Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee

December 12, 2017 Government Center, Conference Room 11

Board of Supervisors Members Present:

Sharon Bulova, Chairman
Penelope Gross, Mason District (Vice Chairman)
John Foust, Dranesville District (Committee Chair)
John Cook, Braddock District
Pat Herrity, Springfield District
Catherine Hudgins, Hunter Mill District
Jeff McKay, Lee District
Kathy Smith, Sully District
Linda Smyth, Providence District
Dan Storck, Mount Vernon District

County Leadership:

Beth Teare, County Attorney James Patteson, Director, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (for Deputy County Executive Robert A. Stalzer)

Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC):

Jeff Parnes, Chairman

Link to agenda and presentation materials:

https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/btc

Supervisor Foust called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the October 10, 2017, meeting were accepted with no changes.

2. <u>Efforts to Secure Funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)</u>

Chairman Bulova; Tom Biesiadny, Director, FCDOT; Todd Wigglesworth, Chief, Coordination and Funding Division, FCDOT; and Noelle Dominguez, Legislation Liaison, FCDOT, briefed the Board on the efforts to secure funding for WMATA and on proposed reforms. The presentation is available at:

https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting %20materials/committees/2017/dec12-transportation-wmata-presentation.pdf

Supervisor Smyth asked what would happen if the federal government does not provide \$125 million for Metro funding. Chairman Bulova explained that the first option would be to revert

back to using the Metro formula shares, and the second option would be the one-third funding contribution for each jurisdiction (Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia). She stated that the Metro Strategy Group (MSG) is expected to present a resolution to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) Board for consideration on December 13, 2017. The resolution calls for a one-fourth funding contribution from Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and the Federal government.

Supervisor Herrity stated that Virginia does not receive their fair share of reduction (percentagewide), based on the one-fourth strategy. He said that having the governance issues and labor costs resolved should be conditions for approving new funding. Chairman Bulova stated that under the one-fourth strategy, Virginia's contribution would be \$125 million, compared to \$155 million under the one-third strategy. Mr. Biesiadny stated that the issues that Supervisor Herrity raised were included in the resolution. Supervisor Herrity asked for more specific language to be included in the resolution. Chairman Bulova explained that the MSG is tasked with the funding issues only, and the governance issues are the responsibility of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) Task Force chaired by Supervisor Cook. Supervisor Hudgins stated that the Metro system carried many federal employees, and that the Federal government should provide contributions for Metro. Supervisor Cook stated that he liked the resolution, and it represents a compromise between multiple agencies. He said it should be clear that new funding should be used for capital improvement projects, and not for operations. He mentioned the bill that Representative Comstock (R-VA) introduced is a starting point for discussion. Supervisor McKay supported the resolution. He stated that one of the major reasons that Metro has problems today is due to the infighting among jurisdictions regarding their funding contribution.

Chairman Bulova commented on the District of Columbia's proposal for a 0.75% sales tax proposed regionally, and that Virginia would pay more than the District and Maryland's combined contributions. Both Virginia and Maryland oppose the District's sales tax proposal to fund Metro.

3. Trail Lighting – Proposed Pilot Projects

William Marsh, Tysons Urban Center Coordinator (DPWES); and Chris Wells, Pedestrian Project Manager (FCDOT), updated the Board on the proposed trail lighting pilot projects. The presentation is available at:

https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting %20materials/committees/2017/dec12-transportation-trail-maintenance-lighting.pdf

Supervisor Smyth asked how a trail is selected to have trail lighting installed. Mr. Biesiadny replied that a trail must have connections to a Metrorail station, and also noted that staff will address Supervisor Smyth's request to consider trail lighting at the East Blake Lane Park near the Providence District Office and Community Center.

Supervisor McKay asked if the existing lights at Barry Road and Oakwood Road are up to the standards and the operating cost. Mr. Marsh replied that they met the minimum for lighting needs for pedestrian safety. The lighting at Amberleigh Lane will need to be upgraded to the lighting standards. Supervisor McKay stated that at the Huntington Metrorail Station, the street lights are not adequate, and requested staff to review and upgrade those lights to standards. Commissioner Parnes stated that Metro maps at Metrorail stations do not display trails on their

maps. Supervisor Herrity suggested staff look at trails connected to VRE stations in Burke. Supervisor Smyth asked what type of lights are used on trails, and Mr. Marsh replied that they are mostly LED lights.

Supervisor Foust stated that the Trails Committee agreed with the recommendations and asked staff to update the Committee at a future meeting.

4. Update Recommended Parking Ordinance Changes

Neil Freschman, Chief, Traffic Operations Section (FCDOT); Charisse Padilla, Transportation Planner (FCDOT); Bob Otten, Police Department; and Hayden Codding, the Office of the County Attorney, updated the Board on staff recommendations for parking ordinance changes. The presentation is available at:

https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting %20materials/committees/2017/dec12-transportation-parking-ordinance-update.pdf

Supervisor Smyth was concerned about the 1,000 feet requirement that would allow a neighbor from three blocks away to park in front of someone's house for 10 days, especially in older neighborhoods, and that homeowners could not do anything about that vehicle. Staff clarified that to be legally parked in the neighborhood, the car must be registered to a household within the 1,000 feet distance of the address. Mr. Biesiadny asked Supervisor Smyth what she thought the appropriate distance should be, and Supervisor Smyth responded one block, or 500 to 600 feet.

Supervisor Cook stated that residents in townhouses need to be able to park on public streets, and anything less than 1,000 feet may not be sufficient under these circumstances. He also stated that the 10-day period may not be adequate for someone taking a two-week vacation. He recommended advertising the time limit for up to a 30-day period. Supervisor Herrity agreed with the 30-day period. Mr. Freschman stated that the problems of vehicles parking for a long time (greater than 30 days) often occurs in the commercial and industrial areas.

