

Project Implementation Working Group
Fairfax County Division of Transportation
Legato Building, 4th Floor Conference Room
Fairfax, Virginia

Minutes

Meeting Held On,
June 28, 2013; 10:00 a.m.

Attendees:

Members:

Chris Zimmerman, Chair
Joe Swartz, DRPT
Jim Maslanka – Alexandria
Jennifer Fioretti – Arlington
Paul Stoddard – Falls Church
Joe Kroboth, III, PE –
Loudoun
Ron Kirkpatrick – Fairfax
Patrick Moore – Manassas
Rich Roisman – COG/TPB
Rick Canizales – Prince
William

Mark Kellogg – WMATA
Mariela Garcia-Colberg –
NVTC
Cynthia Porter-Johnson –
PRTC
Helen Cuervo – VDOT
Wendy Block-Sanford – City
of Fairfax
Doug Allen, VRE
Christine Hoeffner, VRE
Karyn Moreland- Fairfax
Calvin Grow-Leesburg

Tom Biesiadny – Fairfax
Noelle Dominguez - Fairfax
David Dickson – Sierra Club
Tracy Baynard -McGuire
Woods Consulting
Rob Whitfield – Dulles
Corridor Users Group
Bob Chase - NVTA
TL Cranmer –FC Taxpayers

I. Welcome and Introduction

Chairman Zimmerman called the meeting to order.

II. Approval of Summary of June 14, 2013 Meeting Minutes

There were no comments or corrections. The minutes were approved.

III. Summary of June 20, 2013 NVTA Meeting and Recommendations

Mr. Zimmerman reported that all recommendations of the PWIG were approved by the NVTA. He also reported that the NVTA approved the financial and legal group recommendations.

IV. Report from other Working Groups

The following updates were provided:

A. Financial Working Group (“FWG”) – Tom Biesiadny reported that the group met on Thursday June 27, 2013. The FWG meeting focused on the NVTA budget; they also had discussion with the towns about revenues. Also, The FWG worked to finalize the Memorandum of Understanding between NVTA, the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and Arlington County Treasurer for the payment of NVTA’s bills. Mr. Biesiadny also reported that the subcommittee on VRE/ metro issues has been meeting.

B. Public Outreach Working Group (“POWG”) – No update was given.

C. Legal Working Group (“LWG”) – Tom Biesiadny reported that the legal working group has been collecting documents for bond counsel.

D. Organizational Working Group (“OWG”) –Noelle Dominguez reported that the NVTA will pursue the appointment of an interim Executive Director who will assist NVTA for at least 6 months. The NVTA is working this internally. Also, Ms. Dominguez reported that the OWG will recommend that NVTA offices are housed at NVRC for the interim.

V. Review of Overarching Questions

A. Public Comments

Mr. Zimmerman explained that we received a total of 72 comments. Ms. Fioretti organized those comments for the committee. The PIWG received no comments that dealt with the proposed selection criteria.

1. Review of public comments

Jennifer Fioretti presented two packets of tables/ charts to the PIWG. The first chart is comprised of the 69 raw comments which include the comment, the project name, name of commenter, and a summary. She also handed out three more comments received on June 27th that were not yet added in the chart; bring the total comments to 72. She then proceeded to explain chart number two; a project specific list. This chart is a subset of the first, comprised of only project specific comments. She explained that some comments made, or emails received, mentioned more than one project so this was an attempt to separate all comments into individual projects. Project specific comments from the 69 raw comments totaled 194. Staff will amend the public comment forms to include the three additional comments and share with the group at the next PIWG meeting.

2. Organization of public comments

Jennifer Fioretti also handed out a sheet which summarized how many comments were received by each jurisdiction. She explained that the jurisdictional/agency staff may either respond to the commentator directly or send responses to the PIWG coordinator so they can be posted in the website. Also, the jurisdictional/agency staff should decide if they want to respond to each individual comment or respond to a group of comments that deal with the same issue in a paragraph. Comments and responses are due by July 7th, 2013.

B. Discussion of process to develop FY 2014 project list

Mr. Zimmerman explained that the PIWG needs to provide a shorter narrower list of projects to the NVTA. He noted that prior to June 20, 2013 he and Mr. Garczynski were in favor of recommending a project list that allocates somewhat less than the funding available in FY 2014. However, he also noted that the budgeted NVTA revenue is now \$204 million and the recommendations are already below the \$190 million, which means that the recommendations are less than the expected revenues. Mr. Zimmerman also explained that, should the Authority approve a FY 14 bond list drawn from the recommended projects, the FY 2014 PAYG list will naturally diminish because some projects will have been moved to the bond list.

1. Evaluation of project list

a. Review of existing criteria

Rick Canizales discussed some of the additional criteria for the bond project list. After discussion and further clarification, the members decided the criteria for bond validation projects shall be: twenty year useful life, multimodal, geographic balance, high ranking, project dollar size, leverages local, state, or federal funds. Although not required, all the jurisdictions and agencies will have until July 3rd if they wish to recommend projects for the bond project list. Projects will only be selected from the existing submission list of 48 projects.

b. Additional selection criteria?

Mr. Jim Maslanka suggested that members look at leverage as an important criterion for projects that go to the bond project list. This was agreed, as it is among the basic project criteria which are being applied for all projects under consideration.

c. Review Calendar and Discuss Dates for Next Steps

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated the dates for next steps:

July 3 – recommendations from jurisdiction to move project to bond list due.

July 7 – response to public comments due.

July 8 – next PIWG meeting at 2:00p.m.

C. Discussion of PCAC and TAC role in selecting projects for implementation?

1. Six-Year Program

Mr. Zimmerman reported that both the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC) met consistently and were involved in the selection process for the projects for TransAction 2040. It would be good to formalize their involvement for the Six-Year Program Plan.

Mr. Zimmerman explained that both of these bodies have had significant turnover. Ms. Monica Backmon is trying to set up meetings for both committees in July.

VI. Discuss Dates for Next Meeting

The next PWIG meeting will be held July 8th at 2:00 p.m. at the Fairfax County DOT, 4050 Legato Road, Conference Room 400 East and West, Fairfax County, Virginia.

VII. Meeting was Adjourned

Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

Public Comments and Responses: June 6, 2013 - June 27, 2013

Num	Comment	Project Name	Comment Type	Comment By	Summarized Comment	Response
001	I am a VRE (Manassas line) rider between Burke Center and Alexandria. I am glad that there is a plan to put a tunnel between the VRE/Amtrack station and the King St. Metro station. It will be a very nice convenience for me. But, honestly, is it really worth the money? With funds so tight and there being so many useful projects, I just have to wonder if saving several steps is a good reason to spend the money on this project. Perhaps it was decided long ago -- perhaps there's another good reason ... I don't know. Just seems like while it's a nice upgrade, someone somewhere might get better use of the money. Thanks for reading my input.	Alexandria VRE tunnel	Project	Andrew Lawrence	Supports project, but questions if it's worth the expense.	The pedestrian tunnel is a major component of the project and will benefit both passenger safety by providing a grade-separated crossing of the railroad tracks as well as enhancing the connection to the Metrorail station. However, another key component of the project is the modification of the east side platform at the VRE station. The platform improvements will allow passengers to board trains from either side of the platform instead of only one side as is currently the case. Expanding the boarding capacity of the station enhances service flexibility and minimizes station dwell times, which support maintaining on-time operations. As train operations at each individual station affect the operation of the entire line, expanding station capacity through this project increases the capacity and efficiency of the entire line, thus enabling more trains to operate on it.
002	My wife and I strongly support the extension of VRE service to the Gainesville-Haymarket area. The explosive growth in that area reflects an increasing demand for reliable public transportation. We plan to move that direction in the next two/three years as we downsize from our Burke home. Rail service would definitely support our plan to move to Gainesville-Haymarket. Thanks!	VRE Gainesville	Project	Terrance Murtaugh	Supports project.	Planning for the Gainesville-Haymarket extension is in the initial stages and full funding to construct the extension has not been identified. As such it is difficult to predict when the extension might be realized. The extension is important to VRE and we continue to seek out opportunities such as NVTA funds to advance the project.
003	I am a strong proponent of public transportation of all sorts. I think we have too many cars on the roads we have and too many big vehicles. People driving large SUVs by themselves make no sense. I think there should be more access to e-vehicles, and charging stations for those vehicles. Related to public transportation, I find it incomprehensible that there is no VRE station in the Centreville/Clifton area on the Manassas line. Given the population density in that area, there should be a station available. I also have no idea why there is no bus service along Route 123 between Fairfax Station and Fairfax City. Finally, weekend bus service could be more available and reduce private vehicular traffic throughout the NVA area.	N/A	General	Michael R. Emery	Supports more transit and electric car charging stations. Wants VRE in Centreville and buses on Rt 123.	Extensive studies were conducted when VRE was established to determine station locations. Please see the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission web site at http://www.thinkoutsidethecar.org/research/research_vre.asp for a number of those past studies. In addition, the issue of a VRE station between the Fairfax/Prince William County border and Route 123, in the vicinity of Centerville/Town of Clifton, has been analyzed several times by Fairfax County and VRE and the conclusions have all been the same; there are no viable or feasible sites for a VRE station along this stretch of track. This conclusion was made after a 9 month study that took into account VRE operational criteria, location of the station (i.e., north or south side of the tracks), environmental constraints, road access, cost factors, land-use and community concerns and potential ridership. The study report can be found on the NVTA web site.
004	To Whom It May Concern at NoVA Transportation Authority, As a resident of Falls Church (within Fairfax County), I would like to state that I am pleased to see two proposals in the FY'14 budget: *Falls Church-pedestrian access to public transportation, and *NVTC Transit alternatives for the Rt. 7 corridor. Given the congestion and amount of traffic on Rt. 7, and the surrounding area, I am in great favor of these two initiatives. Lastly, for future fiscal years, I would like to see the VRE add more trains to increase the frequency of their service (especially, to add one more later train on the Manassas Line morning trip into DC). Thank you for the chance to comment. Thanks, Heidi Bonnaffon	Falls Church ped access, NVTC Rt 7 AA	Multiple projects	Heidi Bonnaffon	Supports projects and requests increased VRE train frequency.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
005	Sir/Madam, Here are my thoughts concerning the upcoming Transit Projects. I noticed that you are discussing Rt. 28 in PWC only to Old Centreville Rod. What about from Old Centreville Rd. to Liberia Ave in Manassas City and then on to the PW Parkway and 234 Bypass? This is the main congested area that causes the PWC backups on Rt. 28 South in the evenings. The lights are not timed correctly. It seems that the concern is always for correcting and helping congestion in Fairfax County but not on the route cause which is the traffic through Manassas Park City and Manassas City areas. The proposal for the South side of Rt. 28 (after you get through Manassas City) is just another means to not assist the Manassas Park City or Manassas City residents. I would like to see the Virginia State Representatives drive the Dulles Corridor (both morning and evening rush hours) all the way between Loudon County and Manassas City for a two week period. Maybe then they would understand our pain. With the proposed extension of VRE to Gainesville and Haymarket, is there any plan to provide funds for an increase in the number of VRE trains? Currently, by the time the current trains pass through Manassas Park City, they start to become crowded. Adding stations in Gainesville and Haymarket will help alleviate traffic on Rt. 28 South of Manassas City. But it will increase the number of riders which will crowd the trains even more. Jennifer Jordan 9309 Laurie Court Manassas Park, VSA 20111 healinghands313@yahoo.com	Rt 28, VRE Gainesville	Multiple projects	Jennifer Jordan	Questions why Rt 28 widening does not include Manassas. Requests increased VRE train frequency.	Planning and analysis for the Gainesville-Haymarket extension will include an estimation of the potential new riders as well as impacts on existing service. At this time the level of service to support a Gainesville-Haymarket extension is unknown. A service/operating plan will be developed for the extension as well as a financial plan detailing both capital and operating costs. Once a decision is made to move forward with the extension and funding through construction has been committed, recommendations for funding additional service forwarded to the VRE Operations Board as appropriate.

