MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee, Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Date	Tuesday, September 16, 2025
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 34m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/3898
- 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 2026-10-29. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:02] Good afternoon everyone. If you could please take your seats. The Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee meeting is called to order. We will go until three o'clock and after that you don't have to go home but you can't stay here. But we are going to try and keep this moving along. So with that I just want does anybody have any issues with the meeting minutes from the June third meeting didn't think there would be um uh so with that why don't we get into our first uh

[00:00:38] agenda item which is a discussion of the i95 uh i-495 south lighting south side express land study and uh ms shropshire the floor is yours thank you all right good afternoon everyone thank you for having me today i have just a brief presentation to give you an update on where we are with the project and talk about just where we are and answer any questions you have at the end. So we'll just jump right in. Just as a overview and reminder, we are

[00:01:12] conducting an EPA study on an 11-mile segment along the 495 Capitol Beltway on the western end, Springfield Interchange on the eastern end will be the Maryland 210 Interchange. We have some of the access points that are highlighted on this slide. We've been working on this study since 2022, so many of you are familiar with this, and it is aligned with the aspirational initiatives that were outlined in the 2045 TPV long-range plan. On our next slide, we just have a little bit of the study background and

[00:01:51] history. As I mentioned, we have been studying this for about three years now. It is a NEPA study being conducted in conjunction with several of our federal, state, and obviously local partners. We identified our purpose and need early on in the study, and some of those needs are highlighted there on the right-hand side of the slide for additional travel choices, relieving congestion, offering travel reliability, improving safety, and extension of that express lanes network.

[00:02:23] Early on in the study, we had identified and presented 10 alternatives. We've conducted various forms of analyses, and we carried forward two build alternatives and the no build alternative in our analysis, and we have a recommended preferred alternative that I'll get to in our next slide, but I think the bottom statement there on the slide before you is one that's very important to remember is that this is a very early step in VDOT's project development and delivery process.

[00:02:56] at the NEPA phase, and we have a lot of important and other detailed analysis that will come later on in the process that will continue to refine the scope of the project. We'll continue to offer analyses, answer questions that have been asked of us. We've been able to answer a lot of questions thus far, but there'll be a lot more process ahead of us, and this has been a process that we've used on all the managed lane projects that we've delivered to date so that we ask you just keep that in mind as I work through the rest of my slides. Next up, we have our recommended preferred

[00:03:34] alternative. This was presented at our June public hearings this year. This is the two express lane in each direction alternative. This would be a buffer separated two express lanes in each direction. It would begin on the western end near the Springfield interchange. It would carry those two express lanes eastward across the Woodrow Wilson Bridge to about the 295 interchange and then we would transition to one express lane in each direction for the remainder of the project

[00:04:08] to the eastern terminal at the Maryland 210 interchange. You can see some of the benefits that are highlighted there on this slide but we'll talk about those more specifically as we move through the slide deck. I will mention and you see at the bottom of the slide we have received concurrence as part of our NEPA process from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA on our recommended preferred alternative as part of our NEPA process. On our next slide I'd like to talk specifically about some of the benefits of our recommended preferred alternative. Specifically

[00:04:48] on this slide, I'm going to highlight some of the results that we've been seeing from our preliminary traffic analysis that we have conducted as part of our NEPA study. We are seeing some substantial benefits for this section of the Capitol Beltway. If we are able to move the project forward and implement the two express lane alternative, we'd be able to move more people with fewer vehicles. I think that's important to highlight. 2,400 more people during the peak hours is what has been developed in our initial traffic analysis, providing those faster,

[00:05:27] reliable trips. If you remember our managed lane networks, three or more occupants in a vehicle travel for free, motorcycles travel for free, as well as bus transit travels for free. So again, moving more people with fewer vehicles. We'll also be able to demonstrate increased travel speeds in the general purpose lanes. That means for those choosing not to travel in the managed lanes, they'll be achieving benefits from the implementation of the project as well.

[00:06:02] You can see some of the statistics from our traffic analysis there. Westbound in that AMP condition, 109% faster travel in the general purpose lanes. And this would be in the 2050, our build year condition and then 53 percent faster in the eastbound pm peak condition which is substantially faster over

that no build condition of 2050. You can also see some other travel times that will be faster both in those local general purpose lanes as well as the through lanes. It is worth noting with the implementation of the project the same number of general purpose

[00:06:39] lanes, both through and local, would remain as are on the 11-mile segment of the Capitol Beltway that exists today. The next couple slides, I'd like to talk about some of the other benefits that would be delivered as part of the project. And these are some of just the initial benefits that we're committing to with the project. I'm sure most of you are familiar with some of the hallmark features that are delivered with the managed lane projects that have been delivered around the northern virginia region that include transit bike and pedestrian these multimodal benefits

[00:07:18] have been delivered with all of the projects such as 66 outside the beltway 495 95 and with this project we have already made a few commitments that we'll talk about for the south side project and as we are able to move forward with our project and move forward with the project development and delivery phases and be able to determine scope and financial feasibility of the project, we would be able to then make determinations on other features that might be able to be delivered with the Southside project as well. But as far as transit, just to talk about some of

[00:07:57] those things that have been delivered with other projects around the region, you can see $5 billion dollars in transit benefits have been already are scheduled to be delivered throughout the concession life cycle with the other projects already delivered in the region and then 178 million dollars in transit funding has been delivered through the commuter choice program and we would anticipate that the 495 south side project would be able to build on to these statistics specifically the south side project we have made a transit commitment for a new bus

[00:08:35] service between central west prince george's county in maryland and tyson's in virginia this was a transit new transit service that was identified and the drpt transit and transportation demand management study that was conducted to complement the nepa study that we're doing

[00:08:57] Again, as we mentioned, we're in the early stages of developing this project, and if it's determined that a public subsidy is not required for the project, then we have committed to pursuing a formal agreement between Virginia and Maryland to memorialize how investments from the project could be prioritized to potentially deliver other transit projects in the future.

[00:09:26] But again, this will be a NEPA commitment that will be included in our environmental assessment. Preservation of space for a future Metro Rail project on the Woodrow-Wilson Bridge has been a topic that's been talked about a lot with the project.

[00:09:44] Everyone is aware that when the Woodrow-Wilson Bridge was rebuilt and opened, there was unoccupied space that still remains there today unoccupied that we'd like to make use of with this project. to be able to relieve the current congestion that is experienced there every single day but still looking with an eye to the future to be able to start building a rider base with bus transit across that bridge now that could ride in the express lanes on those bus transits they would operate free in those lanes and then in the future as you can see in the bottom right hand

[00:10:22] side of the slide the two express lane network could be converted back to a one express lane with that heavy rail there are a couple ways we've talked about at our meetings again how this could be memorialized first in our NEPA document and then also in any of our concession agreements both of

these are legally enforceable the 66 outside the beltway project has some terms that include metro rail expansion and the median of that project so that is an example of how that

[00:10:55] has been handled in the past. Next up is local road impacts and and how that can be handled in the study. I know that's a question that has come up reoccurring throughout the life of the project and our public meetings and many of our stakeholders including yourselves and VDOT agrees that these impacts should be minimized. We've talked about how as part of our detailed process that we've used on a lot of projects. We do an initial traffic analysis during the NEPA phase that focuses on the main line or the interstate corridor itself. And then as we continue to move through the process

[00:11:34] after the NEPA phase, then we do a more detailed traffic analysis that would include the main corridor, 495, and then the arterial streets as well. So that would be the next step in our process. And this detailed traffic would look at those arterial or local roads, and it would ensure that these adjacent roadways or parallel facilities would operate in an acceptable manner would look for ways to mitigate that and if there were any mitigations that needed to be happened those would be handled through a NEPA reevaluation process and documented through that as well

[00:12:10] so that was a you know a commitment to conduct this local road or operational analysis that was talked about at our public meetings and has been talked about by our executive team as well So we wanted to just include that in our remarks today.

[00:12:28] Another hallmark of our projects has been included in many past projects, such as 66 outside the Beltway. We're including it in 495 next that's currently under construction is inclusion of bike and ped accommodations. We presented this again at our June public hearing where we'll have over seven miles of bike and pedestrian facilities that we're committing to with our NEPA document to be included in the project.