Supervisor Foust stated that he has experienced unattended vehicle problems in his district as well. Mr. Otten replied that the police department has received two types of complaints. People have complained about dump trucks parking for a long time in industrial and commercial areas. In the residential areas, people have complained about vehicles parking in front of their property for four to five days, often without asking permission from the homeowners. Last year, the police department impounded 340 unattended vehicles. This year, they impounded 367 vehicles, the majority in residential areas. The police examined the registration, tags, vehicle inspection stickers, where they park, and the overall maintenance to determine whether a vehicle is abandoned or not. Chairman Bulova asked for clarification between the abandon vehicles ordinance and the unattended vehicles ordinance. Mr. Otter stated that leaving a car in front of a house for two weeks is considered as an unattended vehicle, because that car has not been moved in two weeks. Mr. Codding stated that the definition of unattended vehicles helps to clarify the problem and could allow some exceptions like the 1,000 feet requirement and parking in front of your own house. Mr. Freschman stated that the term "unattended" is not specifically defined and is unenforceable under the current ordinance. The proposed modification would require that a vehicle be moved at least 300 feet every 10 days. An exception would be made to allow a vehicle to be parked within 1,000 feet of the property line where the vehicle is registered.

Supervisor McKay stated that it could be many days before an unattended vehicle is reported to the police, and in reality, the 10-day limit is much longer than the 10 days that people parked their vehicles. This would make the enforcement much more difficult for the police. He agreed with the 1,000 feet requirement. Commissioner Parnes raised a concern about how to figure out the 1,000 feet. Mr. Biesiadny replied that by using Google map or other apps, a person could input their location and home address to determine, by roadway, how far the distance is from your house. Supervisor Foust stated that the Board could advertise for 30 days and the 1,000 feet, and anything less is allowable. Supervisor Gross recommended listening to the constituents and their concerns. Ms. Teare recommended to advertise a range - from 10 to 30 days. Supervisor Hudgins recommended more much latitude is needed on this issue, because many people who live in townhouses have to drive around to find a parking spot every night and will appreciate the flexibility of the ordinance.

Regarding the fleet vehicle issue, Supervisor Storck asked staff to define (fleet vehicles) parking on public streets. Mr. Freschman replied that the proposed ordinance is designed to not allow businesses to park their company owned vehicles on public streets. He explained that fleet vehicles could park on public streets, if they provide services. Supervisor Cook asked about small businesses parking two or three vehicles. Mr. Otten stated that there are complaints about multiple vehicles parking for home improvement jobs, but that does not meet the fleet vehicle definition. Other complaints relate to commercial areas where business owners complain about rental vehicles parking in areas that prevent delivery of goods. Supervisor McKay asked staff to distinguish fleet vehicles from an example of three different people who live at three different houses that work for the same company, and park their work vehicles on a public street. Mr. Otten replied that the police look at the vehicle registration's address. Supervisor Smyth brought up the problem of U-Haul vehicles parking on public streets in Merrifield. It becomes a problem for businesses to get deliveries to their stores. Supervisor Smith asked about the legality of how tow trucks park in cul-de-sacs. Mr. Otten replied that those trucks have to park parallel to the curve and in the direction of the traffic. Supervisor Smith stated that this is a problem that needs to be solved. Supervisor Gross supported the recommendation and said that the Board needs to address the issues. Supervisor Foust directed staff to move forward with this recommendation.

5. Silver Line Phase 2 Implementation

Mark Canale, Chief, Special Projects Division, FCDOT, updated the Board on the progress of the Silver Line Phase 2 Project. The presentation is available at:

https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting%20materials/committees/2017/dec12-transportation-silver-line-update.pdf

Commissioner Parnes asked about occupancy of the garages prior to service. Mr. Canale replied that the garages will be open when Phase 2 of the Silver Line Project is ready.

6. I-66 Inside the Beltway

Tom Biesiadny briefed the Board on the initial observations on the tolling on I-66 Inside the Beltway Project. The presentation is available at:

 $\frac{https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting \cite{boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting} assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting/sites/assets/meeting/$

Chairman Bulova asked if the Fairfax Connector Route 699 has stops near the MWCOG office. Mr. Biesiadny replied that there are no stops near MWCOG at this time. Supervisor Gross asked about the traffic impacts on roads parallel to I-66 like Route 7 and Route 50. Mr. Biesiadny replied that there are no major changes, and that VDOT is monitoring the traffic conditions. Supervisor Storck asked about the ridership level and performance. Mr. Biesiadny replied that in the grant application, FCDOT estimated the ridership at 25 passengers per trip on Route 699, and he believed that is an achievable target. Fairfax County does not subsidize this route. It is subsidized by the toll revenues through NVTC. To break even on fare alone, Mr. Biesiadny stated that the fare must be in the \$8 range. Responding to Supervisor Foust's question about subsidy, Mr. Biesiadny explained that the regular fare for the regional route is \$4.25, and the grant application applied for a certain amount of subsidy. Chairman Bulova asked how many riders received transit/metro subsidy and ride the 699. Mr. Biesiadny said he will provide the data at a future time.

7. Transportation Priorities Plan

Mr. Biesiadny stated that in the package, there is a summary of the public outreach effort on the Fairfax County's Transportation Priorities Plan (TPP). FCDOT has met with eight supervisors and will meet with the remaining two supervisors soon to complete the individual meetings.

The information on the application is available at:

https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/assets/meeting %20materials/committees/2017/dec12-transportation-transportation-priorities-plan.pdf

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M. The next BTC meeting has not been scheduled yet for 2018.