. I also just wanted to update the committee that when we met with VDOT, they did suggest that there would be community meetings in early April. I suggested that they happen sooner.

[00:45:03] It's unclear whether we can get them to happen sooner. But I also would want to urge people not just in the surrounding community, although obviously the surrounding community to this project will

come out, but people downstream. And actually, that's why I asked that the Providence District Supervisor be included in regular meetings, because, frankly, Supervisor Palchuk had said people in my district really want this project to be completed as fast as possible.

[00:45:29] And I think, frankly, in my district as well, they want it to be completed as fast as possible so we can get back to replanting trees, to having a pedestrian walkway that gets you from Scott's Run Park across the bridge over to near Georgetown Pike, to having all of those promised improvements that we haven't seen yet.

[00:45:51] And I think it's a very challenging situation with Maryland. They are not playing ball. And the fact that they aren't playing ball has reduced the effectiveness of this program considerably.

[00:46:08] Even if you think that the hot lanes and that the express lanes are going to help traffic, there's no situation in which they help traffic as much as they could if there were also traffic lanes on the other side of the bridge. So continuing to press Maryland is important, and continuing to engage the community is important.

[00:46:29] I'm very happy with this letter. I'm very happy to know that we are engaging in those meetings. Please continue and please keep us, you know, abreast of any developments and continue to press hard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[00:46:45] We'll make a couple edits to the letter based on today's conversation, but we want to try to get this out in the next day or two if we can. Thank you. Thank you. Moving on to the last portion of our meeting today, which is an update on the Fairfax County bicycle parking guidelines.

[00:47:08] And now we're even ahead of schedule. So good work. Thank you. And while everybody's coming to the table, obviously bike parking is an important aspect of our active transportation infrastructure. There's been some discussion with respect to Parking Reimagined that gave a little bit of information about bike parking.

[00:47:31] But this presentation is going to talk a little bit further about some of the things that we're looking to do to talk a little bit more about the specifics of bike parking, what it looks like, you know, how many spaces are needed, things of that nature, and go into a little bit more detail so that we can complement some of the things that are going on with Parking Reimagined.

[00:47:49] So with that, I will turn it over to Nicole. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. My name is Nicole Winans. I'm an active transportation planner with Fairfax County Department of Transportation. I'm happy to present a briefing on the update of the bicycle parking guidelines, as Greg already introduced.

[00:48:12] So let me jump right in. So Ferris County has had bicycle parking guidelines since 2014. That came out of the Bicycle Master Plan project that was adopted around that time frame as well.

[00:48:29] And that guide recommended bike parking rates as well as provided detailed design guidance for bicycle parking And it was mostly applied to public facilities, but also entitlement developments and has been very successful.

[00:48:49] But in 2020, the county did see the need to add this, what was previously a standalone document, to the public facilities manual by reference. So that happened as part of the phase two update of the PFM.

[00:49:06] And it was also meant to further boost implementation. And in 2023, as you're all aware, Parking Reimagine updated and amended the zoning ordinance to add bike parking requirements.

[00:49:22] That was the first time that was actually now less voluntary and more requirement to really provide those parking facilities for bicyclists. And also included a requirement to comply with the bicycle parking guidelines in the PFM.

[00:49:42] So why is an update of those bicycle parking guidelines needed at this time? So Parking Reimagined amended the zoning ordinance and established how many bike parking spaces are required and included basic requirements for those bike parking spaces as well as a very general location.

[00:50:07] However, the requirements that were created in 2023 do not match the requirements that were included in the original bike parking guidelines, so they're no longer in sync with each other.

[00:50:20] So in addition to that, the zoning ordinance does not provide a lot of the detailed design requirements, particularly how many short-term or visitor parking spaces are required versus long-term or secure bike parking spaces due to the county not having state-enabling legislation to include that in the zoning ordinance.

[00:50:48] and the same is true for the detailed design guidance that is more appropriate to have in the PFM and not the zoning ordinance. Other specific details that are in the bike parking guidelines but not in the zoning ordinance are information about the siding, wayfinding to those parking facilities, rec spacing, the bike room layout, and security needs for secure facilities. The updated bike parking guidelines will provide additional guidance on bike parking design and requirements

[00:51:26] and signage. So that includes what bike racks are acceptable, what size the bike parking spaces should have, and that includes regular bikes, but also cargo bikes that are a little bit bigger, the rack spacing between the racks, but also to obstacles like walls, then bike parking signage, what signage is appropriate, and then the way finding signage to those facilities.