[00:12:57] This includes facilities both in Virginia and Maryland, the majority of which would be in Virginia, but there will be some in Maryland as well since the project is slated to have improvements in Maryland. We have been working with the localities in both states about filling in gaps in the current network, and we have presented this, as I mentioned, at our public meetings.

[00:13:23] I would say this is this is a starting point. Again, we have to determine final scope of the project as we move through the process. We have to determine financial feasibility to see what else might be able to be delivered with the project. On our next slide, we just wanted to highlight some of the robust and extensive public engagement that we've conducted over the past three years. We've had several rounds of citizen information meetings as well as public hearing that was conducted in June of this year.

[00:13:55] We received just under 1,000 comments from the public hearings in June, and we have posted that summary report on our webpage for the project, so you can check out that information where we have answered all of those comments according to, I think, about 70 different themes that we received.

[00:14:17] So it's an extensive document highlighting the input we received on the project. And then last, as everyone is aware, we are getting ready to have a vote at the Transportation Planning Board about inclusion of the project in the long-range plan and why is that important for the project.

[00:14:39] And I would just highlight again that it does not mean that it is a vote for us to build the project right away and start moving dirt, but it's about continuing with our process It is continuing to refine the scope. It is continuing for us to advance looking at the project's financial feasibility, doing more detailed

analyses, continuing to gain consensus within the region for the key aspects of the project. It is continuing to progress on this regionally important project. Right now, it's the only project that is being advanced on this

[00:15:18] congested corridor that causes delay out there. It is the only project that is advancing multimodal solutions on this corridor. And so that is what we are asking for everyone within the region to consider right now. Not supporting the project stops work on what we're doing right now. And that would continue to have the transportation challenges that are faced.

[00:15:48] But this jurisdiction, as well as others along that corridor, and we would not be able to continue to advance the work. We like to be good stewards of our taxpayer dollars, and that's why we have the process that we do at VDOT to begin a NEPA study and use more of a qualitative approach and then move into more details as we move through the project.

[00:16:14] and that is the process we have been successful with being able to, you know, deliver many of our projects. We are a national leader in developing and delivering P3 projects and we feel that this would be another very successful project that has the potential to be able to deliver more than just the few transit and bike and pedestrian accommodations or collateral projects that have identified today but we have to be able to get to that point. So I would just simply ask that you consider the information. I would ask that you continue to support that process that we would

[00:16:53] like to continue with and so I ask that you continue to support the project as it moves forward at TPV and give it your full support for that October vote. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you so much for that presentation.

[00:17:09] Could you go back to just a few questions? Could you go back to slide seven real quick? So I just want to make crystal clear for anybody who's watching at home. I don't know whether you can put slide seven on the – it's much prettier than my face, so put it on the – there you go.

[00:17:29] Slide seven, preservation of future metro rail on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. So this study, looking into this, in no way precludes the possibility for having Metro Rail on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge in the future, correct?

[00:17:48] Correct. Thank you. That was an easy one. I've heard some people who don't get that, so I want to make that very, very clear that studying the issue does not preclude a wonderful Metro solution in the future. And with that, I will turn it over to Chairman McKay.

[00:18:05] Thank you very much. and thank you for the presentation. There are, I share some of the frustration on some points and one of them was the one just clarified. I don't know how much clearer we can make that. I think it's crystal clear to me, but for some reason there are people who still don't believe that.

[00:18:24] The other concern that I have, and it's not, I don't necessarily see it here explicitly, but in earlier presentations, compared to the no-build alternative, The p.m. and a.m. delays in this small section of Capitol Beltway went up to upwards almost of one hour.

[00:18:48] Is that right? Yes. Can you remind us, if we do nothing here, what is the time delay in this segment of Beltway compared to where we are now? Because I can tell you, as someone who uses this almost every day, it's approaching gridlock, American Legion Bridge style.

[00:19:06] Gridlock in the PM heading towards Maryland and in the AM heading into Virginia. So today's condition is not tenable, but how much worse does it get? Travel times in 2050 are anticipated to double for the AM and PM, and in the PM more than double for the peak hours, obviously.

[00:19:26] in the 2050 with the no build. Which is an upwards delay of one hour, which is an unacceptable number, not to mention the environmental degradation of the vehicle sitting out there. And the other piece of this that dumbfounds me is there are legitimate concerns about other arterials that run parallel to this. But my experience in this corridor has been when the beltway is at its worst is when our arterials are at their worst. And so people jump out of the

[00:20:01] beltway onto other alternatives, Telegraph Road, Van Doren Street, Franconia Road. We know the streets that they use, Eisenhower Avenue in the city of Alexandria. If those are backed up, typically it's because something happened on the beltway. And so can you provide any rationale at all to an argument made that the arterial roadways around the beltway that are alternatives to the beltway get worse if the beltway flow gets better. How is that possible? Well, I think we've seen

[00:20:38] with implementation of our other projects around the region with our managed lane projects when these arterial roads, such as the interstates flow better, cars stay on those main roads. And as I mentioned, we're moving more people with fewer vehicles.

[00:20:58] So we have more carpool trips. We have 18,000 carpool trips per day on the existing managed lane network across the Northern Virginia region. We have 2,600 bus trips. So that means more people are in those vehicles and induces the formation of carpools because they can ride in those lanes for free, which is an incentivization.

[00:21:19] So, also, many of us all use these travel apps now, whichever one's your favorite. I think when traffic is flowing better, they will not naturally divert you to arterial roads or side streets, so it keeps you on the main line as well.

[00:21:36] Yeah, it just seems so counterintuitive, the argument that I'm hearing about what's going to happen with the surrounding arterials, and I think you just demonstrated that with data. And certainly, Supervisor Beerman and I are well aware of what happens at the American Legion Bridge approach and all the cut-through traffic problems and nightmarish conditions in some of the neighborhood roads not meant to carry that volume of traffic.

[00:22:02] Most of it is diversion. It's diverting and trying to get away with the backup at the bridge. I mean, that's what a good chunk of it is. And so, I mean, the do-nothing scenario here will guarantee you that those arterials will be jammed beyond capacity.

[00:22:19] Somewhere those cars have to go, and especially if you're talking about a one-hour delay. But I think the linchpin problem here is that we have, and I'll say Virginia has lost its capacity on this project to reasonably communicate with Maryland, and that's unfortunate.

[00:22:37] So I would just say that this project has a pretty significant political problem, and I would hope that the TPB, and I certainly will communicate this to the extent necessary, but we have members of the TPB, would understand the importance of keeping this project alive so that not only the conversations can continue to answer some of the questions that have been raised by the community that we realize some of which cannot be answered yet because we're not to that level of engineering. So to advance this project to

the next level of engineering helps get, sort out some of the issues that the community has raised in a responsible way as a

[00:23:17] natural trajectory of a project like this. But the other thing that's really important is if the TPB doesn't either delay this or support it, then the next administration in Virginia who will inherit this project will not have the capability of working with our counterparts in Maryland on reasonable solutions that get a regional project that's necessary completed. And I think that's really important. I mean, the way this works, if it's not approved by the TPB, we don't get another bite at this for another four years, is my understanding. Another four years, all the data and work that's been done here is garbage because four years from now, we'll be talking about much

[00:23:56] worse delays, much worse traffic in this area, all new conditions that have to be reevaluated. And so it is really important that the TPB understand that we have problems with this project that have yet been answered. The way to get to those answers is to do the further analysis and literally, I hate to use this terminology, but literally build a bridge to a new fresh look with a new administration in Virginia to work with our Maryland counterparts on this.