006	Gail Parker advocated moving forward with rail projects that serve densely populated areas. Ms. Parker stated that rail travel is important in order to move people within and out of the metropolitan area. Rail conserves energy, reduces traffic, and improves the environment. Ms. Parker supports rail to Fort Belvoir and other rail projects listed in the newspaper.	N/A	General	Gail Parker	Supports more rail.	Comment noted.
007	Jerry King, Chair of the Alexandria Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, offered testimony in support of mass transit and multi-modal transportation projects, including projects that get people to mass transit. These include safe sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle facilities such as bike lanes, cycle tracks bike share, and bike parking.	N/A	General	Jerry King, Alexandria BPAC	Supports transit and multimodal projects.	Both the Authority and the JACC recognize that in order to begin to solve the traffic gridlock in Northern Virginia that strategic investments need to be made across all modes of transportation. The Authority has consistently sought to balance its investments and is not biased toward one particular mode of transportation relative to another. Rather, the Authority is focused on congestion relief and improvements to our transportation infrastructure, and is deeply committed to funding projects of all modes that accomplish those most efficiently and effectively. The primary goal is to develop and sustain a multimodal transportation system that supports our economy and quality of life. This requires that investments be fiscally sustainable, that we promote areas of concentrated growth, manage both demand and capacity, and employ the best technology, joining rail, roadway, bus, air, water, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities into an interconnected network.
008	Transportation Commission passed a motion to recommend the staff supported projects, with the understanding that the AMTRAK surface lot project was removed from the list. The motion included a recommendation that \$500,000 be added for bicycle parking design and implementation along major regional commute corridors.	Alexandria projects	Multiple projects	Alexandria TC	Supports all Alexandria projects, recommends \$500k for bike parking.	Comment noted.
009	There were no public attendees who spoke to these items at either meeting however both the elected governing body and the appointed Planning Commission were very supported of the projects and complimentary of the good work efforts to implement HB2313. City Council supports the full list of projects submitted by the City of Falls Church staff and directed Vice-Mayor Snyder to convey their consensus at the June 20th NVTA meeting. If project criteria selection and funding constraints prevents all City of Falls Church specific projects being funded Council is supportive of the Project Implementation Working Group recommendation project list. The Planning Commission unanimously endorsed the five projects submitted by City Staff for Fiscal Year 2014 funding by the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA). Those five projects are: (1) Phase II of the Transit Alternatives Analysis for Route 7, (2) Pedestrian Access to the Intermodal Plaza, (3) Bus Shelters along Broad Street, (4) Pedestrian Bridge on Van Buren Street, and (5) Pedestrian Signals at Columbia Street and North Washington Street. This action has been provided to City Council as well.	Falls Church projects	Multiple projects	Falls Church City Council and PC	Supports all Falls Church projects.	Comment noted.
010	Mr. Chairman, I'm president of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance. Speaking from a regional perspective, I want to commend Loudoun County and yourself for the FY-14 projects. It's very much in keeping with the spirit and the letter of how House Bill 2313. Each project has a very clear nexus to reducing congestion and making a regional transportation network work better. I wish I could say the same of some of the projects that some of the other jurisdictions have put forward. I think Loudoun County has been exemplary in the thought that it's put into this. Loudoun County's project choice is important, not only because of improved transportation for Loudoun County residents but also because it upholds the faith, hope and confidence of both the private and public sector leaders and individuals and organizations that called for new regional and statewide transportation funding for so many years. This creates exciting new opportunities for the region. It also brings with it great responsibility to make sure we choose wisely. The law doesn't require every available dollar be spent in this year. The alliance believes it would be more prudent to focus on a few projects in the region and save some of the funds for future years when we have had a chance to bring some of the other more important projects to us ready to go than it will be to look at this year's free for all that, well, we are not under any guidelines. Let's just spend it and then worry about the real criteria later on. We have good projects on the list. We have better projects right on the horizon. We think the taxpayers would appreciate it if we said we are going to spend money now but put -- save money for the next couple of years when we can invest it. We want to thank you for your leadership on the transportation authority over the years. It's a good common sense perspective to the debate. We appreciate it. Thank you.	N/A	General	Bob Chase, NVTAlliance	Supports Loudoun projects and suggests fewer larger projects.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.

011	<p>Good evening, Chairman York. I'm from Leesburg, Virginia. A couple of observations and comments I want to make. Thank you first for having this hearing. House bill 2313, I'm glad you have additional funding sources for transportation. I'm opposed to how Richmond came about with this bill increasing taxes on Virginia residents. I think they could have had a better bill and utilized existing revenue sources and not had to raise taxes. Putting that aside, there is one project that has been delayed for some reason. It would have helped with the Sycolin flyover and that's Miller Drive southeast on the airport property. That was originally intended to be completed around the time of the closing. As far as I know ground has not been broken on that. So if that could be expedited it would be beneficial for the Sycolin flyover alternate routes. The other projects that you have listed, one that I think, in my opinion was more important than the Sycolin flyover, is the Route 7 interchange. Having traveled on Route 7 frequently to get to work, that's a major bottleneck. I see it's on a schedule if there is a way to expedite or move that up in priority, that would be beneficial. Two projects that really I think have an impact on the quality of life at Loudoun County that are not on your list and I probably understand why they aren't. I want to bring them up anyway. The improvement to Route 15 north out of Leesburg up to the state line. I frequently take this route to go visit relatives in south Jersey. This is an area of Route 15 that's a major bottleneck. I believe there are restrictions on improving it any further than it is. I compare this to other sections of this 625-mile route from New York down to South Carolina. I frequented the Pennsylvania and New York portions of this. It's a modern two-lane in each direction divided highway. My thoughts are we can do better with relieving congestion heading north and south along that route on Route 15. The last point I want to make is we need another Potomac River crossing. It's been talked about extending Route 28. We have Maryland to deal with, Fairfax County and Loudoun County. But having just one route north of the capital beltway to get across into Maryland is a big impediment. Having grown up in southern New Jersey for instance, they have six Delaware River crossings. Six between Wilmington, Delaware, and Philadelphia. We have one. I think we can in Virginia, Loudoun County, and Maryland, work to make a crossing a reality in the future. Thank you very much.</p>	N/A	General	Dwight Dubliga	Likes transportation funding but wishes taxes hadn't been raised. Suggests additional future road projects, especially into MD.	Comment acknowledged.
012	<p>Chairman York, thank you for the opportunity to comment on behalf of the Washington Dulles Foreign Trade Zone as well as members of the Washington Airport Task Force. I will echo some of Tony's comments (Tony Howard). First priority is to ensure that this money is spent against the guidelines laid down and doesn't seep into cosmetic projects, bicycle trails that perhaps aren't going to help relieve congestion. Bicycles in urban areas are fine. One you had on your list is Route 606. I would absolutely endorse that as a priority. In supporting transportation improvements, we note that you have an aggressive program as a county to expand your commercial real estate tax base because that can help keep homeowners' real estate taxes down. What we would urge you to do is to apply this money to reduce congestion, to persuade NVTA to do the same. If the congestion is not cured, and if transportation not improved, I hate to say it, but you probably won't achieve your economic development goals which are so vital to everybody's pocketbook. Thank you.</p>	N/A	General	Leo Schafer, WDFTZ, WATF	Wants NVTA to follow guidelines, not do cosmetic projects. Supports Rt 606 project (says it is on the list but it is not). Opposes bike projects in suburban areas but says they're OK in urban ones.	Comment acknowledged.
013	<p>My name is Mark Miller. I'm a resident of Leesburg. I wanted to comment for the larger committee. One thing to note, the initial project was two sections of Belmont Ridge Road and whittled down to just one. If that one is done in conjunction with the Belmont Ridge Road interchange which includes, my understanding, the widening of Belmont Ridge to Gloucester Parkway, that would have two four lane sections that would bottleneck into two lanes going downhill. That would make the two lane curve around Loudoun County Parkway and Redskins Park like a walk in the park. Just on the record for other people that may not be as familiar with Belmont Ridge Road to one day hopefully encourage them if the two projects will be done to have the third missing link completed to avoid safety hazards going forward. One other comment or question, would be while I am all in favor of -- not in favor of more taxes but I am in favor of this bill because of what it does for the whole region as well as the commercial base in Loudoun County to develop what we want to develop. But the constitutionality of the bill on the whole is certainly going to be called into question as early as July. So I was curious what sort of provisions are in place as far as putting things in motion but then wondering if they come to a stop, if the constitutionality is questioned, then it probably gets started and then all of the sudden constitutionality is struck down. What sort of provisions does NVTA have so localities like us aren't left holding the bag on incomplete projects?</p>	Loudoun Belmont Ridge Rd	Project	Mark Miller	Wants all Belmont Ridge Rd projects to be completed at one to avoid temporary bottlenecks.	Comment acknowledged.
014	<p>I'm Pat Turner. I'm founder of Bike Loudoun County and also an avid cyclist. I want to point out when most new roads are built I believe VDOT is tasked with putting asphalt trails along the side of the roads. I assume that will be the case with these. Also, I note that the metro station -- I think they will require some bike and pedestrian access to them. Because there may not be enough parking spots in some of the garages. That will be not only economical but a healthy way for people to get to the metro stations. My other -- I have a question. How will these projects that have been identified by the NVTA and I was on the Technical Advisory Committee. We drew up Transaction 2040. How will these be integrated into the VDOT CTB six-year improvement plan? I don't know if they are on different levels or they try to integrate those or what.</p>	N/A	General	Pat Miller	Wants Loudoun's Metro stations to have bike/ped access.	Comment acknowledged.