[00:51:53] The updated guidelines will also provide guidance on the design of short-term and long-term bicycle parking facilities, as I discussed. But first, let me just define what short- and long-term facilities are. So short-term design facilities are meant to support the need of these short trips, going to the store, visiting a friend, parking your bike for two, three hours at a time, is a very different need than a long-term facility that is for residents and multifamily buildings that need to store their bike somewhere overnight when they're not using it, or for an

[00:52:32] employee that goes to work and has to park their bike for multiple hours, eight hours or so during the day, as well as transit facilities where folks may want to bike to the transit facility and park their bike there securely. So for short-term bicycle parking facilities, the guidelines will provide details and best practices on where those should be located and the access route to those facilities, the rec types and spacing, markings that are associated with bike parking, as well as the maintenance of those facilities, and also reference the area-specific design guidelines. So

[00:53:10] some of our activity centers have branded bike racks. Some of Tyson's and McLean have a specific aesthetic to the bike rack. And these are referenced in this guidelines. For long-term bike parking facilities, the guidelines will provide guidance about best practices on what type of facilities could fulfill this need. For example, bike rooms inside a building or a bicycle cage or bicycle locker that are freestanding outside the building. Again,

[00:53:45] where are those ideally located and the access routes to those facilities what rack types are appropriate for a long-term facility e-charging so a bike bikes are becoming more and more popular with the electric charging electric assist as well as e-scooters so having outlets available and where to put those and how many would be included in this guide rack spacing and room layout as well as access control and security measures. And then additional recommendations,

[00:54:21] also not requirements, but optional enhancements such as benches, bike tools, and so on. But most importantly, additional guidance is needed on the ratio between the short and long-term parking because it's crucial to understand that the needs for short and long-term bike parking differ by land use. For example, in a residential setting, the need is greater for long-term storage because the residents need to put their bike somewhere when they're not using it, but still need a little bit of visitor parking near the entrance. So a ratio here would, for example, be 10% short-term

[00:54:59] parking and 90% long-term parking. On the opposite, the retail land use has a very different need. They primarily need to support short-term parking for the customers that arrive to go shopping or eat at the restaurant and a few spaces that are secure for the employees so in that case you would have a 90% short-term parking versus 10% long-term parking so the next steps for this project is to distribute the draft guidelines to the board offices for review we're aiming for mid-february

[00:55:33] and then we will welcome your feedback and any comments you may have update the guide and then bring it out to the public for review by late March and you're going to take that feedback make updates and then bring it to the full board for endorsement in late spring or summer this year so the questions we have for you today feedback we would appreciate is in general the need for the update of the bicycle parking guidelines if you have any comments any questions on that as well if you have additional issues you would like us to include in the bike parking

[00:56:11] guidelines before we we get them to you later on this year. So with that I open it up for discussions. Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman. Thank you. Good presentation. I would just say it is mid-February so I'm assuming in the next day or two we're gonna get these guidelines. Kind of hard to comment on them because I don't I don't have them. We definitely need them. I would just ask that this is outside of the realm of what we're looking at here in terms of guidelines. But the only concern that I have, and this is not exclusive to this issue, but obviously

[00:56:49] when new developments come in, we're going to be working with the applicant to adhere to these new guidelines. But we've got a ton of commercial residential properties all over the county that aren't going to be coming through our process that currently do not have bicycle facilities at all.

[00:57:07] And if you ride around this county, you can see examples of where people's bikes are locked to chain link fences in the loading dock of shopping centers, things of that nature. So I'm just wondering if we're evaluating where we can see with our own vision today where the need for these facilities are, where you might have a property owner or property manager completely aloof to considering putting those amenities in place and what we can be doing to encourage people across the county to understand our guidelines and to self-implement them on a case-by-case basis, especially where we've identified that

[00:57:45] there's a demand absent having to come through our land use process and being told to do it. And so it's a little bit outside of the realm of what you're working on, but I think it's a question for DOT from an operational standpoint, how we take these guidelines and encourage them across the county, but

most importantly, how we target areas of the county right now where we know there's a need for bicycle facilities and they don't exist.

[00:58:10] And some of that might be as simple as reaching out to the property owner and saying, hey, take a look at this. Why aren't we doing this, especially for retail shopping centers where these are their customers coming in. And so I would just ask us to consider that operationally as a part of this process.

[00:58:26] But I will withhold comments on the guidelines until we get them. I do think we need them updated, as you've clearly made the case for that. Real quick, and I'll jump in. I know on one of the slides, I think it also had community stuff in early March.