[00:24:26] And if we do that, we might actually come out with a successful answer not only for this segment of express lanes but also the American Legion Bridge. And the last thing I will say on this is I will overlay this project against our One Fairfax equity policy and give it five stars because those of us who have been around long enough know that this segment of the beltway was deliberately excluded by the private sector because there were feelings that there wouldn't be enough revenue generated in this segment to support the cost. It should have never been excluded, should have a transit and carpool benefit in this section of the beltway just like

[00:25:04] every other square inch of interstate highway in Fairfax County right now. And so to not give the people who live in this segment of the Beltway, the same benefits that everyone else in Fairfax County gets is, in my opinion, is an absolutely a walk backwards against the One Fairfax equity policies we have in place here. And frankly, the original project scope wouldn't have met our One Fairfax policy at the time had we overlaid that. So this project should have never stopped at the Springfield Interchange. Absolutely has to go through and across to Maryland.

[00:25:36] We absolutely need to get Maryland support, and we absolutely need the time to do that, to keep this project alive, because the alternative of do nothing is unacceptable, I think, to everyone. So I appreciate VDOT's work on this. I appreciate the tough spot you're in of trying to sort through and answer questions, some of which you don't have the data to be able to answer yet.

[00:25:59] And what you're asking us to do is keep this project alive so that we can do that. And I will answer the question about the political problem that they can't. which is, let's be honest with ourselves, we're going to need to have a new look and a fresh start with Maryland. And it's very clear to me at the TPB and other places having their support is going to be necessary to make this successful and to make sure that we actually don't recreate all the problems that we know already exist at the American Legion Bridge.

[00:26:27] And we are on our way to doing that here if we do nothing. And I think that's something we all have to take stock of. So thank you. Thank you. I just want to level set for the rest of the meeting. We're going to try and keep this conversation going until about 2.15, and then we'll have about 20, 25 minutes for the TAC presentation and about 20 minutes for the TPP presentation.

[00:26:54] But I had on the list, I had Supervisor Lusk, then Supervisor Herity, Supervisor Smith, and then Supervisor Palachuk. Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll just make a few comments here. First, I very much appreciate VDOT coming to the board today to discuss this project and to share their updates and certainly answer questions.

[00:27:13] I've had a number of meetings now with the project staff throughout this review process and have always seen them to be up front in discussing the issues and the concerns at each stage as well.

[00:27:29] I had the privilege of providing a list of questions to the project team, and they provided very detailed answers to each one, so I appreciate that. And I just want to reiterate some of my concerns here publicly again. First, and the chairman made reference to this, I'm very concerned about the impacts to the adjacent and parallel roads and intersections, and I do sincerely wish we could have an analysis sooner, but understand that is a limitation that VDAC currently has.

[00:28:02] I appreciate hearing the commitments today that any impacts will be mitigated. That's an important point. I also believe that the pedestrian and bicycle improvements are not as expansive as they could be. And I think it would be better to match what we have in the comprehensive plan, including a planned pedestrian bridge over 495 from Vine Street over to Oakwood Road.

[00:28:29] I know the community has expressed some concerns about that as well. And then I'm also concerned about some of the Maryland comments on the project, and to me, it is clear and so very specific that, you know, VDOT has to, you know, have some concurrence from Maryland at some point to the chairman's comments.

[00:29:00] Maybe it's a level set at the point that we get a new administration, but continuing to work and hopefully we'll get to a place where Maryland understands and sees the value of the project. We've also had some other issues, and I appreciate that this item will be coming back to the Transportation Planning Board in October.

[00:29:24] And as the chairman said, I hope that we can have this move forward because I think it's important. Additionally, I'd say it's obvious that we do need public transit alternatives, particularly crossing over the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. I would prefer, obviously, that we have Metro Rail, and I think that the future will and should include it, as we heard.

[00:29:48] There's an opportunity for that to still happen. I'll also note during this year serving as Sheriff Cog, I've had the opportunity to be involved in a number of the DMV Moves meetings since last May. And I know very well that the region and WMATA are planning some significant changes going forward.

[00:30:12] Expanding Metro Rail is not where WMATA is at the current time, but I know that we hope that this will happen in the future. What they are planning towards today is expanding bus priority and ensuring that we have inter-reasonal connectivity.

[00:30:34] I think that's really important. The express lanes project would allow for bus priority across the Woodrow-Wilson Bridge and connect those bus priority lanes to as far as the American Legion, which we heard the chairman mention earlier, and as far west as Manassas and as far south as Fredericksburg.

[00:30:53] Just making those connections is certainly something that's really going to be important. Now, I will say I'm continuing to scratch my head with regard to Maryland's reluctance to support the plan at

this point. And I've heard a number of representatives from Maryland at the DMV moves, as we've talked about the bus prioritization and coordination, and they see that as a regional focus.

[00:31:19] And when they've had the opportunity to talk about that, the pushback has not been as clear there. And from my standpoint, if you look at the congestion and you look at the people who are going to have the greatest impact from these improvements, it's going to include those Marylanders who are commuting to Virginia every day to their jobs and then commuting back to Maryland to get to their homes.

[00:31:49] So they've really, really got to get on board here. I'll also say, you know, looking at the issues as it relates to congestion, again, Franconia Road, we see, you know, people diverting off and we see them diverting off of other roadways as a way to get off of the congestion.

[00:32:14] And that's not in the interest of our residents, it's not in the interest of those who are trying to get to areas within our county. So with that said, while I have a couple of reservations and we're going to continue to work through those, I support this project moving forward, as the chairman has stated as well, and really moving forward in the Visualize 2050 plan and look forward to VDOT continuing to work to address the issues and concerns of the community and of this board.

[00:32:48] So with that, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Supervisor Lusk. We'll go to Supervisor Herity in just a moment, but I think we can shortchange some of the talk here. If we just show of hands, if you think Maryland should play ball on these projects. Okay, thanks. We don't need to touch on that anymore, but Supervisor Herity, your comments.

[00:33:07] Go ahead. I'm going to echo most of the comments that have already been made and not repeat them. But, I mean, it was just last night we were looking at Fair Lakes and the Fair Oaks region and looking at the traffic in that area and the amount of traffic on the side roads.

[00:33:24] It actually went down in 2024 because of the opening of I-66. We saw that clearly with gallows and some of the roads around I-495 when we opened those express lanes. So, you know, in addition to all the carpooling, transit, congestion relief benefits, you've got the relief on the other corridors.

[00:33:48] You know, the real big benefit, well, let me just go one place that I maybe not should go, but bike ped. I think we need to look at what's happened in the I-66 corridor before we put a whole lot of money into that and make sure that whatever we do bike ped-wise is designed so people are actually going to use it because we spent a lot of money on that and there's not an awful lot of use of it so just a word of caution there you know the great benefits that I see are we open up the route one quarter especially once get you know the transit operations there you open all those

[00:34:25] people up to Tyson's Corner and in our other job centers if may I'll go one to Maryland one more time, sorry. But if Maryland were smart, it's not just about their residents getting to work here and going back. It's about opening Maryland up to our residents who might want to go work there.

[00:34:44] I mean, it's, I wouldn't sit on that bridge for an hour and a half to go work in Maryland unless I really had to. But anyway, that's my thought. 100% behind the project needs to go. Fair point. Thank you. Vice Chair Smith.

[00:35:03] So on slide four, part of the slide talks about delivers faster travel times, including on general purpose lanes. My question is really going to relate to 66 outside the Beltway. And it's interesting when you drive, because you see you've gone from four general purpose down to three.

[00:35:20] I am supporting the express lanes, okay? I'll just say that right now. But I would like to know what the process is to follow up, because you do this data and figure out what you think it's going to be before the project starts. is there any follow-up after the project is implemented to see if you are getting those increases for people on the general purpose lanes too?

[00:35:43] So I don't need an answer right now, but I am very interested in that for the 66 Outside the Beltway project. And if anything about that process that you could share now would be great. Just a very quick answer, and then we can follow up about the 66 project. There is commercially available data from some of our concessionaires, And then there's Enric's data.

[00:36:04] That's a third-party vendor we use that tracks just general traffic data that's often collected from people's cell phones that are tracked as you use our roadways that we have some, I'd say, anecdotal data that gives us some glimpses into how the lanes are performing as well.

[00:36:23] Thank you. Supervisor Palczyk. Thank you. I just want to very briefly, from my perspective, give more of the regional importance of this network. I've only heard from the other side concerns about the downside they may see from having this connectivity, but I think as a region, we all agree that connectivity is helpful to the economy.