015	Good evening, Chairman York. My name is Tony Howard. I am the president of the Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce. on behalf of the board of directors and 1100 members, thank you for the opportunity to speak on the NVTA proposed fiscal year 2014 project list. I want to commend you Chairman York for the opportunity to provide a forum for the business community and citizens to discuss the new transportation dollars to be made available through house bill 2313. Our chamber paid a vital role in the adoption of the historic legislation during the 2013 General Assembly session. We are excited about the millions of dollars this will generate to address the significant backlog of unfunded transportation project. We are excited about the additional \$300 million or more it will generate every year to improve mobility and safety here in Northern Virginia. This evening I'm pleased to convey the chamber's support for the project list the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors put in for inclusion in the priority list. Chairman, I would like to urge you and your colleagues to remain vigilant in ensuring that the NVTA does adhere to the mandate that all regional funds associated with 2313 be dedicated to projects that will provide the most congestion relief for the taxpayers investment. That will help ensure the additional Loudoun County projects and competition for the limited regional funding. One of the critical projects is the proposed Bi-county Parkway. I know there is considerable work that must be done before the project is ready for state or regional funds. The Bi-county Parkway is clearly of significant regional importance. By connecting major employment population centers in Loudoun County and Prince William we'll help reduce traffic congestion in the region, home to Virginia's fastest growing and most economically vibrant communities. I would ask you to urge the transportation authority to make the Bi-county Parkway a priority at the appropriate time and support a road to help improve the quality of life in our communities by getting traffic off the neighborhood roads, making it easier to get to work, school, church, and the grocery store and ultimately home to their families. Thank you for this opportunity to provide the chamber's insight into this important issue.	Bi-County	Multiple projects	Tony Howard, LCCC	Supports Loudoun's projects and wants Bi-County Parkway added.	Comment acknowledged.
016	I was in Loudon for their NVTA meeting and there were only eight comments that were all given by developers and business owners and over half those commenters wanted to add the bi-county parkway to the list.	Bi-County	New Project	Unknown	No request. Commenting on other public comments.	Comment acknowledged.
017	On the projects for PWC and Fairfax County, both have Route 28 projects, both to widen roads. The areas they are widening don't compare in traffic and congestion to other areas. Would like to see money allocated to finishing Route 28/I-66 interchange because it's regional. I'd hate to spend money on projects that don't provide much congestion relief.	Rt 28	Multiple projects	Mark (last name unknown)	Supports Rt 28 projects, but wants more for 28/66 interchange.	The project will improve capacity on a segment of Route 28 which currently carries over 60,000 vehicles per day, for an LOS F. The intersection/signal improvements will improve through travel as well as travel to other corridors such as Route 29 and New Braddock Road. The I-66/Route 28 interchange project is now funded at \$50 million in the VDOT 6-Year Program. This funding level will allow VDOT to move forward with design of the improvements.
018	Is there somewhere we can find a summary of the study that was done on Route 29 from Danville to Northern Virginia during Governor (now Senator) Kaine's administration?	Rt 29	General	Unknown	Requests info about unrelated Rt 29 study.	Comment acknowledged.
019	Is any of the money we're discussing going to be allocated to the bi-county parkway? In the next two years. Do you know where they would get the money for it?	New Project	New Project	Fred Greco	Asks if NVTA is funding Bi-County.	Comment acknowledged.
020	Thank you for hosting this meeting. If we're talking about critical priorities from a transportation perspective, we've got to talk about the east/west corridor. And we've got to talk about relieving congestion on 28, either getting into the east/west corridor or 66 getting them. You've talked about increasing VRE priority to get more rails to decrease traffic on the road which is a great suggestion. You've talked about widening some of these roads to relieve choke points, which is great. Those are great priorities. Then you get the people talking about the tri-county parkway, and they are looking ahead to the future. The people in CTB in Richmond said they were maybe going to look into funneling money from NVTA into this project and it is shortsighted for you to say you don't know about it because if the people in Richmond decide to use money from NVTA we're going to come back in larger numbers and complaining about how you said you didn't know what we were talking about. This is the dream road of people in Richmond and would help developers up there in Loudoun which might increase cargo traffic, there are definitely going to be more cargo trucks on a road that we paid for and built that the State's not going to reimburse us one dime for that section of 234 on the Prince William County Parkway which is going to be seized by this tri-county parkway and the worst part is that we keep hearing about misinformation and bad information, that somebody is not telling you the truth. There needs to be more clear information. If they do come asking for money I'd like you to bar the door to them.	New Project	New Project	Mac (last name unknown)	Opposes Bi-County. Wants east/west connections instead.	Comment acknowledged.
021	The question I'm about to ask I already know the answer to but I think it's one that people should be aware of. How is, with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, which is the Metropolitan planning organization for the urbanized areas which is about 150 square miles of the county and the two cities. How are you guys playing into with their consolidated work plan because they control a pot of money particularly there is going to be involvement from the beltway down and then the other parts through Fairfax.	N/A	General	Ray Beverage	Question about TPB process.	Comment acknowledged.

022	I'm really new to this world of transportation planning but regarding the bi-county parkway, I have been surprised to hear so many ways of trying to sell this road. What concerns me is that I don't understand the relationships that all these different organizations have to one another and which ones have more power than others. So my concern is that your organization could be used as a conduit to try to sneak money in to try to accomplish the building of this road. There has to be some reason that people are pushing so hard for this as it doesn't make any practical sense from where I live and my experience it's not going to help traffic, it's going to make it worse. It's going to hurt people and take their land. We're going to lose access and our way of life is going to be affected. Where can we see the relationship between these organizations laid out, like an org chart? I think that needs to be out there for us to see. So who do I ask to get this information? And who holds the power regarding the bi-county parkway?	New Project	New Project	Susan Bartlett	Asks who makes final decision for Bi-County and if NVTA will be used to build it.	Comment acknowledged.
023	I'm opposed to the bi-county parkway. In the slides you talked about a proposal to collocate your meetings with the CTB public hearings and I think that's a huge mistake. The public hearing process does not serve the public. It serves the agencies and their agendas. It's difficult to get credible information in a timely way. Combining the two would not allow enough time for locals to have their say.	New Project	New Project	Barry (last name unknown)	Opposes Bi-County. Opposes holding NVTA meetings at CTB.	Comment acknowledged.
024	Can you educate me on what is done to eliminate these disconnects between parties and groups and addressing regional planning? Because my reaction when I came in here was that Virginia and Maryland don't talk. I can tell that the regional planning is optional. There needs to be a switch in the am and pm for the timed lights on main roads and the feeder roads need to match because the bottleneck comes from the feeder roads. What can we do about this regional planning bottleneck? It's obviously missing an area. In Chicago they use the freight lanes. They told the freight trains to park outside the city during rush hour so the commuter trains could run.	N/A	General	Unknown	Wants MD and VA to plan together. Wants to prioritize rail tracks for passengers over freight at rush hour.	Comment acknowledged.
025	Delegate Anderson and I voted against this bill and I voted against the creation of the NVTA in 2002. There is a provision in the bill about maintenance of effort and Prince William has a higher maintenance of effort per dollar ratio than Fairfax County and that is a problem. What is disturbing to me, among other things, is that fixing 28 near Nokesville is of primary benefit to Fauquier who is not stuck with the taxes, we should focus on fixing congestion in the areas that are being taxed. And one more question, what are the rules for amending the agenda or the list of projects at the next meeting? Can someone make a motion to add the agenda? Why can't we take on projects that would benefit the higher tax areas instead of areas like Fauquier that has lower taxes? And how much money from NVTA is going into this project?	Rt 28	Project	Del. Marshall	Opposes Rt 28 project south of Manassas because it would serve drivers from outside NVTA region.	Comment acknowledged.
026	I'm going to follow up from some of what Del. Marshall said. All of us here are familiar with 28, with the rush hour and traffic flow there. Improving 28 on the border of Fauquier County and Prince William County, it's a great improvement, however if you look at it as a whole and the traffic flow during rush hour you still get a bottle neck and that's right there at Manassas Park at Old Centreville Road and US 29. And so, although you improve the southern part you still get this bottle neck, so therefore those residents that are going to be happy that in Prince William and Fauquier that this road has been expanded near their area, they're still going to get this traffic as they try to go up north and south on the way home. I was thinking your problem is the criteria and I hear data. We have data. I mean there are 54,000 to 63,000 cars that travel per day in that portion of road I just mentioned that needs improvement in Manassas Park and that's a lot of cars. However your criteria is skewed because you need to consider traffic flow and also the approach as a whole to the improvements you're making because you're improving one portion but you've got a bottle neck here. You're really not improving the road. And in addition you've got Orchard Bridge development that's coming along that's going to provide more cars and more traffic. So my question is, can you amend your criteria because that is the crux of the problem here. Well just because we don't specifically get it right or it's not doable, how about five lanes, how about synchronizing the signals in that area, how about not providing for opposite turns on the road during rush hour. Those are innovative ideas that can improve the traffic flow in that area. It doesn't seem like you're considering traffic flow in these plans. How am I going to tell my citizens that they're getting more for the money, their tax dollars, when we didn't even make the list so I can't give them a timeline for the future? A courtesy would have been to put our project on the list with a date but it isn't even on the list.	Rt 28	Project	Preston (first name or last name unknown)	Wants something along Rt 28 in Manassas Park.	Comment acknowledged.
027	I guess I just don't understand why 28 widening from the city of Manassas to Fairfax County line was not on anybody's radar screen. This has been a problem for 10 years and to say it's not on the comp plan, I have to say someone was asleep at the wheel. So I have to say I'm very disappointed in the County and whoever was in charge of that area for not doing that. You just stepped in, I know you just took over that region but it's bizarre. You've seen the people have had problems there for 10 years now, so it's an excuse and it's a bad excuse. It should have been on the comp plan and why it's not is a real question that I as a voter and as a citizen want to know. But I want to jump to something else. You know I heard you say how the NVTA is, that it forces us to think in a regional manner about everything. Everything I've heard here tonight just confirms that east/west is the commute and so the north/south, tri-county or bi-county or whatever you're calling it today is not a road that helps Prince William County commuters and I would ask one more question. You said that this forces us to think in a regional manner; well I would ask what Chairman York has said about the widening of 15 from the Prince William County line through Loudoun County and through Oatlands. Is he in favor of that so he can help commuters that travel that 15 have a better commute?	Rt 28	Multiple projects	Mary Ann Ghadban	Wants something along Rt 28 in Manassas Park. And asks if Scott York is in favor of widening Rt 15.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 14 NVTA funding.

028	For Route 28 you mentioned it's shovel-ready. The insistence on shovel-ready projects is like a monument to the sales tax. The better use of money is to change the traffic light timing and to align the traffic lights together. That's a relatively low cost solution to congestion. You can connect the traffic lights wirelessly or using a hard-line cable so the computers can control the traffic lights. You can use sensors. Talking about the east/west route, maybe we need another interchange on 66 to take the relief off of the smaller feeder roads. I know that would be a long term project. Another way is to build another secondary feeder road.	Rt 28	Multiple projects	Craig Summers	Thinks signal timing would work better on Rt 28. Wants more exits on I-66.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 14 NVTA funding.
029	Every one of these no build situations results in a disaster. I think we should tie the Manassas airport into the Dulles airport and tie them into the ports and possibly add another port in the Potomac for light products. Having said that, I'm in favor of the bypass but we need to make sure that government is responsible for mitigating the thousand or so people that are going to be affected adversely by this road in order to balance the hundreds of thousands of people that are going to benefit from it. Apparently it's faster to go down 50 than 66 because the construction has opened up. Do not close any more roads or paint any more yellow paint on pavement. HOV lanes are unconstitutional and terrible. We should set up a program where people are incentivized to ride with other people. Also see pdf p 50/50.	New Project	Multiple projects	Steve (last name unknown)	In favor of Bi-County. Hates HOV lanes.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 14 NVTA funding.
030	You've done an excellent job and I can understand why your priorities are what they are. I imagine we'll need more park & rides and commuter lots and I was wondering if we could bond that. It's important to have the HOV lanes and the bus transit to get traffic off the roads. I'm concerned about your Transaction 2040 because you do have a lot of those dream roads in there and bridges. One of the questions I have is about I-66 improvement on Rt 15. When Route 15 between 29 and 66 with the rail crossing, that portion doesn't get improves until 2035. That's what I saw. What about Balls Ford Road? We have the crossing there. Is that something that you would consider?	N/A	General	Unknown	Commends work. Asks if we can bond for park and rides. Asks if improvements to Balls Ford Rd are possible.	Comment noted. Project not submitted for consideration for FY 14 NVTA funding.
031	I have no problem with Phase 1. Phase 2 from the relocated Vint Hill Road to Fitzwater Drive will not relieve any congestion. There are about 40 houses there and only 3 new ones have been built in the last 30 years. How will that relieve congestion? If it's not going to go all the way to 29 there is no reason to displace all those people and take their land. Who is the proffer from? Is Avondale the only place they're coming from for Fitzwater? Do you think this is really worth it for 40 houses? Is that really a benefit to the people of Prince William? If it only stops at Fitzwater? I ask that the money be used for something else like VRE to Bealeton.	Rt 28	Project	Shirley (last name unknown)	Opposes Fitzwater Dr segment of Rt 28 expansion. Wants money to go to VRE instead.	Comment noted.
032	We need to build new track and add more trains that run more often and to more places. Adding more roads just creates more traffic and we need less. I encourage you to move the rail projects to first priority.	N/A	General	Gail Parker	Supports more rail.	Comment noted.
033	Thanks for hosting this meeting and I want to express my support for the VRE proposals to increase the number of coaches and to build a Gainesville station. I'm a commuter that drives from Gainesville to Manassas City to take the train and I feel Like that would really help. I'm really new to this world of transportation planning but regarding the bi-county parkway, I have been surprised to hear so many ways of trying to sell this road. What concerns me is that I don't understand the relationships that all these different organizations have to one another and which ones have more power than others. So my concern is that your organization could be used as a conduit to try to sneak money in to try to accomplish the building of this road. There has to be some reason that people are pushing so hard for this as it doesn't make any practical sense from where I live and my experience it's not going to help traffic, it's going to make it worse. It's going to hurt people and take their land. We're going to lose access and our way of life is going to be affected. Where can we see the relationship between these organizations laid out, like an org chart? I think that needs to be out there for us to see. So who do I ask to get this information? And who holds the power regarding the bi-county parkway?	VRE Gainesville	Multiple projects	Susan Bartlett	Supports VRE Gainesville. Opposes Bi-County.	Comment noted.
034	Thanks to Congressman Connelly for sending a representative. First question is about House Resolution 907. I'd like to know what role the NVTA and the local governments played in that study to look at the multi-rail versions in a multi-modal study to address the congestion in Northern Virginia. I would support that about the relief of chokepoint for trains.	Metrorail	General	Unknown	Supports Metro expansion.	Comment noted.