[00:58:42] i think we want to do that a little bit later because we're exactly but yes we'll definitely get you um the guidelines and to your point i do think you know the best first step in trying to get people to understand what is needed is for all of us to understand what is needed and let them know hey this is how we're planning on doing uh bike parking in this county this is how we're planning on looking at short term and long term and then talking to them and saying i know your customers are looking for bike parking this is how from our perspective we think it makes sense

[00:59:18] talk to them about whether they are willing to provide it and if not you know maybe that's something that we all look at is that something that we can do from our end but i do think the very first step is for us to kind of make it in our heart of hearts uh the the understanding the goal that this is what we're looking for from a bike parking perspective but i do i 100% agree with you and hear you on that thank you as somebody who sits on the end i'm going to go from the middle out so we can so james first supervisor walkinshaw that's a good that's a good policy

[00:59:50] all right he loves that yeah um i agree with everything chairman mckay said obviously we do need to move move forward i guess a couple of questions that i have um and and maybe they're kind of general questions about about the pfm maybe less questions i have but questions that will come up in the public maybe. So the ratio, just as an example, the ratio that you have on the slide for retail 90-10, what would be the process if a property owner or developer said,

[01:00:27] hey, look, based on the kind of retail we have here or the context of the location, actually we think 80-20 is the right number for us or 85-15. Can you talk through the process to address that kind of potential discrepancy between maybe the guidelines and what a property owner developer believes makes sense for their customers and someone who's going to be visiting their site? I suppose a walking shot, that's a great question. So the zoning ordinance now requires

[01:01:01] to follow the guidance in the PFM. So if the PFM has a 90-10 ratio, it's always possible to go beyond that so as long as the minimum uh requirements are met so the number of spaces within the 90 10 ratio but they would like to provide additional short-term parking for their specific needs they're always welcome to do that and and that happens actually quite frequently that a developer um has uh proposes a need for additional parking to basically over park for bikes which is of course something we would love to see um and support them in that so it's not

[01:01:39] actually the ratio that's operative it's the raw numbers within the ratio correct so that is what the zoning ordinance requires and it's based on the amount of car vehicle or parking that is required so the number is set and there's very little wiggle room to go below that but then the ratio would would allow

them to shift the parking the type of parking where they it's located on the property, and if their need differs, there's always some flexibility as long

[01:02:13] as the minimums are met. Okay, and then second question, and maybe this will be, this will come out when we see the draft of the guidelines, but have you thought through potential for conflict between the bicycle parking guidelines and just, for example, the parking lot landscaping elements of parking reimagined.

[01:02:37] So you could envision a scenario, I think, where those, you know, you have to make some tough choices in terms of what, you know, are we going to locate the bicycle parking in front of the building and take away from the potential parking lot landscaping that we hope to achieve with parking reimagined?

[01:02:55] Yeah, that's also a good question. So particularly the visitor parking, which I think would be the most area of conflict considering where it's supposed to be located in a convenient location near the main entrance, it's often integrated into the landscaping.

[01:03:11] And the guide will also talk about imperfect surface for that parking. So unlike a car parking space that has a lot of weight, there's a little more design flexibility to really integrate a bike parking rack within the landscaping.

[01:03:26] as long as you have the required vertical clearances to be able to use a bike rack. So what we want to avoid is having an overgrown bike rack that nobody uses, but there are definitely ways, similar to a bench, for example, that you would like to integrate within the landscaping panel.

[01:03:45] Thank you. We'll go to Supervisor Jimenez next, bouncing around just for fun. Thank you, Chairman, and thank you for this. One quick question you mentioned, and I think it's great that you're thinking through this electronic or electric bikes, because they're obviously becoming more and more of a thing, and so it's good that we're kind of thinking through ahead. How would you all measure how many cords you would need for each station? How does that work? Like, is it one cord or is it two?

[01:04:18] It depends how many. Like, how do you estimate how many electric bikes would be coming in per station, depending on where they're at? So that would be similar treated as a percentage. So 10% of the provided bike parking would need to have charging capabilities, and that's one outlet per bike rack.

[01:04:40] And bike parking, the charging for an e-bike doesn't require a cord that's already there. So unlike a vehicle or e-charging port where you plug in an existing cord, the bike usually comes with a cord and it plugs into a regular outdoor outlet.