[00:36:48] We need housing, we need transportation, we need jobs, and we need them to be connected, right? And that's what we hear from our community. I also want to say Tyson's is no longer a corner, so if we can't get it right, our community won't either. But to the regional connectivity and then to the bike lanes.

[00:37:07] And I think to expand what we learned from 66 is that there was, I was not on this board yet, but there was a lot of negotiation that went through in creating those bike lanes and understanding that some of that, whether it's related to cost or relative impact, created a less desirable, I think, outcome for those who would be riding it.

[00:37:30] So I think it's very important to have that connectivity and the multimodal options. I think as that gets looked at more carefully, making sure that we are not cutting corners on the bike and pedestrian connections in order to save a little bit and make it feel like an afterthought.

[00:37:47] So I think it is important, but more importantly, how we look at it and how we engage the community around that. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Palachuk. Supervisor Stork. I'm going to echo the comments I made.

[00:38:04] There's a number of people in the Mount Vernon District Community or on Riverside on Richmond Highway that I guess are cautious about this, that's being kind, maybe are clearly against it in some cases. I agree that we should continue considering this.

[00:38:20] I think the core issue for me, and I think most of the folks, residents that I've heard from, are making sure that it truly has a net benefit to the communities that it's, if you will, bisecting. And I think that's the caution, that's the concern, is that it may not have that.

[00:38:37] And so for me, that's the core issue for me, the fuel, the devil's in the detail about this. Clearly, bike ped, whether it's like along 66, something that's better, that truly brings people there because they want to ride, it's a way to get across the bridge and go work somewhere over there or vice versa over here.

[00:38:56] I think those are all the key elements. And again, Maryland has to be part of the conversation or we, I don't know how we move this forward in a way that truly would be beneficial to both. Because we're going to end up with what we have now, really, which is a dead end at the American Legion Bridge and further challenges.

[00:39:15] But I'm very supportive of continuing to look at this and seeing how we can address those issues. Thank you. Just one last thought real quick on the bike ped piece. And I appreciate folks bringing it up. And I don't find where we are to be sufficient in that area either, but I think it is right.

[00:39:32] It is a negotiation. I would just say the importance of bike ped for this particular project is probably higher than any I've ever seen before. And the reason for that is because the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, which was a federal earmark, partly this is the reason why. But long negotiations and lawsuits with the city of Alexandria, a lot of concern brought at the time by this board, amounted to the best bike ped facility you could imagine across the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, and to my mind is underutilized.

[00:40:03] And yet it is exactly, I mean, it is perfection when it comes to bike ped access to get people across there. And so the importance of tying into that and expanding upon that is critical because the hardest part of the infrastructure which is the bridge itself already has that component on it and it works well and it is well done and well designed and so i just want to point that out is that the stakes are high here to make sure we're utilizing the existing infrastructure we already have to the best extent possible thank you i will simply close by saying unfortunately that

[00:40:41] great infrastructure does not exist in my part of the county with the american legion bridge which continues to be a disaster, and I know that 495 Next is doing its best to try to finish that project and get us to a point where we see some benefits in the general purpose lanes.

[00:41:00] The predictions for that up in North County are not quite as good as 109% faster in AM Peak and 53% faster as they are in South County, which is why it is extremely, extremely important that we get Maryland to play ball, and I mention that at pretty much every one of these meetings.

[00:41:20] Thank you, Ms. Shropshire. Thank you for that presentation. And with that, we're going to move on to the second presentation, which is from the Fairfax County Transportation Advisory Commission, the TAC. So with that, Chair Michael Champness should be coming up along with Vice Chair Christy Garten.

[00:41:42] And after you get a chance to sit down and we change over, we can get started. And I will probably still call it Tyson's Corner until the day I die.

[00:42:00] I'm just going to throw that out there as well. Go ahead, Chair Champness. The floor is yours. Thank you. Thank you very much, Chairman Bierman, Chairman McKay, esteemed members of the Board of Supervisors. Appreciate the opportunity to present today our TAC report and our work plan for the coming years.

[00:42:22] Through our bylaws, we're supposed to provide advice and counsel to the Lord on major transportation matters and issues. So here we are. Press this to go to the next slide. Yeah. Works. Fantastic. Thank you. So here's who we are. I'm Mike Champness, Christy Garden.

[00:42:41] Kevin Morse is here. Keith Fox, Shiva Pant, Peter Weyland. And I believe Ajo Way is participating remotely. I know a couple of people are going to try and do that. So, and if there's anybody

else here, I apologize for not being able to acknowledge him. But we've had great participation with the TAC throughout this activity and going forward with what we plan to do.

[00:43:02] So just very briefly, really the past couple of years have been spent working on developing recommendations for the transportation element of the comprehensive policy plan. Partnering with the Planning Commission, obviously the board chartered the Planning Commission to update the comprehensive policy plan.

[00:43:20] I know they reached out to a number of groups and boards. We were among them. And so we worked very carefully with them, very closely with them, also planning and review meetings with county staff. You can see all the meetings there, a few joint meetings, lots of activities over the past year or so, culminating in me sending a letter to, of comments, letter to Bob Cora that had been approved by the TAC.

[00:43:42] and a copy of that letter is in your package. So following on, you know, we continue to meet with the policy planning committee. Christy and I have gone to a couple of their following meetings, met with the staff aides, chiefs of staff and staff aides for the board supervisors in May, did some more planning on what we're going to do next, and not the least of which, we had our elections in July.

[00:44:04] And so our slate has just been renewed for the next year, so we're ready to go. Not going to go into this in great depth, but did just want to, you know, very briefly summarize the comments we made on the policy plan.

[00:44:20] Some general observations about context-sensitive implementation. Chairman Beerman, I know that's something that you had to comment on when we talked about that. And really, we have the tools available now to really dive in and take advantage of the context-sensitive and really get into some depth there.

[00:44:37] Key recommendations, I'll mention 50-minute neighborhoods again. Chairman Beerman, you had mentioned that when we talked. but also identifying and removing policy barriers. Just one thing that we had mentioned in there is that perhaps as a last resort, if we're not getting what we hope to get from exceptions and waivers to the VDOT design guidelines, we can consider buying some streets.

[00:44:57] That's not something we want to do routinely. It gets expensive, we understand that, but don't want there to be an automatic impediment to going forward. So that's something that we sort of look at. Those are the kind of things we want to be able to sort of showcase. And at some point, that question will be where and when. We'd have to be involved in some of those conversations.

[00:45:12] is appropriate. But ultimately, the bottom line is that the transportation element is put together very consistent with our comments. Our comments were consistent with what the staff had put together, and so that was encouraging. Going forward, really our focus is on implementing the transportation element with hamphy emphasis on outreach. We have some work plan principles that are reprinted here from a presentation we made some time ago, some of the things we've been trying to do. I'll point out in particular, we see our role as proposing solutions not to take positions. We're not here to be another advocacy group for one position or other, although if we

[00:45:50] believe strongly about something, we will do that, but really to try and, you know, use our breadth of knowledge, breadth of expertise, working with others to help you navigate some of the challenges that are facing these issues here. We think that's more our role than being just another advocacy group. We know from when the board of the Planning Commission had come briefed the board

about the comprehensive plan, they've been directed to come up with some less specificity, not being too directive. That fits perfectly in natural bridge to the county boards and commissions. The TAC can pick up where the CPP leaves off, and that's kind of how we're

[00:46:24] looking at it. So we have organized ourselves in work plan focus areas and some outreach partners. You can see those there. Each one has two, in one case, three commissioners, one case one commissioner assigned to each of these each of these areas um and our partnership and outreaches as well so we're at we're uh loaded up and ready to go um to get into the issues that we that we need to get into we talked a lot about outreach um because we really believe that having communications is obviously critical here i know that not news to the board um but collaborations of cda planning and development department of economic initiatives others there we're going to

[00:47:03] be reaching out and going to folks as opposed to waiting for folks to come to us, although that happens as well, too. You know, a great example of that, and a shout-out to the Fairfax Connector marketing team, the winner of our 2024 TAC award. Ben Boxer's, you know, head of the group, Caleb Berry, head of the team, did some great work there, exactly the kind of thing we're looking to see and to build on, in part because they were down to a level of specificity that we're getting to the kinds of things people need to be able to ride buses.