035	See pdf p 3/50.	Rt 28	Multiple projects	Jeremy Seltz	Opposes Fairfax's Dulles/50 and Dulles/McLearnen Rt 28 projects, says they are free-flowing now.	These projects provide additional capacity on the highly congested north-south Route 28 corridor that provides travel within and between three counties in northern Virginia, as well as connections to the Dulles International Airport and major east-west highways such as I-66, Route 50, and the Dulles Toll Road/Greenway. The current Average Daily Traffic count of 111,000 vehicles puts this segment of Route 28 at a Level of Service (LOS) E, which is very congested for freeway conditions. Route 28 is a significant technology corridor in both Loudoun and Fairfax County as well as an important access to Washington Dulles International Airport. With its links to Prince William County, Manassas and Manassas Park, and future link to the Metrorail Silver Line, it is well qualified for regional investments by NVTA. In addition, VDOT and its contractor have developed plans to implement this widening which are "ready to go." This project readiness criteria plays an important role in NVTA's FY 2014 project selection. Concerning the I-66/Route 28 interchange, VDOT is currently soliciting proposals for the design of improvements at the interchange (and nearby intersections). In addition, VDOT's draft Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) does include \$50 million in funding over the next 4 years toward this project. VDOT has concluded the planning study phase of this project, with information posted on their website: http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/northernvirginia/i-66_and_rt_28.asp
036	See pdf p 4-5/50.	Rt 28 and new	Multiple projects	Mark Scheufler	Opposes Fairfax's Dulles/50 and Dulles/McLearnen Rt 28 projects, and wants Centreville Rd/Rt29 portion to end at Fairfax line. Proposes 3 new projects: StoneRd/NewBraddockRd/I-66 off ramp, OldCentrevilleRd/ComptonRd roundabout, BallsFordRd/BullRdDr new connection.	NVTA is currently considering projects for FY 2014 funding, which means the projects should be able to proceed to construction or begin a new project development phase in FY 2014. The 3 new projects have not yet been studied, and are therefore not positioned to move ahead with implementation.
037	See pdf p. 6/50.	New	Project	Del. Dave Albo	Requests \$23.7 million for Rolling Rd widening. Wants project redesigned to reduce duplicate bike access.	Although the Rolling Road Widening project is in Transaction 2040, Fairfax County felt that it might be unlikely to rise to the level of "project readiness" for prioritizing FY2014 regional NVTA projects. In addition, until the final VDOT Six-Year Improvement Program was released in mid-June, the County had hoped that some additional state or federal funding might be applied to the project. Fairfax County is considering this project for the NVTA 30 percent funding that is returned to the local governments for FY2014. This would allow a design update which would better position the project for FY2015-2019 NVTA regional funding by improving project readiness. Fairfax County is using a cost-benefit analysis tool to evaluate a number of unfunded projects, including this section of Rolling Road. The results of the analysis and other factors will be used in preparing project recommendations for the Board of Supervisors' consideration this fall. These recommendations will include a number of different funding sources, such as the NVTA local funding and the County's commercial and industrial property tax for transportation.
038	See pdf p 19/50.	Rt 28, Rt 1, VRE Gainesville	Multiple projects	Robert Clapper, PWCC	Supports congestion reduction. Supports following projects in PW: Rt 1 Featherstone, Rt 28 Fitzwater, VRE Gainesville	Comment noted.
039	See pdf p 28/50.	N/A	General	Barbara Varvaglione	Supports pedestrian projects, especially Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax Co, and Fairfax City project lists.	Comment noted.

040	See pdf p 30/50.	New	Project	Kevin Raymond	Wants interim VRE stop at Sun Cal development.	VRE is working with both Sun Cal and CSX, who owns the railroad right-of-way, to come to agreement on a station at the Potomac Shores development. Ultimately CSX must grant permission for a station stop at that location.
041	See pdf p 32/52.	New	Project	George Fitzelle	Wants wifi on VRE trains.	VRE continues to explore options to provide WiFi service on its trains. Through a number of different tests and studies have been done as noted, we have discovered several areas along the tracks we use where a signal cannot be received. Until a provider is able to offer continuous service, we will not offer WIFI on our trains.
042	See pdf p 36/50.	VRE Gainesville	Project	Kennth Knarr	Supports VRE Gainesville. Wants more transit in Fairfax, PW, Loudoun generally.	Extension of the Orange Line to Gainesville, while included in TransAction 2040, is not a project for which FY2014 funds would be timely.
043	See pdf p 42-43/50.	Potomac Yard Metro, W&OD Trail	Multiple projects	Del. Randall Minchew	Opposes Potomac Yard Metro EIS and W&OD Trail lighting. Wants strict adherence to congestion test.	Comment noted.
044	See pdf p 46/50.	New	Multiple projects	Marie Potter	Wants improved exit at Dulles/Rt28, left turn lane at LoudounCtyPkwy/Shelhorn, removal of barriers at right turn lanes, lower tolls on Greenway, elimination of all HOV lanes.	Congestion on the DTR ramp to northbound Route 28 is likely attributable to weaving movements between the DTR and Innovation Interchanges. If the commenter could be more specific about the concerns at this ramp, the County and VDOT can discuss whether improvements can be made. (next 4 comments are outside Fairfax County) HOV Lanes are an important option for encouraging carpooling. HOV lanes work best when physically separated from general traffic. Driver education on their proper use and police enforcement are critical in areas where the lanes are only separated by striping.
045	See pdf p 47/50.	Rt 28	Multiple projects	Cheryl Rowland	Wants Rt 28 signals retimed in am, better "service to train", and asks why Manassas Park Rt 28 project didn't meet req'ts.	Concerning the I-66/Route 28 interchange, VDOT is currently soliciting proposals for the design of improvements at the interchange (and nearby intersections). In addition, VDOT's draft Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) does include \$50 million in funding over the next 4 years toward this project. VDOT has concluded the planning study phase of this project, with information posted on their website: http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/northernvirginia/i-66_and_rt_28.asp
046	See pdf p 48/50.	Many	Multiple project	Wendy Kaczmer	Supports VRE Gainesville, wants I-66 widened to Haymarket, wants I-66/28 interchange improved, wants Rt 15 widened from 66 to Rt 7. Opposes Bi-County.	Comment noted.
047	See pdf p 49/50.	New Project	New Project	Jonathan Way	Wants southern end of Bi-County to be at Godwin Dr.	Comment noted.
048	I am writing on behalf of one of our constituents who attended the June 26th meeting at the Fairfax County Government Center. She attended the meeting but is not able to email comments by the deadline, she very much enjoyed the projects that were proposed but would like for all to keep in mind the challenges people with disabilities and the elderly may face.	N/A	General	Alexandra Dixon	Asks to keep in mind disabled/elderly needs.	Comment noted.
049	I would like to submit my comment to support the Alliance's testimony regarding their project list that have the greatest significance as well as the caution to disregard projects, like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways being that they will not have a significant impact on the regional traffic congestion.	N/A	General	Randy Brown	Only supports large impact projects. Opposes bus stops, pedestrian projects, other small things.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.

050	<p>I want to commend the NVTA for putting together a reasonable first priority list for spending the share of Transportation funds that will be coming to Northern Virginia region. The structure of the priority list makes sense and addresses the needs of the localities within the constraints of what is available to spend. The use of spending to speed up the RT 28 from Linton Hall to Fitzwater to complete the construction sooner and design RT 1 from Featherstone Rd to Mary's Way is commendable. It is disappointing to see many routes like RT 1 segmented and separated in VDOT SYIP, and not get funding as it has in the past. These allocations are a great way to accelerate needed improvements. However, in the case of the RT 28 improvements the NVTA and PWC should evaluate the necessity of widening the roadway to four lanes where intersection and spot improvements might give the same outcome without jeopardizing 40 homes. There are many needs coming down the pike and considering the cost (\$580,000) of one bus to serve the PRTC Gainesville area, and the need of more park and ride lots along the future improved I-66. All of these future needs will have to be addressed holistically. The Balls Ford Rd park and ride lot is about to come on line and the need for others in the I-66 corridor will probably cost at least a \$1 million dollars to acquire land, as it has in Loudoun County. Removing just 7% of the single occupancy vehicles has been shown to improve the flow of traffic and we must do what we can to make it attractive for drivers to choose alternative modes of travel. With the Tier I Environmental Impact Statement on the I-66 improvements moving forward there will be many opportunities for regional funding in the future and we hope you will continue to work cooperatively and fiscally responsible. One of the concerns that I have is how you have addressed future transportation in the TransAction 2040 Plan. There is heavy emphasis on routes that are not planned other than as dream roads, e.g., N-S CoSS, Eastern and Western Washington Bypass with Potomac River bridges. Yet, you are not meeting the opportunities to improve existing roads that are congested and need to be improved now. For example, RT 28 from Manassas to Fairfax County Line. If existing RT 28 is widened it would help to get traffic moving towards I-66 and Dulles region and provide a lane for HOV and bus rapid transit. Another example, there will be pressing needs for overpasses for railroad crossings, specifically the widening of Balls Ford RD and RT 15 between RT 29 and I-66. I understand the interchanges are being slated for improvement and hopefully the railroad crossings can be improved as well. In the latter case, the widening of RT 15 in that area is not planned to be 4 laned until 2035 and that is something the community needs now. These are just a few suggestions I just wanted to present for possible funding scenarios where the NVTA can help accelerate needed projects in the future. Thank you.</p>	Rt 28 and new	Multiple projects	Philomena Hefter	<p>Supports the list of projects. Asks if widening Rt 28 is really necessary, or if spot improvements would be just as good. Says more park and rides are needed. Wants focus on improving existing routes, not building new ones. Wants Rt 15 widened now.</p>	Comment noted.
051	See pdf entitled "051.pdf"	Rt 28, Bi-County, more	Multiple projects	Leo Schefer, WATF	<p>Endorses NVTAlliance's comments. Wants more rigorous analysis and fewer larger projects. Wants completion of Silver Line, Dulles Loop, Rt 606, elimination of Rt28 and Rt66 congestion, Bi-County, other chokepoints</p>	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.