[01:05:02] So it's not a highly specialized charging procedure. And a lot of bike racks now come with integrated outlets. Okay, so it's more about an outlet than it is about providing the cord. Right, yes. Thank you. Supervisor Luss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[01:05:17] I just want to be supportive of the bicycle guidelines, and I'll make a point that there are a couple of pretty aggressive bicyclists in my community, and one of the things they do remind me of is that as they're getting to the destination, there's no place for them to, you know, put their bike and lock it and protect it.

[01:05:36] So this is vitally important. Going to the point that the chairman made with the existing businesses, if you're going to a shopping center that's been there for 30 years, there probably aren't any facilities. So we do have to figure out how do we, you know, get those programmed and available.

[01:05:53] And I'll just say, you know, to the point that was just made by Supervisor Jimenez, I smiled when you mentioned the e-bike because I wasn't even thinking about that. I mean, just in my head, it's like, wow, you do need to have the ability to charge those bikes as well. So thank you for what you're proposing.

[01:06:10] We'll look forward to seeing the details and in support of the work. So thank you. Supervisor Alcorn. Thank you. So just confirming, these are guidelines that are intended for individually-owned bicycles, not fleets, right?

[01:06:26] So we're not talking about capital bike share. Is there going to be any overlap with how those designs, because we do have those, too? So great question. So the need for capital bike share station siding are slightly different.

[01:06:47] First of all, the stations themselves are very large, but they also require solar, and they need to be installed by a truck. So they have all these additional requirements logistically to function that a traditional bike rack doesn't have.

[01:07:04] It's really just like a little rack that needs to be securely fastened to the ground, needs to be visible, and a convenient location and space so that you can actually use it. So there's some need in, okay, this needs to be something that's visible to the public, so it gets usage, but it's a little bit more complex for Capital Bike Share.

[01:07:26] However, I would like to mention the e-bikes that are now coming with Capital Bike Share can be locked to bike racks, so they don't always have to be returned to the bike share station. They can also be locked to regular bike racks. So having more of those particular locations within the bike share system where they're allowed to be used in Fairfax County, having more wrecks that are secure and convenient to use will also favorably improve the use of capital bike share.

[01:07:54] Okay, great. And my other question relates to, thank you for mentioning the design guidelines in Tyson's McLean. Reston also has those, and there is a fair amount of guidance in those design guidelines.

[01:08:10] I know there is in the Reston one at least. Are you seeing differences across the different area guidelines as it relates specifically to bicycle parking that need to be resolved? Because the first point in the design guidelines for Reston as it relates to bicycle parking is basically see the Fairfax County bicycle parking guidelines.

[01:08:37] So it seems like there needs to be some sort of normalizing across these different area guidelines. Are you seeing any conflicts or discrepancies across them? Because I'm not as familiar with the other ones. So a great question.

[01:08:54] The guidelines, if they are named by name, it shouldn't be a problem. It's just an update of the guidelines. If they refer to the 2014 version, that would need to be an update. So the public facilities manual, for example, only refers to the guide by names.

[01:09:12] So there's no amendment of the public facilities manual needed because of how that was done. So we would need to go through the specific special area plans to see if there's any updates that are needed. If not, that would be great.

[01:09:28] And most of the design requirements or guidance that are area-specific, how those racks are designed themselves has not changed. So that design has been pretty consistent over the past 15 years, so I'm not too concerned that those no longer match.

[01:09:51] It's maybe the spacing we have to look at, so we will take a look, and it's a very good point once they adopt that we can need to see what additional work is needed. Okay, very good. Thank you. Supervisor Stort. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Several questions. First off, I know we have a number of abandoned bikes that can be not only some of the services that are out there, the scooters, et cetera, but I see them in other areas.

[01:10:21] Do we have, is this policy going to address that in any way? Is there already a standard policy that says if a bike is in a particular location for more than X amount of time, then it can be considered abandoned and then removed by whomever, whatever? So we have an existing process for the publicly owned bicycle parking facilities, and we do tag those bikes for the special tax for two weeks.

[01:10:51] If they're not removed, we have the authority in coordination with FCPD to remove those bikes, and we have to hold them for a couple months to see if anyone claims them, and then they will be donated or disposed of, depending on conditions.

[01:11:08] So there is an existing process already and expected? Okay. Secondly, one of the things that I've been a regular rider of my bike to my office, one of the things it doesn't have is any kind of protection from the elements during the, you know, 8 to 7 or 8 or whatever it is.