[00:47:31] And we recognize that's important. That's something that actually came out of our review is, you know, if there's not going to be more Metro anytime soon, I'm not going to be more Metro anytime soon, buses, BRTs, that's the way you're going to be moving folks around. So we want to get more into that and get more, you know, getting some more depth there.

[00:47:50] And so this is a natural fit. And we'll talk about that in just a slide or two as well. But we also think that one of the advantages the TAC has is not being as visible as the board, as a CDOT, it's easier for us to have open conversations and dialogue.

[00:48:09] We want to talk to folks. Tell us what you think and why. Things that we ask about are not automatically going to be implemented. We're an advisory group. So we can ask folks to tell us what you think and why and perhaps try and figure out how some pieces fit together there. That would be the goal.

[00:48:29] Just to summarize some recent meetings and key highlights, you can see as we look at the meetings up top there. We're getting into some of these, you know, key areas we mentioned in our recommendations, but also we know that are pretty important. You know, slugging is back. Commissioner Fox, our new recording secretary, had been interviewed by the Wall Street Journal about that. You know, marketing discussions, transportation priorities plan, concentration transportation analysis. I think we had a conversation or two on the 495 Southside expressly in study as well. And NVTA, a blueprint that they have for a regional BRT system. They've

[00:49:07] done some good work there. They've got some good groundwork, I think, that we can build on with them. And modernizing proffered transportation demand management rates, this is a great example. Marcus Moore, Matthew Tatum came to us and said, you know, we'd like to come talk to you about this.

[00:49:23] We'd like to tell you what we're doing, solicit some advice as colleagues, as co-conspirators, so to speak. And, again, we really appreciated that. Going forward in these next ones here, transit network landing on connectivity, sort of buses plus.

[00:49:41] Commissioner Ray has graciously agreed to help orchestrate that activity there to help try and navigate the various pieces that are going on that area. In fact, there's going to be a conversation tomorrow morning with she and I and all their folks from FCDOT to discuss what that might look like in some of our next meetings.

[00:49:58] Microtransit, micromobility, autonomous vehicles, it was a white paper for the policy plan. Some excellent work there, but some gaps, a topic that large you can't possibly cover in just the four or five pages that they put together. and so we're not uh we're using that as sort of a jumping off point not to critique that paper per se because it was again good work and what we want to do is use that as an opportunity like well let's look at each of these maybe this is going to be divided into three there'll be sort of relations and that's the sort of thing we want to get into and get into in a bit more depth one of our commissioners uh commissioner thiel is a um pretty knowledgeable about technology issues and he has

[00:50:35] been threatening us for some time to give us a deep tutorial on the uh the designs of autonomous vehicles, and we are absolutely looking forward to it. We are absolutely looking forward to it. Waymo, et cetera, you know, all sort of things like that as well. Department of Economic Initiatives, we've said for a while, not very visibly, but we don't want to forget, needs to be tied into economic development activities. And so, you know, we've been opening some conversations with DEI. We've talked to EDA in the past, you know, sort of keep those conversations going as well. And also growing out of our focus area team meetings.

[00:51:11] So we have that transit-oriented development group, perhaps urban design standards. Could be another joint meeting with the Planning Commission. We've opened that dialogue with them. You know, we'll see where that goes. Trails, sidewalks, bikeways, plenty of ground to plow there. You know, we'll look into that as we go forward as well, where that might look good.

[00:51:28] So to get to the final slide here, what we plan to do is continue with our upcoming meetings, as we've described here, continue a collaborative review of important initiatives like the SEL, et cetera. One of the reasons we got started doing things like this is when the FCDOT would come brief us on projects, without exception, they're all in good shape.

[00:51:49] There was never a situation where there's a gaping hole, what's this, what's missing. So we felt that just offering advice on the individual projects wasn't really all we could do. We wanted to get more, but we don't forget that as well, too. We're a resource for FCDOT as well.

[00:52:05] We want to continue that. That's very important. So I'm going to refine the priorities and strategies to provide the Board with the implementation. We'll be back, you know, through your staff, you know, Chairman Behrman, you know, as necessary through the BTC as appropriate and also just, you know, as I say, sort of individually.

[00:52:23] We're going to meet with the Planning Commission again. We have another one of the coordination meetings. This one is October 9th. Again, Vice Chair Garten and I will be attending that meeting. They're reviewing their report in proposed amendment language. I had a quick look at 326 pages. So we probably won't look at all of it, but we're in as best we can, as best we can keep up.

[00:52:42] And build partnerships across county departments, stakeholder groups, members of the public. You know, we've thought about, talked about, you know, how we might structure for that. The bylaws we have are pretty flexible. We're not limited on how we can relate to other groups.

[00:52:58] Although, if we do have official meetings, the FOIA rule is all apart. We recognize that. That's one of the big reasons. It's the primary reason we try to have our focus area teams only have two commissioners. They can talk with each other, work with others. Maybe there's sort of a shadow advisory group, you know, some sort of tech committees.

[00:53:14] We'll see how that works. You know, as we get more connected, we'll figure out what makes the most sense. And really, I think our rating here is similar to most, many presentations you get. You know, your thoughts, of course, on our work plan and what we've got so far, you know, referrals, maybe folks for us to talk to, and of course, your priorities, both as a group here and individually. We'll be increasing our interactions with you individually through your members. We'll be talking about that in a meeting this evening, as Vice Chair Gartner and I talked about last week.

[00:53:46] So we'll be around. We'll be being more visible. This won't be the only opportunity, but we definitely wanted the opportunity to solicit your views now. And thank you for your support, and thank you for the opportunity to speak here today. And that's what I have. Thank you so much, and thank you to everybody who's on the TAC and volunteers their time.

[00:54:05] These folks are obviously volunteers. They're giving up their time to look into various issues, to consider things that maybe we don't have as much time to fully address, but also to provide recommendations.

[00:54:20] And so with that, I do want to open up the floor, whether or not there are any particular issues that folks around the table think are something that the TAC could tackle. Before I open it up, though, I will say that, too, when this presentation was brought to me, two things that jumped out immediately were microtransit and autonomous vehicles, because not only are we seeing autonomous vehicles starting to move into the DC space. And we know with these companies, they often move into spaces without asking

[00:54:59] questions or they ask for forgiveness, not permission. And we want to be not necessarily caught flat footed. But also with microtransit, it was brought to me by Delegate Shin talked, for instance, about whether or not there would potentially down the line be an opportunity for microtransit pilot program in the town of Herndon to try and drive more traffic to our brand new metro station in the town of Herndon. So I at least felt good about some of the upcoming meeting

[00:55:36] topics. But with that, I'm going to turn it over to Supervisor Palchik to hear her ideas. Oh, wait, sorry. Chair's privilege. To the chair for topics. Just real quick, I want to thank the tack, too. I just want to double down on what you said about the amount of time and the volunteers.

[00:55:53] And I hold at a very high level, I really appreciate this shift, not really evaluating projects, but going a little bit deeper. And I think we need that now more than ever. I guess the one question that I have, and I just want to make sure I'm reading it right, because the March 31 letter that you referenced to Mr. Pecora, there was a piece of it that really jumped out at me. And I know you talked about the whole idea of, you know, dealing with VDOT design guidelines.

[00:56:21] And at some point in time, maybe it makes sense for the county to think about other alternatives, like owning that section of roadway. I get that point. But at the very beginning of it, you mentioned, and I've been a strong longtime advocate of making sure that our policy plan is much, much more flexible than it is now. And to me, looking at the policy plan, We have to be doing that.

[00:56:46] And I know you're acknowledging that a bit when you talked about, you know, searching for areas where, and just to quote this, it says, where existing regulations or policies are inhibiting or in some cases even preventing the adoption of innovative transportation policies. And then you go on to mention some of those.