052a	<p>Thank you for the opportunity of supplementing the written comments I made on June 7 and oral testimony on June 20 at the hearing regarding the subject proposals. Unfortunately you did not include my written comments of June 7 in your public comments packet distributed on June 20, so I have included them herewith. I have reviewed all of the extensive materials you added in your web site regarding individual projects. The staff clearly worked very hard to produce all of the materials, and I appreciate it. Nevertheless working hard in this case does not mean working smart. The Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance appropriately says the following on its web site regarding use of the funds from HB2313: "Unwise Choices May Not Turn the Region to Dust But Most Certainly Will Compromise a Tremendous Opportunity To Build the Transportation System We Need And the Public Confidence Necessary to Invest More in the Future." As a university trained civil engineer with an MBA, I believe a rational and normal first step in analyzing regional needs would be to look at current congestion and accident locations and establish priorities based on needs for improvements. The Virginia Department of Transportation did this in their 2020 report. You can see it at the following Internet site: www.virginiadot.org/projects/resources/NorthernVirginia/NOVA_20_20Plan_summ.rpt.pdf. Base line analyses are missing. I have included the key maps from the 2020 report. It seems you should have made similar maps, along with supporting data and a report update for the public. On Annex I, you can see the situation that existed in 1999. The "Congestion [was] concentrated in core and inner jurisdictions (east of Route 28)." The roads with "One hour or more of stop-and-go traffic" are marked in red. The roadways in gray were "occasionally congested;" this means "stop and go" also. Since then the congestion has grown greater. I recommend you and VDOT provide an update. Accident / crash data should also be included. A major cause of congestion according to VDOT is accidents. Generally accidents during commuting hours are caused by impatient drivers. Once the data and maps are assembled, then an analysis of the worst (priority) areas should be done. VDOT and the State Police have this sort of basic information and it is shown on the VDOT web sites. It is strange that you presented us with a grab bag of projects with no overall analysis. It frankly seems like Political Pork, rather than rational regional analysis and establishment of logical priorities with clear methodology. Your undocumented presentation of project data raises the question of whether politicians have chosen projects that help their own or friends commuting or possible contracts to cronies. Given the referenced media release that lists expenditure by jurisdiction, rather than by project, is the expenditure allocation based on jurisdiction size and influence rather than regional commuting priority considerations? Annexes II and III show what the congestion patterns would be with \$4 billion of expenditures versus \$13 billion. These show the alternatives and how much it would cost to substantially alleviate congestion. You show no overall impact of your project proposals. The project list gives no realistic analysis.</p>	N/A	General	Thomas Cranmer	Opposes transit projects and wants more analysis on all projects. Wants a road expansion on Rt 7. Requests response.	<p>The widening of Route 7 from Jarrett Valley to Reston Avenue is one of the Tysons-wide Roadway Improvements included in the Tysons Amendment to the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, approved by the Board of Supervisors in June 2010. Since that time, the Board, the Planning Commission, County staff and others have been working to develop a funding plan for all of the transportation improvements in the comprehensive plan amendment, including the Route 7 project. On October 16, 2012, the Board of Supervisors endorsed a funding plan for the improvements in the Tysons Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Subsequently, on January 8, 2013, the Board approved three revenue sources that are part of the plan. At that time, the plan included \$200 million in "unidentified state and federal funding" over a 40 year period (an average of \$5 million per year). When the plan was adopted, there was no source for these funds. With the passage of HB2312, there are new sources of transportation funding for Northern Virginia. County staff believes that the \$200 million in "unidentified state and federal funding" can be addressed by either the 70 percent of this funding that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority retains, the Fairfax County portion of 30 percent of the new funding that is transferred to the local governments or with additional funding the Commonwealth Transportation Board has to allocate. As a result of the Board of Supervisor's action and the passage of HB 2313, County staff considers all of transportation projects in the Tysons Amendment to Comprehensive Plan as funded. Specifically, the Route 7 project is included in the first timeframe (FY 2013 and FY 2027) for the Tysons-wide Roadway Projects. It is scheduled to be complete by FY 2025. VDOT is involved in project planning now which will continue in FY 2014. (response continues on next line)</p>
052b	<p>The congestion relief cited does not provide any sources and backup data and thus could have been picked out of the air. Alternatives should be analyzed like the 2020 study did. Total cost is \$1.2 billion, with 74% going to Metro projects. It is surprising you did not show the total cost of projects on the Excel spread sheet. As I noted in my testimony on June 20, when the camel puts its nose in the tent, you have the whole camel in the tent. You just showed the camel's head with 2014 expenditure totals, rather than the total costs for the projects. Excel makes it easy to make totals. Therefore I did it on Annex IV. You also did not provide increased ridership data to show how much congestion would be alleviated. Since only about \$300 million is going to road projects (one-third of which is for Route 28), this is a paltry sum compared to the \$4-13 billion proposed in the 2020 study. Based on these figures it seems the projects you are proposing would have minimal impact on congestion. Why should the bulk of the expenditures for Northern Virginia go to transit projects versus road improvements? This appears to be a matter of ideology, rather than economics. Virginia has published guidelines for the economic appropriateness of transit projects and you don't mention them. Projects left out are not discussed, like widening Route 7. Annex II shows the massive congestion that still would result with a \$4 billion investment. You are not reviewing most of the roads shown in Annex II. For example, Route 7 has massive congestion from Reston Avenue to Tysons during commuting hours. It is not mentioned in your comments. Annex V shows VDOT is doing \$5 million of studies now about Route 7. Then no, repeat no, expenditures are budgeted for the rest of this decade. Why haven't you mentioned Route 7 or any of the other congested areas and what is required to reduce congestion? Cost numbers are not justified or explained. None of the project costs show sources and methods of calculations. Government cost projections are generally underestimates for projects. The Silver Line costs were estimated at \$1.9 billion in 2001 and now are more like \$7 billion when garages and access roads are taken into account. Fairfax DOT estimated the cost of Route 7 at \$160 million until I worked with VDOT and the result was \$300 million as a projected cost as a 2012 estimate.</p>	N/A	General	Thomas Cranmer	Continuation of previous comment.	<p>(continued response from above) NVTA's current funding effort is only addressing FY 2014. NVTA will be developing a longer-term capital program beginning later this year. The VDOT Six Year Plan has yet to include all the County funding for Tysons-related projects or any of the new funding approved for NVTA. The Six Year Plan is amended every year. By the time the FY 2015-2020 Six Year Program is considered by the CTB in June 2014, there will be more definitive information about the Route 7 project. Depending on how far VDOT proceeds with the design, the project may be ready for right-of-way money in the next year or two.</p>

052c	<p>Economics of transit are not discussed. How much of the operating costs of transit are being covered? MWATA (Metro) has reported to its board that only 67% of operating costs (e.g. electricity, train drivers and sweepers' salaries) are covered by fares. None of the Capital Needs are covered by fares and have to be made up by taxpayers, most of whom do not ride the Metro. Before the Metro was built, 16.7% of people in the Metropolitan Washington area took buses. After the Metro was built, 16.8% of people in the area took rail and buses. This is obviously a tiny change for a massive expenditure. People generally prefer driving cars. Why shouldn't WMATA and VRE pay for their own expenditures? You haven't discussed the basis for a decision to subsidize WMATA and VRE. By putting expenditures in a lot of different pots, people can't see real total project and organizational costs. There should be more project transparency. WMATA has yet to provide ridership projections on the Silver Line. Metro ridership has been declining and flat in the last three years, due in part due to lack of parking, accidents, fires, inoperative escalators and other mismanagement. The economics of the Innovation garage are not discussed. The cost per car is roughly \$40,000 per car parking space for the \$89 million project. The Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority offered to build parking at \$34,000 per car. The construction manager for Loudoun County told me they are building a garage at a high school for \$18,000-20,000 per car. How much is going to be charged as a parking fee? What is the total annual revenue and expense projected to be? What is the payback period and rate of return for the garage? What are the payback periods and rates of return for any of the projects? In conclusion it appears that you are rushing to conclusions about a project list without adequate analysis and public knowledge of what you are planning. The risks of overruns and probable lack of reduction of congestion relief are high and not analyzed. Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please provide a response to these points.</p>	N/A	General	Thomas Cranmer	Continuation of previous comment.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
053	<p>Re Your Excel "Proposed Project List for Consideration for FY2014 Funding" That includes Total Project Cost as well as FY2014 Funding Required, dated 5/24/2013. The major problem in both of the subject documents is they do not conform to Virginia law HB 599, approved April 18, 2012, Code of VA 33.1-13.03:1. An evaluation is required to "provide an objective quantitative rating for each project according to the degree to which the project is expected to reduce congestion and to the extent feasible, the degree to which the project is expected to improve regional mobility in the event of a homeland security emergency. Such evaluation shall rely on analytical techniques and transportation modeling..." This is supposed to start January 1, 2013 under the law. Examples of such an evaluation and analytical techniques are the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Tier Interstate 66, From US Route 15 in Prince William County to I495 in Fairfax County dated 12 February 2013. Table 2-7 Shows Projected Number of Hours of Congestion on I-66 from 2011 to 2040 in each direction. The Statement shows Metrorail with periods highly congested (100-120 people per car). The Statement shows crash rates, such as 100 crashes per 100 million vehicle miles traveled. A key measure that should be provided, as illustrated in the Statement is the cost per incremental person accommodated. See Evaluation Table 3-4 of the Statement, with an evaluation of Capacity Improvement Scenarios. Alternatives should be considered, especially in the case transit with heavy rail, vs light rail, vs bus types, vs doing nothing. The World Bank and others have been doing rate of return analyses for 40 years to facilitate ranking of projects. VDOT and NVTA should do such rate of return analyses for each project. Without numerical evaluations, the projects just appear to be the normal Political Pork wish lists. Without numerical analyses, it is impossible to comment rationally. One project that strangely is omitted from all of the lists is expansion of Route 7 in Fairfax from Reston Avenue to Lewinsville Road (Jarrett Valley Drive) and beyond. Although work is being done on evaluating intersections and a traffic study is supposed to be completed in October 2013, only \$5.0 million dollars is allocated for FY2014 and nothing more through FY2019. \$25.0 million is "Required After FY2019." However the \$25 million is only for preliminary engineering. The latest estimates I have obtained from VDOT are that the right of way would cost \$50 million and the construction would be \$220 million for a full project cost of \$300 million. Why didn't any of the projections show Route 7 and the timing, if ever, for the widening?</p>	N/A	General	Thomas Cranmer	Wants more analysis, wants widening of Rt 7.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
054	<p>I would like to strongly endorse the other NVTA (Northern Virginia Transportation Alliances') priority list. * Route 28 improvements (Fairfax, Loudoun and Prince William Counties). * Route 659/Belmont Ridge Road (Loudoun). * US Route 1 (Prince William). * Metro Orange Line Power Upgrade to accommodate 8-car trains. * Purchase of more VRE passenger cars instead of proposed platform improvements. These projects give us broad benefit on a regional level and will demonstrate to the citizens and taxpayers of Virginia that the Authority has worked to put the long sought after new funding to the best possible use.</p>	New	Multiple projects	Richard Entsminger	Wants a different set of projects. Includes some of the proposed road projects and a new project.	While adding more coaches to the VRE fleet will provide additional seating capacity, VRE is a system of components: trains, stations, parking, track, storage yards, etc. Train operations at each individual station affect the operation of the entire system. Expanding platform capacity by constructing second platforms or extending existing platforms not only provides room for more passengers and longer trains to use the station but also increases the efficiency of train operations over the entire system by minimizing station dwell times and providing flexibility to board passengers from either side of the railroad right-of-way. This, in turn, increases the capacity and efficiency of the entire line, thus enabling more trains to operate on it.