[01:11:31] Do we have any accommodations for that, that there would be some protective? and i realized not the structures necessarily that we're in here but maybe more individualized something that could be pulled over the bike that would protect it is that included in or do we have any kind of design guidance or whatever that we would include as part of this so we don't have in the in the parking guidance because that's an individual need so you're referring to maybe a cover of your own bike well having as part of our standard we'd have x number of bicycle stations

[01:12:10] that would be uncovered and then a few that would be covered that would give at least some choice for the rider when they park at a location yeah so so covering the the visitor bike parking um is a recommendation but it's it's still optional it's not that's that's far more expensive than i'm thinking because you're talking about a canopy etc and that's i know tens of thousands of dollars. Probably just to think about it, it's $10,000. How about anything that's more individualized that we could offer, would have, that would be able to address that in a less

[01:12:46] comprehensive way, but still provide some options on a first-come, first-served basis? Yeah, that's a very good suggestion, so we can look at those opportunities. That's why it's also important to have the long-term parking and ideally make it available for visitors as well, because there are also some folks that have very expensive bikes that may be interested in having it in a more secure location even for a short amount of time.

[01:13:13] So, for example, providing bike lockers as an optional visitor parking instead of just a long-term that's maybe more convenient for employees or residents, that would be an approach. But it's definitely the guide is talking about the benefits of having covered visitor parking as well to protect it from the elements because it is a barrier.

[01:13:37] That's what I'm advocating. I know Metro has that in some of their locations, the ability to do that. And there is a security enhancement to that for individuals who own, obviously, very expensive bikes. So I would urge that to be part of this.

[01:13:53] And then the last one is I know the City of Alexandria has done some, I would say, more decorative bicycle arrangements and do we have any, is there any kind of mechanism that would encourage that or I mean, in other words, do our standards provide for that or do we, are we prescriptive, too prescriptive or maybe more prescriptive than we need to be about how somebody might approach that?

[01:14:24] So thank you. That's a very good point because bike parking can be used for placemaking. It can be used as public art. There are many examples across the country and also locally of how the actual REC can be designed in very creative ways.

[01:14:40] So it's possible to do that as long as the basic requirements and the zoning ordinance are met. So it needs to still have the security and convenience. But otherwise, there's flexibility in going a little bit out of the box and not just having, you know, the base standard and really making it a feature.

[01:15:04] The risk with that is that sometimes it's no longer recognizable as bike parking. So having additional signage that identifies those racks as bike parking would be helpful, and there's some guidance included in the guide on that. So in your mind, the guidance provides some flexibility for somebody to do that?

[01:15:22] Yes. And if somebody requests more, if they see a public facility and there's inadequate biking, there's our normal process of saying something to somebody and there is a mechanism that you would have, FCDOT would have in place to then look at that, study it, and then make recommendations or get additional parking provided?

[01:15:44] For public facilities, yes, we do have an internal process. We have the ability to add bike parking where it's required. The exception is schools, public schools, have their own process to go through. um but uh everything except schools we would be able to cover um actually the parks also have their own um so they're they also uh have their own process of uh providing bike parking and public parks but outside of those two uh we are happy to review help um with the siting um and we have

[01:16:19] some internal budget to provide some additional recs um when needed so the standards we're talking about we also applied to our park authority parks um because you brought up you just brought up a point i'm sorry i hadn't thought about it but so the park authority have they been engaged with this and have they provided their own responses to what's being proposed here in order for the park authority um and uh schools to um make this a requirement they would need to endorse separately

[01:16:54] um to through their own boards and that is uh the plan that we currently have but first we will go of course through the fairfix county board for endorsement and then work with the other boards to hopefully get their endorsement as well if i might if i might just very quickly on that however our dpw staff meets with them on cip improvement projects and so when those improvements rehabilitations expansions other things come through we're being very upfront with them about what the guidelines are and encouraging them to follow those

[01:17:32] correct so it's not just their board has to adopt a policy that may be true for their day-to-day things but at least when their capital improvements come forward we're insisting to the extent we can that

they include these correct yeah and I was gonna go from the perspective of whether it's a public facility review or something that comes through the process that we all look at then yeah absolutely I think that'd be something that we would request and we would talk to them about okay thank you actually sir well actually so that is the process we do have a CIP review committee so that that's a part and

[01:18:06] parcel of the whole okay any other questions no lots of good points made you guys have your work cut out for you to integrate these guidelines into all of our other guidelines with respect to parking and otherwise, but it's really great to know that we're thinking about this, that we're tackling it.

[01:18:36] Doing this better will have great effects for the county, so thank you for your time and effort on this, and with that, I have nothing else, so I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. I don't need a motion to adjourn, so I'm just going to adjourn.

[01:18:53] Thank you.