[00:57:01] And I'm just wondering if you had anything specific in mind there. I mean, we know that there are elements of the policy plan that are kind of a regurgitation of VDOT requirements that maybe necessarily we can't control. But are there other things that are within our control that are not trying to comply with VDOT standards that are in our policy plan that you were specifically thinking of, any of you were thinking of as inhibiting factors?

[00:57:30] because, again, if my goal and I think a majority of this board's goal is to make sure that our policy plan has the flexibility it needs, we need to drill down on that part more and make sure we come out of this with that outcome. And I'm just trying to figure that out a little bit more. Mike.

[00:57:47] There was not a particular instance that drove us to make that recommendation. Although originally it had been crafted, it was more directive. If we feel we need to, we can go forward and do it. and Commissioner Fox pointed out that there are procedures in place.

[00:58:04] And so, okay, let's try and use the procedures. But to us, it was more of a we didn't want us to feel or you to feel handcuffed by those. We also didn't want to start casting aspersions on policies that probably are good, maybe are good, in most cases are good.

[00:58:22] We wanted to be more specific. But I think another animating factor there was we had a line in there we talked about placemaking, making every place its own someplace so that each place can do what it needs to. Placemaking is going to be different in South County than other areas. And so the restrictions or the rules that might be perfect somewhere else might not be here. And so it was really more of a notice of flexibility rather than a specific thing. But as we go into it and get into it in more detail, then yeah, we'll be looking for specific policy impediments at

[00:58:59] which point we can say, to come to the board and say, we believe we've identified this particular policy impediment. We think you ought to consider doing X or Y. Good. I really appreciate that because that will be particularly helpful. And we all get frustrated. We run into, you know, a challenge where we can't implement something that we know is what the community wants because there's some arcane policy or something that's not speaking the same language.

[00:59:21] And so if you identify those, I'm particularly interested in those with the shared goal of making sure that our policy plan, among other documents in the county, is useful, but its usefulness also extends to its ability to be flexible, to respond to changes in technology, changes in community needs, new focuses on how we connect communities and other things that might not have been visible at the time the original policy plan elements had been adopted.

[00:59:51] it. And so I really appreciate that. Excellent answer. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Thank you. Supervisor Palchuk and then Supervisor Lusk. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, and everyone on the board. I know my representative, Sonia, had a work commitment, but she's watching online. So I want to thank her for her invaluable work on this. And first of all, let me just say I was very excited to see that not just in one, but I think in two sections, in the TOD and in the Enhanced Transit and BRT.

[01:00:19] You talked about the importance of transit-oriented development and having access. I love, I'm just going to read it because I love this, should be extended beyond rail stations to include bus rapid transit routes and commercial corridors with high-frequency buses.

[01:00:36] Buses and BRT should be closely tied to TOD planning and be paired with extended micromobility connections. To me, as a new owner of a used e-bike, and how much it can change your life, that 15 minutes. Those of us who don't have the strongest legs, everything becomes flat.

[01:00:54] But most importantly, I think I'm starting to see more and more people living across our corridor, across my bus corridor, using bikes and when they can, e-bikes, as a way to more easily get to bus and to transit.

[01:01:10] So I think to your point, and as we discussed earlier in the meeting, We're not going to see additional metro trains anytime soon. And so how do we think about that enhanced connectivity? I believe we're going to see a presentation on NVTC that the FedEx Connector has seen a 19% jump in the past year.

[01:01:29] I know we're seeing a lot more increase in use, partly due to, you know, return to work for the federal government and others. But I'm also curious as we look at the next tranche, how much is impacted by the new bus lines and by changes that have been made both by our agency and WMATA and others in the region to have enhancement.

[01:01:55] So I guess my only ask of you as our commission is that I want to make sure that while we're looking at the policy plan, that you help us better engage and more understand in each community, to your point, Mike, right?

[01:02:12] Every community, every place has its unique aspects, its unique history, its unique community, both residential, commercial, educational, all of that. And so how do we take this 400 square miles and be those extra eyes and ears for our staff who do so much across the county, right?

[01:02:32] So that's my big ask. I know I live inside the Beltway now. I always lived outside of it and have seen how different that is and then how different it is being in the most urban district compared to some of the others that are much less urban, right? And how do we sort of take that best fits all to best fits each community and vice versa.

[01:02:55] So I want to thank you for your highlight on that. I was going to ask who loves to ride the bus as much as I do. It's probably going to be a big fight over that one. But I think, you know, as the other ask I have is to help us, you know, those who did not grow up using the bus, riding the bus.

[01:03:13] I was speaking to one of our, I won't name her, one of our most beloved seniors who's been very engaged. And she said, oh, you're taking the, I've never taken the bus here. How do you do that, right? And so as we have seniors wanting to age in place and younger members of our community, We have training for our students to ride the bus and maybe thinking about where our pockets and ideas for helping more of our older community members feel comfortable and understand how do you have this option if they're no longer able to drive or wanting to drive.

[01:03:45] It's that level of detail that we know we need to get into. How do you find the bus? How do you get on the bus? How do you feel comfortable? With a metro, it's right there. You can't miss it. buses, you're not as confident. And there are things we can do there. And Commissioner Brighi did make some good contributions in the very area you're talking about, as I would have expected.

[01:04:07] So fantastic. Awesome. Fantastic. Thank you. I used to teach middle schoolers how to ride the bus. We can teach middle schoolers. We can teach adults, right? Thank you. That's true. Great. Supervisor Lusk. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then I'll reference slide number five and appreciate two points under, first, the work plan principles, Fairfax County as a test bed for innovation.

[01:04:32] I really like this and would love for you to maybe give some additional thoughts there. And then second, under work plan focus areas and outreach partners, new technology or new transportation technologies. Just curious to maybe have you add a little additional color around both of those because I think they're so important for us to be seen as an innovative place and then looking to test out new and different things.

[01:05:00] Sure. We know that this is something, quite honestly, Chairman McKay has talked about many times in the past. We know it's been a, you know, being attestified is something the board has long been interested in. You know, one of the autonomous bus in Mosaic District a few years back, another ATT&CK Award winner, Although they won because of what they did, not they didn't win because we did it, gave them the award.

[01:05:28] But that's an area that we really need to roll for sleeves a little more on. And one of the things that I'm not going to put Commissioner Thiel on the spot because he's not here at the moment, but the conversations and the issues he raises about some of the real challenges about designing an autonomous vehicle system from a design perspective, not from a county implementation perspective, though clearly you can see the obvious immediate implications.

[01:05:53] It's not that simple. And so we want to learn a little bit more about that. I've also been, we're also been trying to reach out to sort of research groups, groups like VTTI and things like that. Had an initial conversation with them, like to try and pursue that if that works out.

[01:06:09] Quite honestly, if there's some suggestions, you've got professors, and I met one, quite honestly, in Drainsville just the other day. We're going to try and enroll him as well. to have some of these kind of conversations as well, too. So that's probably among the squishiest piece of this, not surprisingly, which is not surprising, sir, why you're interested in it.

[01:06:27] But, quote honestly, now that you know we're open for business, please do an issue you think about or something you've seen. Please send it to your TAC rep, and we can certainly add that to the mix there. Great.

[01:06:46] Well, the conversation doesn't end at this table. I recommend reaching out to your TAC representatives. If you're lucky like me, you sort of have two. Mike's my representative, but Christy also lives in the Drainsville District. And I hope that we can keep the conversation going and keep using the TAC as an incubator for ideas related to transportation issues in the county.