055	Are there any plans to do away with the traffic lights at the intersection of I-66 and Rt 28 in Centreville? It seems like all of Rt 28 now has overpasses with the exception of this one very congested intersection.	Rt 28	Project	Keith Holtermann	Asks if traffic lights at Rt 28 / I-66 interchange will be removed.	Concerning the I-66/Route 28 interchange, VDOT is currently soliciting proposals for the design of improvements at the interchange (and nearby intersections). In addition, VDOT's draft Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) does include \$50 million in funding over the next 4 years toward this project. VDOT has concluded the planning study phase of this project, with information posted on their website: http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/northernvirginia/i-66_and_rt_28.asp
056a	After the Authority Hearing on June 20, The Alliance "urged the Authority to apply more rigorous objective analysis to the proposed project list". I am addressing what I think should be done to be truly professional work and to speed up the process to rank ALL improvements based on congestion relief. The main purpose for building most highway and transit infrastructure is to reduce congestion for the short run (like 2020) and for the long run (2040). Each highway and transit improvement in the TransAction 2040 Plan hopefully has some congestion relief and the degree to which it reduces congestion per cost is one way to rank all of them assuming we cannot afford to build them all. While there are other reasons to consider in ranking, the first test should be to rank them based on congestion relief per cost. When we did this at VDOT NOVA a few years ago with test software we developed we found that 30% of the funds could reduce about 70% of the regional congestion. If we do this same analysis today, the remaining 70% of the funds that do little for congestion relief could be diverted to other modes; like bike, walk, safety, or more buses, more train cars, etc. Here is my proposal: Run the MWCOG model to get future trip tables for forecast years by mode based on no new highways but transit being in place as in the CLRP. Next, add one of the 100+ highway improvements in the TransAction 2040 Plan to the No-Build network (Base network) and see how many vehicle-hours of delay at LOS F are reduced regionally from this one improvement. Next, do the same for another improvement to the Base Network. Repeat this process over and over for all 100+ projects to see how much regional congestion is reduced per dollar cost for each of the 100+ projects. Next, take the project that has the most congestion relief per cost and add this to the Base Network and repeat this process for the remaining 99+ projects. This would result in hundreds of thousands of computer runs. Each computer run would involve updating the network and running a traffic assignment to the network and calculating the regional vehicle-hours of delay reductions at LOS F per cost. To do this manually would be impossible because it would take years to do with current staff and/or consultants. We had developed a super model to do all these calculations which still took many, many computer hours to run because of the trillions of calculations. All we had to do was flag each of the 100+ projects with a project number and let the computer do the rest. This is like turning over the state of the art process for ranking based on congestion relief per cost to robots. This super model will require some improvements to address HOV lanes, HOT lanes and tolls in its capacity restrained traffic assignment algorithm but these improvements could be accomplished in a timely manner and would give us a vastly improved process in the state of the art of ranking projects based on congestion relief per cost.	N/A	General	Bill Mann	Wants much more extensive computer modelling to target only the most effective road projects, allowing the majority of funds to be used for transit and multimodal projects.	The proposed approach is useful as a pure analytical ranking exercise. Analyzing the Northern Virginia region's multimodal system however is complicated and requires the use of qualitative judgement to balance the mechanical process. The commentator's proposed process does not address synergistic (or competing) effects of certain project combinations, which is especially important given the corridor level analytical framework that NVTA has taken from TransAction 2040. A modified stepwise approach was used for the modeling and evaluation of projects in TransAction 2040. In addition, the Authority has provided a 5 page explanation of the "Project Selection Methodology" used by the Project Implementation Working Group to evaluate the 48 projects submitted to the Authority for FY 2014 regional funding. This document has been posted on the Authority's website.
056b	The advantage of using this model, once software improvements are done, is we could easily rerun it many times for each jurisdiction or each magisterial district, etc. to test as many changes as we want. For example, let's say a County Supervisor has project 36 as a preferred project but the model says this project produces very little congestion relief. We could study the problem and find that because Project 3 went first it stole most of the LOS F from Project 36. We could re-group Projects 3 and 36 as one project and rerun the model or we could alter project 36 in some way to improve its ranking. Modified 36 might now preempt Project 3 from ranking high. Modifying projects to increase their benefit-cost ratios is true planning and needs to be done to get the most bang for the buck for this region. The point is we can rerun the model as many times as we want by just modifying a few network updates. This would be a very powerful tool, once modified/repared making it easy to test tons of ideas to get the best possible transportation infrastructure construction strategy.	N/A	General	Bill Mann	Continuation of previous comment.	See response to comment #056A.

057a	<p>Please consider my following comments. I attended the NVTA meeting at the Fairfax County Courthouse on June 20th. As you decide which of the 33 proposed projects should be retained on the short list, you need to keep the following in mind: What was the cost/benefit analysis for each option? Should we upgrade using corridor basis selection? Is the project shovel ready or not? What is the expense of each project? Are there adequate funds available? Pay cash or float a bond? How soon will one relieve congestion vice another? With these competing questions/answers in mind, one also needs to keep in mind: Right-of-way acquisition / engineering costs are a large expense with no congestion relief. Right-of-way acquisition / engineering costs take considerable time and provide no congestion relief. Just because something is shovel ready doesn't mean it should move to the top of the list if a cheaper and/or better option/s will be available in the near future. Will land acquisition be cheaper or more expensive in the future? Will bonds be cheaper or more expensive in the future? Will any option selected simply create traffic problems somewhere else and therefore have a zero gain effect to traffic flow? Which upgrade/s will create and encourage more jobs in the region vice simply more homes and traffic congestion? Which upgrade will save the most lives? If I were in your shoes I would look at these issues, and any other issues you can think of, and give each project being considered a weight of between -5 and +5 to each and ever one of the above questions. After weighing each project, those with the highest value become the highest priorities. Comments on the reason for the value selected could be shared between members of the Authority and agreed upon before the totals are determined. I looked at the above list I created and then weighed it against either a light or heavy rail option. A paradigm shift away from just more and wider roads feeding into existing overcrowded roads which in turn require more and more upgrades and more and more tax dollars is just a vicious cycle. Rail, combined with cluster housing around businesses and entertainment seems to be the obvious answer. We have a unique opportunity to create a more efficient transportation infrastructure in relatively undeveloped areas of Loudoun and Prince William counties or just more of the same inefficient network. Railroads would fund transportation routes vice the taxpayers which would free up significant transportation funds to improve our existing inadequate road system while at the same time taking care of natural transportation growth. VDOT is estimating the proposed Bi-County Parkway will carry 60,000 vehicles/day by 2040. Much of this traffic will be freight traffic traveling North/South to avoid the existing traffic congestion on the Dulles Toll Road, 495 Beltway, and I-95 corridor. There are already 24 traffic lights on Rt-234(Dumfries Road) from the Prince William Parkway to I-95/Rt.1 intersection. With this much additional traffic on Dumfries Road the number of traffic lights needed would nearly double accommodate individual homes/businesses directly on the road, the existing housing developments and soon to be a 4th school (with 25 m.p.h. speed limit) to safely access this Parkway.</p>	N/A	General	Gary O'Brien	Opposes road widenings. Wants more transit. Especially along Bi-County.	Both the Authority and the JACC recognize that in order to begin to solve the traffic gridlock in Northern Virginia that strategic investments need to be made across all modes of transportation. The Authority has consistently sought to balance its investments and is not biased toward one particular mode of transportation relative to another. Rather, the Authority is focused on congestion relief and improvements to our transportation infrastructure, and is deeply committed to funding projects of all modes that accomplish those most efficiently and effectively. The primary goal is to develop and sustain a multimodal transportation system that supports our economy and quality of life. This requires that investments be fiscally sustainable, that we promote areas of concentrated growth, manage both demand and capacity, and employ the best technology, joining rail, roadway, bus, air, water, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities into an interconnected network. The Bi-County project was not submitted for consideration by the Authority for FY 14 funding.
057b	<p>Truck traffic mixed with commuter and other vehicles naturally slow traffic as trucks can neither brake nor accelerate as quickly as cars. Add to that, traffic lights every quarter to half mile and you have a recipe for total gridlock like Rt.1 is currently experiencing! If the Bi-County Parkway is to be a freight solution, it won't work on the Dumfries Road portion of this proposed North/South transportation link. An alternative rail option would have the following benefits: Avoid adding Loudoun county commuters to already congested Rt.66. Need considerably less land acquisition/expense. Eminent domain guidelines for rail links avoid lengthy/expensive legal battles. Connect Dulles and Manassas Airports with a commuter/freight/business connection. Connect Manassas to the Silverline Metro service at Dulles Airport. Promote visitors to the Manassas Battlefield tourism via rail from Dulles Airport. Create freight/warehouse/retail businesses and associated jobs in support of the multiple rail terminals. Have significantly less impact on the Rural Crescent than a 600 foot wide limited access highway. Allow and promote local farmers to quickly get their produce to the airport or points beyond. Take freight (trucks) off existing local roads to improve traffic flow and safety. Significantly reduce transportation costs for local businesses, increasing their bottom line as well as encouraging new businesses into the region. Take many trucks off I-81, I-95 and the 495 Beltway improving traffic flow/safety while providing a safer route for hazardous cargo. Would not restrict Mid-county home owners from having easy road access to and from their properties. A simple rail crossing with an occasional train is far less restrictive and intrusive than a 6-lane limited access highway! Would take commuters off the highways relieving growing traffic congestion; wasted expensive fuel; and reduce air pollution/greenhouse gases. Fewer vehicle miles traveled means less gasoline wasted; less property damage/injuries; and lives lost to highway deaths. More quality time available for families vice long commutes sitting in traffic jams. Encourage business exchange between Prince William and Loudoun counties. Provide new Loudoun county commuters with another commuter option South and East to Washington D.C. via the VRE. Add significant revenue stream to Norfolk-Southern and also the CSX rail companies. Would create new jobs at, and around, Dulles Airport as freight traffic increased. Could become part of the existing Norfolk-Southern freight rail connection from Manassas to the Virginia Inland Port at Front Royal, Virginia, which falls under the Virginia Port Authority. Could connect to the existing passenger/freight lines running parallel to I-95. One path for this option, West of Quantico Marine Base, has already been studied by VDOT years ago as one of the "Outer Beltway" road option. It would not require the same identical path; however, since some study has already been completed on this option it would reducing costs/time to develop. A shorter alternative could follow Bristow Road, past the Manassas Airport, and Joplin Road to Triangle to connect to the Norfolk-Southern line/station at Quantico.</p>	N/A	General	Gary O'Brien	Continuation of previous comment.	See above and below.