[01:07:08] And with that, thank you very much for your service and your time here. And we have 20 minutes left for the last item of the agenda, which is the transportation priority plan update. TPP thank you all thank you very much appreciate it and Commissioner Wayland is already ready with some of the outreach candidates We're gonna have a good conversation this evening. Thank you. Mr. Beerman

[01:07:30] Okay, the floor is yours when you're ready. Thank you Justin all right good. Good afternoon members of the committee Ray Johnson Department of Transportation

[01:08:08] Smith that you love and would have been here she is the head of our transportation priority planning coordination and funding but I she's not able to make it so i will try not to chop this up too bad um slide two that's me thank you uh so today we'll cover some background quick background on the transportation priority plan of the tpp why the update of it matters it is important and how it aligns with the county's

[01:08:45] broader transportation goals um we'll share the proposed 25 through 30 tpp highlights for both revenues and expenditures um to share with you how the projects have been prioritized and funded over that time period so we'll briefly just nope sorry i'll touch briefly on the public engagement that had taken place in the past few months and the feedback that we had received from

[01:09:24] the stakeholders through that process and then we will conclude with recommendations and next steps so that you know where we're headed after today's discussion um so starting with background the tpp is the county's main document for guiding transportation investments it defines the priorities for the roadway transit and active transportation initiatives tpp is updated when

[01:09:57] there are major changes that affect funding well the overall funding picture and as for an example when new revenues become available or are removed for that matter and another example of when the the TPP may get updated is when we have significant budget impacts that require a total reprioritization of projects.

[01:10:25] So milestones for the proposed 25 through 30 TPP update. So back in February of this year, staff met individually with board members to solicit feedback on staff proposals. March and April, same year, we met with the TAC, Transportation Advisory Commission, to review and refine priorities. And in July, we held a public

[01:10:59] meeting and received formal public comment through a comment period. So more background. So the first board-approved TPP was back in 2014.

[01:11:16] That program totaled about $1.4 billion and covered the fiscal years 15 through 20. The 2019 approval included over $3 billion in funding over the years 20 through 25.

[01:11:33] The proposed 25 through 30 TPP is just under $4 billion in total transportation investments. So the table we see here on the slide highlights the current TPP, 20 through 25, and distribution of funds to the different programs.

[01:11:55] So about $1.2 billion was allocated to major roadway capital projects. Another $820 million was allocated to transit capital and operating needs, and just under $375 million for active transportation or bicycle and pedestrian projects.

[01:12:19] So funding was also approved to a lesser extent for debt service, traffic calming studies, and reserves for contingencies. So the funding outlook, so for the 25-30 TPP, our current estimate is about $3.1 billion in revenue across the six-year period.

[01:12:48] Funding profile is diverse, so it is made up of a mix of federal, state, regional, don't have private on that slide, my apologies, but private and local funding sources. So a point of note, a portion of the revenues are committed to major recurring costs.

[01:13:08] For example, Fairfax Connector requires about $40 million in annual funding toward transit operations. Metro Capital support contribution annually in the amount of just over $13 million.

[01:13:28] And we pay just over $13 million annually towards Silver Line loan repayment. So meeting these commitments is essential and required, but does limit how much money that we can apply to new projects.

[01:13:50] All right, funding allocations. So the expenditure estimate for the proposed TPP equals the revenue of $3.9 billion, with significant allocations going toward major roadway capital projects, transit, and active transportation projects.

[01:14:10] So approximately $1.8 billion is allocated to major roadway projects. It is noted in the slide, and I will note it here, much, if not all, of our roadway widening projects do include active transportation components and facilities.

[01:14:30] So $1.2 billion is proposed to be allocated to transit operating and capital needs, over $350 million for active transportation projects, about $250 million for spot intersection roadway improvements, and then we have $75 million that is allocated to Reston and Tyson projects and or reserves.

[01:15:01] So it's revenues coming from developer contributions, the road funds, and the service districts that can only be used within those defined geographic areas. And then we have $20 million set aside for small area projects.

[01:15:23] Challenges, so rising project costs, I know you all have heard a lot of this. it probably can't be overstated. So we are impacted by increased costs due to labor, inflation, materials, land values, list goes on. So due to current revenue restrictions and constraints and cost increases, the proposal is to focus revenues on existing projects.

[01:15:55] So we have informed the public that there are if there are any new ideas new projects that Those they would have to be swapped out with Projects that are already proposed and or existing within the current TVP. All right moving on the public engagements So public outreach materials were posted online July of this year And a public meeting was held on July 16th.

[01:16:33] So the meeting was offered in English and Spanish. Other languages were made available upon request. So the comment period lasted until July 23rd, and we received about 330 comments.

[01:16:50] So roughly 85% were project-specific, focusing on the Cinderbed Trail project. the Flint Hill transportation project in the development in Oakton, and active transportation improvements along Birch and Kirby roads.

[01:17:12] So 15% of the comments were more generalized, so there was a mix of opposition to roadway widenings, the need for more multimodal improvements in active transportation projects, and other General concerns included escalating project costs and environmental impacts.

[01:17:42] So, next steps. So, we are planning the 25 through 30 TPP to be before your consideration in November or December of this year.

[01:18:03] Yeah, that is it. So, I will answer any questions you have to the best of my ability. If I can't answer your question or no one else here at the table can, we can happily get back to you. I will withhold my question until the end and defer to Chairman McKay.

[01:18:23] Thank you very much. I mean, to answer your two questions, obviously, number one is yes. I do think, number two, one thing in the challenges, we talked about it earlier today. I do think one of the challenges that's not listed here is the timeliness of getting these projects done.

[01:18:41] And I will save some people's energy for later and just say that I think we uniformly agreed earlier here today it's taking way too long to get projects done. And that is absolutely a challenge that is different than rising project costs and some of the others here.

[01:18:57] So I would have just, you know, appreciated an acknowledgement of that challenge. The other, the real question that I have is if we move forward and adopt this at the end of this calendar year, which is what is slated to happen, we know that simultaneous to the work we're doing, there's the DMV Moves Task Force looking at long range ways to address not just Metro, but what my hope is, is just transit capital and operating expenses long term in a more sustained way.

[01:19:28] We know that the General Assembly is also, as a study group, working on this, and potentially there could be breakthroughs in the next session that maybe can provide some financial relief to the transit capital and operating components of this plan.

[01:19:45] And so I guess the question is, should that happen? What happens with this plan? Once we adopt it at the end of the year, if other funding sources become available, do we go back and amend the plan and put more resources into some of these other areas here?

[01:20:01] Because one of the things that I think is important for our public to understand, while people might not like to talk about coming up with a new revenue source for Metro and transit, the reality is we can do that. It frees up resources to address all of the other transportation infrastructure needs that we know exist, not just in our county and our region.

[01:20:22] So help me understand how those efforts parallel and if there is a breakthrough, either because a DMV task force recommendation is coming forward and is adopted or there's some funding solution that comes out in the next General Assembly session.

[01:20:40] What happens with this? Yeah, Greg Steverson, director of FCDOT. So conceptually, the idea is that if a funding source comes around that fundamentally changes sort of the structure of what's needed on the transit perspective, we can absolutely sort of redistribute funds.

[01:20:58] The how we do that, to what extent we do that in terms of, like, bringing the entire TPP back or having some internal discussions or discussions with the board as to what we're getting back and then how we may distribute it, it could happen any number of ways. But the absolute argument would be if we find funding for Metro that really takes the need away from what we have projected, we could absolutely sort of redistribute in that way.

[01:21:23] So we're not locked in. And I think this is important because if we do, if that solution is found, I would hope we'd bring back at least a significant enough, if not the entire TPP, so that people can understand the context in which this is helping. because obviously it's designed to help support transit, but in supporting transit in effect could end up a resorting of this and positively affecting a whole lot of other transportation infrastructure as well.

[01:21:51] And so I want to make sure we don't lose that context piece of this that I think is really important. And I would like to hear, and I don't need it for here, but back to my first comment, the challenges that are listed here, We know there's more than these, and I think the timeliness of getting projects built is something we're going to need to get maybe not discussed here in great length, but we're going to need to get some better closure on.

[01:22:19] We will, and that's one of the things. It's on the list of topics for future BTC. We're going to have to put together some information. We're really looking at, okay, how long do projects generally take? What is the reason for that? And really giving people an insight into some of the things that we work through, some of the things we struggle through, some of the decision points and what happens if you make a certain decision this way or that way, some of the things that lead to what I call scope creep, and just really giving some insight into here's a timeline, here's why that timeline exists, here's why that timeline gets extended, and how you try and find ways to not have that timeline be extended.

[01:22:58] But that is something that is coming forth at another BTC meeting for sure. yeah i think really important and i know others will have comments on this but but i know there's some shared responsibility here with other stakeholders on some of these projects but what i'm most interested in i mean obviously identifying those so that we can work to improve those with other stakeholder organizations but what i'm most interested in is making sure there's nothing in our county process that is causing these to be more delayed any of our own regulations any any of our own procurement headaches, any of our own staffing needs, whatever they are.

[01:23:33] And, you know, we talked a minute ago with the TAC about the policy plan and making sure it's flexible, making sure that the policies that exist within the county that you're working these projects off of, that there's no deficiencies within those that this board can immediately correct, understanding that some of the outsider's stakeholder pieces that I know are a factor might take a little bit longer to address.

[01:23:55] Thank you. Thank you. Before I turn to Vice Chair Smith, I just want to co-sign that. And I was going to save my comments for the end, but I'm just going to put them right now. Time is money. We need to move these projects along faster. And we know that there are other stakeholders and we know that there are other pain points. But what is happening within the county itself, our own processes have to speed up.

[01:24:21] I mean, we cannot, frankly, we cannot be sitting here in fiscal year 2026 talking about the fiscal year 2025 to fiscal year 2030 TPP. You can't do it. We've got to do better, and it's something that we need to continue working on.

[01:24:39] And that was going to be my closing comment, but it isn't because we're going to turn over to Vice Chair Smith, Supervisor Herity, Supervisor Palchuk, Supervisor Jimenez, who is chairing the FACS-PISA. So in five minutes, if we get Supervisor Jimenez, he's going to be cutting into his own meeting.

[01:24:57] So go ahead. Okay. So I went to the website and I looked at the proposed 25 to 30 projects. Some of them that are on there is like the Route 28 widening, which I was under the impression was completed.

[01:25:16] So I want to understand how this gets updated and how we deal with this. I would like to sit down with staff with all the Sully projects because I am confused about which one of those came up, like under the $100 million and we were doing more safe crossings.

[01:25:36] Some of those I see in here. I'm really frustrated, and this is not a staff issue at all, that I have had a project in Franklin Farm neighborhood that I was aware of in 2016. In 2017, we lost $102 million for transportation projects, so I couldn't get that into the TPP in 2019.

[01:26:01] This project needs to be done. At the time, it was probably only $2 or $3 million. There's plans to add a turn lane. And then when I look at this list and you hear, well, you can only do that if you get rid of something, I have a lot of $250,000 projects, $350,000 projects, smaller.

[01:26:19] And then I'm going to give some context to something taking a long time. In the 2014 TPP, a trail along Pleasant Valley Road was added. Staff has been working diligently at that.

[01:26:35] There have been problems with getting rights to property, stormwater issues. I just got an update about that today. We'll be lucky if that project is done in 2027. That's an $11 million project. And so I look at this time frame and I look at this intersection on Franklin Farm Road and Fairfax County Parkway that we should have fixed years ago for the public.

[01:27:01] I need to figure out what's the path forward. I look at slide six and I see set-aside funding for small district transportation improvements. What does that mean? I understand the constraints, but I'm very frustrated. I need to get this done for the community.

[01:27:18] And we can follow up later, Greg, but I need a meeting with Steve. Yeah, I just wanted to talk really quickly about your last point. The $20 million there is really set aside to sort of tackle some of that stuff that we just finished talking about. Things that are not currently set in the TPP, it gives you some level of flexibility to be able to maybe tackle a project that comes up that wasn't expected or that you're looking to tackle.

[01:27:42] That was the purpose of that. We can talk about it further, but I did want to bring that up, and I appreciate you bringing that up. Thank you. Supervisor Herod. I'm going to be quick and try to take a different tact a little bit. A long time ago, Bob McDonald commissioned a local mandate review.

[01:28:00] We were able to successfully get rid of some VDOT requirements on local governments. I mean, I think we really need a – and this is building on what you said earlier clearly. I think we really need a proactive look at the kinds of things that really – We're redoing stuff that the state or the state's redoing stuff we've already done and get rid of some requirements.

[01:28:24] I'm also going to say as these things come along, utility relocations is another bugaboo that gets involved. And, you know, Rolling Road, in Fair Lakes Parkway, way back in the day, I got engaged. Rolling Road, I got engaged, and we were able to shave months and, in one case, years, one case, months off the schedule.

[01:28:44] Make sure staff use us as a resource because we have connections. We can, you know, make calls and move projects forward, but it only works if we communicate. And I stumbled into the Rolling Road one, and then there's the one that drives me batty, which is the federal bat requirement, but we can't do anything about that.

[01:29:04] Anyway, that'll pass it on. We all know about that, right? You can't cut trees down anyway. Drives citizens batty, too, because they don't understand why everything's going down all at once. Yes, please, if you're watching at home, Google FederalBat requires the Supervisor Stork.

[01:29:21] I know we're all kind of singing a similar song here, and we know the challenges are deep. Can you just refresh for me on page for the $1.4 billion program approved by the board in 2014 for FY 2015 to 2020, how much of that has been completed?

[01:29:45] Yeah, we'll have to get back to you on that. I don't know that we have that number directly here, but I'll have to get back to you on that one, what's been completed out of those. I think that would give us an idea of how big our challenges are. And I know that that was one of my frustrations when I got on the

board in 2016 was that money had been approved in 2014 and really, really not much had been done at that point.

[01:30:08] and then identified that it was for an important path in the community, and the chairman will remember this, along Alvarez Memorial Highway from Richmond Highway to Mount Vernon State. And it took another eight years, basically, almost, to get it done.

[01:30:24] And I would have the same question then for the $3.04 billion approved by the board in 2019 for FY 2020 to 2025. that give us a sense at least of how deep the challenges are.

[01:30:40] And then I know, I mean, I'm sure there's parts of this that my office owns. I know I'm not immune from maybe asking that something be done or not be done, but I think the core of it is not having clear plans that are identified and clear ownership of what parts of those plans each part is going to do and then in turn make sure they get done.

[01:31:04] And, I mean, Richmond Highway, that corridor is a great example. We lived that, frankly, with what was happening there. And all of a sudden, surprise, surprise, now we're two or three years behind. And I know from a board office perspective, I truly didn't understand or wasn't aware of that. And so I want to be partners in this process.

[01:31:22] I recognize at times I can slow things down. Sometimes, as Supervisor Heritage mentioned, we can speed things up. So I think the clarity of that communication is in all of our interests and, frankly, the ownership. You know, because I'm sure it's frustrating to staff at times when board offices maybe are taking too long to respond or something else.

[01:31:42] And let's all be accountable for our own parts of this. But the objective I think we all agree with is our projects are taking too long and as a result costing too much. And we know we're not getting as much done as we could get done. So thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Prochek.

[01:31:59] I think it'll be very brief. I have two points. Number one would be the engagement piece. I think 300 some comments, not adequate, but as we're sitting here and people are overengaged from 20 different agencies and different projects, I'm looking at the next presentation, which is going to be in our climate goals, and 43% of greenhouse gas emissions in the county come from transportation, right?

[01:32:26] So I think there's an opportunity as we think about countywide and then within our areas. You know, I think we all are trying to host meetings and better engage with the community and get better feedback. I would say, you know, if and when we approve this, that the new engagement starts right then, right?

[01:32:45] Because this is long-term planning and to continue to figure out how to receive feedback from those most impacted and how we can continue to work together on that. So I appreciate it. I think you hear all of our passions for transportation, especially multimodal, I believe, on this board more than any other board.

[01:33:07] And so let us help you better reach the community and help move projects along. Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Jimenez. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think one thing that kind of makes me happy that we've heard today is a lot of frustration, and I think that that's something that continues to be voiced, whether it's internally or externally, is let's speed things up.

[01:33:34] Let's get things done. Let's stop having meetings about having meetings about how to work on this and streamline things. We already know it needs to be streamlined. Just get it done. Whether it's development, whether it's bringing business to Fairfax County, get it done.

[01:33:50] Stop having meetings to talk about how this could potentially happen. That's ridiculous. We're going around in circles. So I'll leave it with it. Just get it done. Thank you. Thank you, and that's a good note to end on with that. We are going to get this meeting done.

[01:34:07] Thank you.