057c	<p>With all the above benefits, and more, WHY do we continue to only think MORE and wider inefficient roads!?! In Maryland, MARC line ridership is already up 4.3% compared with April 2012. "More than 25,500 passengers ride the line between Perryville and Union Station in Washington, D.C." Like the baseball move "Field of Dreams" says "Build it and they will come." Additionally, to quote Chris Miller, president of the Piedmont Environmental Council: "There are only so many pounds of freight that you can move on an airplane in an economical way. I think it is less than one-tenth of one percent of freight in Virginia comes by air. It is going to be an important economic activity but it is not the major way to move freight in the United States." Thank you for your considerable time and efforts in finding and promoting economical and safe transportation solutions.</p>	N/A	General	Gary O'Brien	Continuation of previous comment.	<p>VRE is currently preparing a System Plan that will include looking at commuter rail travel markets in new corridors. While a detailed analysis is outside the scope of the plan, a preliminary review of potential demand for the suggested rail alignment(s) relative to projected regional travel patterns can be considered. While the Perryville to MARC line ridership cited is large, it also reflects service on the MARC Penn Line, the systems busiest line, which serves the Baltimore and Washington, DC central business districts as well as other regional destinations such as BWI and College Park. It is uncertain that a Dulles to Triangle rail alignment would include the number of employment and housing destinations necessary to support as robust commuter rail service as the Penn Line, even under future conditions.</p>
058	<p>One reason for the congestion in Northern Virginia is our dependence on a few major roads. Without a connected local road network, travelers, including bicyclists, are forced onto these major roads. Making those roads wider will not solve our congestion problems. Many of the same bottlenecks that currently cause congestion will continue. We need more alternatives to these big roads. Where good alternatives exist, such as in the Ballston Corridor, the quality of life is higher, people can more easily travel by transit, bicycle, and by walking. Fairfax County has decided to concentrate future development around transit, and their transportation funds should be going to support that vision. If the Route 28 widening project is funded, it must include a parallel bicycle facility that is included in the Fairfax County Trail Plan that is part of the Comprehensive Plan. We think more funds should be devoted to regionally significant bicycle projects. There have been comments made in earlier public hearings about the wisdom of investing in bicycling infrastructure as a solution to regional congestion. There are only two good regional bicycle facilities in Fairfax, the Washington & Old Dominion Trail, administered by the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, and the Mt Vernon Trail administered by the National Park Service. The W&OD Trail passes through Loudoun, Fairfax, and Arlington Counties, the Towns of Herndon and Vienna, and the City of Falls Church. Hundreds of commuters use the trail on a daily basis. Without that trail many of those people would be forced to drive, adding to our current congestion. On weekends both trails are extremely popular, allowing area residents an alternative to driving their cars. Several years ago it was estimated over 2 million annual trips are taken on the W&OD trail. That number has likely doubled since then. Both trails are overcrowded. We need to be planning a network of these regional trails, facilities that relieve congestion and are much more cost-effective than big road projects. The Custis Trail is another major commuter trail that extends parallel to I-66 inside the Beltway. That trail should be extended along I-66 outside the beltway. There should be major regional trails along our primary road corridors such as Route 7, Route 50, and Route 1. Commuting to work comprises only a portion of our daily trips. NVTA should be building a transportation infrastructure that allows NoVa residents the ability to take more short trips by walking and biking. If more children were able to walk and bike to school it would alleviate some of our daily congestion. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the NVTA project list.</p>	N/A	General	Bruce Wright, FABB	Opposes road widenings. Wants more alternatives to driving, especially long-distance regional trails.	<p>Both the Authority and the JACC recognize that in order to begin to solve the traffic gridlock in Northern Virginia that strategic investments need to be made across all modes of transportation. The Authority has consistently sought to balance its investments and is not biased toward one particular mode of transportation relative to another. Rather, the Authority is focused on congestion relief and improvements to our transportation infrastructure, and is deeply committed to funding projects of all modes that accomplish those most efficiently and effectively. The primary goal is to develop and sustain a multimodal transportation system that supports our economy and quality of life. This requires that investments be fiscally sustainable, that we promote areas of concentrated growth, manage both demand and capacity, and employ the best technology, joining rail, roadway, bus, air, water, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities into an interconnected network.</p>
059	<p>I am pleased to offer the following comments regarding your FY14 proposed projects: The list of projects being considered, grouped by categories that reflect the recommendations of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance and my own, is attached. Additional Comments: S. W. Rodgers, Co. Inc.(SWR) is Heavy-Highway, Site Development Contractor dedicated to transportation improvements that relieve congestion & provide the most efficient use of infrastructure funds, to accomplish that goal. We have over 350 employees that try/need to get to their various jobs in northern Va. every day & on time. Long-term regional and statewide transportation funding is and has been a long-standing priority of the company. We supported HB 2313 and many of our region's legislators put their reputations and political careers on the line in an effort to pass this legislation. It is important to the business community, our legislators and, most importantly the public that is paying these taxes and fees, that these revenues be invested well. In this regard, we, at SWR urge you to support those suggested priority projects for FY 2014 regional funds, attached herein. In addition we ask you to endorse/include, Virginia's (VDOT's) designated and CTB approved COSS "Bi-County Parkway" providing a north-south connection from I-95 to Dulles Airport, in your FY14 plan. You are not required to spend all the allocated funds in the FY14 plan & it would be prudent to reserve a portion of the funds for future projects & unexpected needs. (For attached project list see document "059attachment.doc".)</p>	Many	Multiple projects	Roy Beckner	Provides a list of NVTA's proposed projects and his opinions on the regional significance of each.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.

060	The thirty-two projects included in the June 3rd version of the NVTA proposed project list provide a good initial balance of projects for consideration. The Columbia Pike Multimodal Project contains all the elements of forward thinking combined with more immediate benefits. It helps to implement not only an improved roadway, but also smart growth planning (Columbia Pike neighborhood plans) and preparation for future mass transit improvements (streetcar). It will improve the busiest bus transit corridor in the region. The Leesburg separate-grade interchange will improve one of the most pedestrian unfriendly intersections in northern Virginia. It will make it safer for both automobile and pedestrian traffic for both local and through traffic. Transit oriented improvements in Falls Church will add safety considerations and accessibility within a jurisdiction that needs both. Pedestrian access to/from the West Falls Church metro stop will be greatly improved. Investments in VRE will improve transit in the entire NVTA region by further improving that transit option. WMATA's request for ten new buses will have multiple benefits and will provide additional capacity to fit into the wide regional transit improvements that are planned. The Route 1 buses are needed as the BRT option is implemented. Route 16 buses for Columbia Pike, already the most heavily travelled bus corridor in NoVa, will need revision when the streetcar comes on-line, but until then will help WMATYA address population increases that current redevelopment is bringing. There are many other projects that also should be lauded and NVTA should act to move the projects forward. It is imperative that NVTA continue to consider the long term impacts of shorter term projects. There are certainly road projects that need to be done. The primary focus must be on moving the most people with the most effective investment for the long term needs of the region. The Silver Line is critical to meeting those needs. The Bi-County Parkway is not. NVTA members must be pressed to engage in total planning for their communities. This means smart growth, complete streets, and development planning that works with 21st century transit. How will Potomac Yards, for example, be developed to link the area to commercial corridors where the residents may work? The way the City of Alexandria plans this development should be an important factor in future investments in roads and transit in that area. How will Fairfax development the road and transit infrastructure to move residents and workers within Tysons? Will bottlenecks be avoided by actions taken before re-development is completed? Those jurisdictions are dealing with those questions, as are most in the region, but it is in rewarding effective planning where NVTA can have the greatest influence and make sure that the region benefits for each and every 'smart' decision that members make and enact with NVTA assistance. I attended the June 20 open house and hearing held in Fairfax City	Many	Multiple projects	Rick Keller, Sierra Club	Supports project list, especially transit and multimodal projects.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
061	Collect thousand of signatures every year, showing people want rail. There are a lot of short-term projects, but he notices that TransAction 2040 has a lot of long term projects, such as extending Blue and Orange lines, Light Rail on 28. All Rail that would require a huge investment. Hopes that NVTA can start allocating some funds not just on items now, but for things in the future. These are billion dollar projects and are key to 2040 actually happening. We can due a service by extending for those that commute. Even if we work on those other incremental pieces. Start doing utility work and design for the big proejcts in the immediate sights.	N/A	Multiple Projects	Joe Oddo, Indep. Greens	Supports more rail.	Comment noted.
062	Appreciate the opportunity to make the presentation. Here to advocate for building rail. When we build more roads we get more traffic, and we need less traffic. Costs for rail per mile are less than roadway per mile. Also important for emergency evacuation.	N/A	Multiple Projects	Gail Parker	Supports more rail.	Comment noted.
063	The TransAction 2040 process is flawed, but the good news is that the majority of what is proposed here, he supports. Talked with Loudoun County about their bus request. How about regional service from Loudoun to Springfiled and Ft. Belvoir. Heard tonight about Fairfax project for bus service on Parkway and they can work together. Maybe use the HOT Lanes. Need to open up cross-border connections for buses. Regarding Rt 28, biggest concern is the intesection of Dulles Toll Road and 28 (SB28 to EB DTR). Great that you're widening 28, but what about that intersection.	LC/Fairfax Connector; Rt. 28 Widening	General	Rob Whitfield	More cross-border connections for buses. Also, good about widening Rt. 28, but what about the DTR intersection.	If the commenter could be more specific about the concerns with the DTR/Route 28 interchange, the County, VDOT, and MWAA could consider future improvements.
064	Pleased NVTA did not fund Arlington Streetcar. Do not want NVTA to fund in the future. Requested of the Arlington County Board that they comission an independent cost benefit analysis. Want BRT. Discussed merits of streetcar. Streetcar cost \$260 million more for 5 miles than BRT. FTA didn't approve the streetcar application because of its merits. The streetcar doesn't meet the requirement of congestion reduction relative to cost. Would like to see Arlington, Fairfax, and Alexandria collaborate on a regional BRT solution.	Arlington Streetcar	Project	Steve Pontoon, Arlingtonians for Sensible Transit	Doesn't support Arlington streetcar. Wants region to consider BRT solutions.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 14 NVTA funding.
065	Thanks County Board Member Zimmerman for hard work and efforts. Has not issues with the four Arlington projects proposed for consideration for FY 14 funding. Streetcar is a real step forward. Would like streetcar along Wilson and Clarendon Blvd. Additional projects to consider for the future are 1) Courthouse Metro Station Second Elevator; and Blue /Silver Line Mitigation (create short shuttle trips into DC).	Many	Multiple Projects	June O'Connell	Supports Arlingtons four projects. Suggests future projects.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
066	Thanks County Board Member Zimmerman for his support for bike and pedestrian projects. Belives that bike and pedestrain projects have regional value. Asks that the in the future Arlington and NVTA consider using the 30% and 70% funding on bike and pedestrian projects.	New	General	James Schroll, Coalition for Smarter Growth	Supports bike/ped projects. Have real regional value. Consider using regional funding to support bike and ped projects in the future.	Comment noted.

067	Supports the Columbia Pike Streetcar and bikeshare. Would like more trains, less traffic. Quotes number of people killed in car crashes every year in the region. If you grow rail, you grow value of businesses and homes. References VA state study that shows that for every \$1 invested, \$20 return. Investing in rail cuts our dependency on foreign oil. Supports rail in the following areas: 1) Potomoc Yard Metro Stop; 2) Dedicated passenger (VRE) rail so that they can increase capacity; 3) Cameron Yard Metro stop; Rail to Manassas, Woodbridge, and Fredericksburg; 4) additional passenger rail tracks over the Potomac; 5) Crystal City Rail; 6) Rail along I-395 and I-495; 6) Finish rail to Dulles.	New	General	Kerry Cambell, Independent Green Party NoVa	Supports Columbia Pike streetcar and bikeshare. Wants more transit, especially rail in a number of places throughout region.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
068	Thanks County Board Member Zimmerman and staff for hard work and efforts. Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club as well as the Mt. Vernon Group submitted comments for the record. Addresses Bob Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance comments made at the June 20, 2013 NVTA public hearing. Mr. Chase criticized three projects in Arlington as not being of regional significance. Mr. Dickson explains that there are many regional benefits to these projects 1) Boundary Channel Drive is close to I-395. Anything that improves roadway congestion there is a regional projects; 2) Columbia Pike Multimodal has alot of congestion. Improvements to open choke points will help a great deal.; 3) 10 WMATA buses for regional routes is regions. Also addressed by another commentor regarding Columbia Pike Streetcar. Columbia Pike Streetcar was never considered by the NVTA and therefore was never declined for funding. The Sierra Club has supported the streetcar since 2007. The FTA did not deny funding on the basis of the streetcars merits, rather due to sequestration the FTA didn't fund any new projects. They suggested that Arlington and Fairfax is better suited for New Starts and thefore should reapply for New Starts funding which they could get more money for.	Many	Multiple Projects	David Dickson, Sierra Club	Supports Columbia Pike streetcar and Arlington's projects.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
069	Supports Boundary Channel Drive, Crystal City Multimodal, Columbia Pike Multimodal, and ART bus Blue/Silver line mitigation.	Many	Multiple projects	Arlington Transportation Commission	Supports Arlington's 4 projects	Comment noted.
070a	Overall, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority has established a credible process for helping the public understand what is involved in making decisions for regional transportation project priorities. It is evident that County transportation and regional agency staff have worked hard to produce documentation. Thanks are also due to Chairman Nohe and other NVTA Board members who have been involved in the process. At present, several of the priority setting criteria are too subjective in nature while no quantitative benefit cost criteria are applied in decision making. Improvements are needed in criteria used for subsequent funding decisions. Several general concerns: 1. A lack of coordination exists between VDOT and NVTA planning at present. Fairfax County Transportation Department Director Tom Biesiadny has acknowledged this problem and promises that later this year they will show projects planned in Northern Virginia on a more coordinated basis. 2. So far, VDOT has not produced Northern Virginia maps showing where most significant traffic congestion exists and location of projects already funded within the approved six year capital improvements program. Given that VDOT had several months notice of the NVTA project funding program, this is disappointing. An effort should be made by NVTA and VDOT, prior to the final NVTA public hearing on July 24, 2013 to prepare a map showing both VDOT/DRPT approved projects and proposed NVTA projects. 3. NVTA should not commit capital to projects for which vastly greater unfunded costs are involved. To illustrate, Tom Biesiadny described to Fairfax County residents a proposed highway improvement project for widening Elden Street in Herndon. Normally, this would lead me to say "Big deal. So What?" He then described how the \$2+ million requested from NVTA would be added to \$18 million already arranged from other sources to complete the capital structure. That said, it is not clear to me how big a congestion relief is involved. Tom outlined another proposed highway improvement project: Braddock Road widening with HOV/bus lanes from Burke Lake Parkway to I 495. Having lived between Braddock Road and Little River Turnpike thirty years ago, I readily understand his claim of travel time savings involved. By contrast, for Metrorail related projects, no NVTA funding should occur in FY 2014 unless the local jurisdictions involved provide written evidence of prior approvals within their respective capital budgets to fund the majority of costs. In the case of design of traction power stations in Arlington County and Alexandria, no NVTA funding should occur until an overall funding plan for Metrorail capital improvements and the appropriate funding commitments and financing plan have been approved by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as well as the District of Columbia and Maryland state authorities. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS EVACUATION PLANS MUST BE PREPARED FOR EACH PRIMARY TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR IN TRANSACTION 2040.	Many	General	Rob Whitfield, Dulles Corridor Users Group	Supports NVTA's transparency on prioritization process, but thinks its too subjective without any qualitative b/c applied in decision making. Identifies general concerns, doesn't want NVTA to fund projects with significant funding needs, wants NVTA to only fund projects that are approved in local budgets, that can be completed in two years without significant ROW, that are vastly unfunded and to restrict funds to those who oppose I-66 emergency improvements. Would like to see map of VDOT and NVTA projects at NVTA hearing. Suggests creation of emergency evac plans for each transportation corridor.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
070b	For each of the eight transportation corridors shown in TransAction 2040, an emergency preparedness evacuation plan should be prepared during coming months. Contribution to emergency highway evacuation capacity should be added as an additional criterion for project selection and evaluated for each proposed highway funding project. Priority should be given to planning and implementing highway improvement projects which will increase the capacity of primary evacuation routes in each corridor. Jurisdiction(s) which have impeded completion of I-66 emergency evacuation highway improvements should not receive any FY 2014 NVTA funds. As a guide to your decision process, for FY 2014 projects, accept on a priority basis only those projects which can be completed within two years - by mid 2015, which do not require extensive right of way acquisition costs and for which no further decisions and funding approval requirements by other jurisdictions or authorities are involved. The bottom line in selecting projects: "Take the best, leave the rest!"	Many	General	Rob Whitfield, Dulles Corridor Users Group	Continuation of previous comment.	See above.

071a	<p>I am a retired transportation economist. I did analysis on numerous projects over 23 years with the U.S. Government Accountability Office. For the last 8 years I have been a member of Arlington's Transit Advisory Committee which is responsible for advising the county manager on all transit matters in or affecting the county. I have made extensive comments to county staff about Arlington's Master Transportation Plan drafts from 2006-08.</p> <p>I question whether the \$12 million in the NVTA's list for the Columbia Pike Multi-Modal project is an improvement in reducing congestion which is the major goal of NVTA. There is a long history of how Col Pike is seen by the county board. A little background: Mr. Zimmerman as chairman of Arlington County Board in 2006 stated that the "Streets" section of the MTP is focused on the "Urban Village." After adoption by the Board the Streets section stated that the only efforts to improve highway capacity involved improvements in key intersections (such as left turn lanes) of several four lane roads. Expanding overall capacity of main roads was not part of the plan. The \$12 million in the plan is simply a partial payment. Arlington's FY 2013-22 Transportation Capital Improvement Plan shows the total cost of the project is \$69 million.</p> <p>The Multi-Modal project is the result of the Board approved the Streetscape Plan for the Pike. This plan among other items included a) narrowing the curb travel lane to 11 feet, and the outer lane to 10 feet; b) eliminating bus pull-outs; c) putting a 7 foot-wide parking lane on each side of the Pike in "Town Centers" which comprise 2.5 of the 3.5 mile length of the Pike being redeveloped; and, d) reducing speeds from 30 mph currently to 20 in town centers and 25 elsewhere on the Pike. These changes were later included in the Multi-Modal plan. The VDOTas early as 2005 stated (in an appendix to the July 2005 Columbia Pike Streetcar report) that a 7 foot width was dangerous!</p> <p>On March 19, 2007 I attended a Public Forum on the Master Transportation Plan; a discussion issue was whether arterial streets should be rebuilt with narrower lanes to "manage" traffic speeds. After the meeting I asked the Arlington Traffic Bureau Chief whether VISSIM was going to be used to model narrower lanes and parking lanes. Modeling was not done and there were no plans to do it, I was told. He also stated he didn't know how highway capacity would be affected by lane narrowing. In an Oct.23 2007 meeting I was told by the Chief of Arlington's Transportation Division that only traffic counts were needed to determine effects of narrowing lanes.</p>	Columbia Pike Multimodal	Project	Joseph Warren	Does not support Columbia Pike Multimodal project. Does not believe that it provides sufficient congestion relief.	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
071b	<p>In TAC meetings from 2008-12 I was frequently told by county staff that VISSIM would be used by the Col Pike Multi-Modal project staff. At a Multi-Modal project design meeting on 3/26/12 a bus representative from METRO objected to on-street parking with 7 foot wide lanes. I asked the county staff representative and consultant (from Kimley-Horn) about the impacts of the 7 foot parking lane and travel lane narrowing. They said no VISSIM analysis had been done; the consultant was sure that the 10 foot outer travel lane was safe, even for vehicles of 8 ½ wide passing each other. They said VISSIM analysis was the responsibility of the streetcar team.</p> <p>In view of these facts it is clear why Arlington wanted a transfer of the Pike from the State to county control. I discussed the proposed transfer of the Pike to Arlington with a local state rep on April 1, 2012. I was told that after a transfer to the county VDOT would have no role in modeling traffic effects or determining safety of a 7 foot parking lane width.</p> <p>In the absence of specific information about Multi-Modal project's traffic impacts I believe it is most unwise and ill-advised to approve this project for FY 14 funding. At the June 20 NVTA meeting, Mr. Zimmerman expounded at length about the need for projects that will reduce congestion. This appears hypocritical in view of the absence of any formal modeling of specific roadway changes to Col Pike. This project should not receive funding until such analysis is done.</p>	Columbia Pike Multimodal	Project	Joseph Warren	Continuation of previous comment.	

072a	<p>Following up on my verbal testimony from your hearing on June 20, the Coalition for Smarter Growth submits the following written comments. As you recall, we strongly disagree with the approach being pressed by Delegate LeMunyon and Bob Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, and Delegate Minchew. Their concept is that you can eliminate congestion through highway capacity expansion, or "get the red out" as they like to say. Unfortunately in a great metropolitan area with a strong economy you cannot do that. The proponents of capacity expansion are ignoring the power of induced traffic in a metropolitan area, a phenomenon well-known in the transportation planning community (we will transmit some of the studies to you). A newly widened highway in a metropolitan area can fill up with traffic again in as little as five years. In the short-term people change the time of their commute returning to the peak hour, they change the route of their commute, and they change the mode, leaving carpools and transit to use the temporarily expanded capacity. Longer term, highway and arterial expansion fuels the continuing spreading out of Northern Virginia, inducing new areas of auto-dependent development and new traffic. This region has done a terrific job in charting a different course, as captured in the Region Forward report and a number of the other studies that have been in the Council of Governments including the What Would it Take Scenario and the land use/transit component of the Aspirations Scenario. It is clear from those reports that a network of transit oriented centers and communities, addressing the east-west jobs/housing imbalance, and transit offers the most effective long-term approach to our transportation challenge -- providing strong alternatives to driving and creating patterns of land use that provide the greatest reduction in single occupant vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.</p> <p>Our localities are also trying to chart a different course. Chairman Bulova has made a transit-oriented development future the priority for continued growth in Fairfax County, and Arlington, Alexandria, and the District of Columbia have been national leaders. Arlington has added millions of square feet of development without adding traffic. The low car ownership and very high non-auto mode shares in Arlington and D.C. are astounding. Furthermore, Loudoun County developers have all been pushing mixed-use developments, unfortunately too many lack the matching transit needed to support them. North Woodbridge, Manassas and Manassas Park are all seeking compact mixed-use development as their future. The reason this new approach is so important for our transportation priorities, is that these transit-oriented communities are a regional traffic solution. That's because every person who lives in one of these communities or works in one of these communities is taking fewer car trips and driving many fewer miles per day. They may not even own a car, or they may own just one car and drive it on the weekends.</p>	Many	General	Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth	<p>Supports regional process. Supports multiple projects throughout region, especially transit projects. Underscores importance of transit oriented development, providing strong alternatives to driving, and developing in general sustainable walkable communities. Notes that widening roads is a waste of resources. Need to address bottlenecks, but cannot do it forever.</p>	Comments noted. See "Project Specific Comments" for additional responses.
------	---	------	---------	--	--	---

Project Specific Comments: June 6, 2013 - June 27, 2013						
Num	Corridor	Jurisdiction / Agency	Project Name	Comment	Response	Pro/Con/Neutral
039	1	Fairfax	Herndon garage	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	1	Fairfax	Herndon garage	Herndon/Monroe Metrorail station garage should not be at the 100% most proximate location to the station and should be wrapped with active uses and/or groundfloor uses and well integrated into mixed-use development	Comment noted.	Undetermined
072	1	Fairfax	Innovation garage	The Innovation Center Metrorail station garage should not be at the 100% most proximate location to the station and should be wrapped with active uses and/or groundfloor uses and well integrated into mixed-use development	Comment noted.	Con
039	1	Fairfax	Innovation garage	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
052	1	Fairfax	Innovation garage	The economics of the Innovation garage are not discussed. Why is it so expensive?	Comment noted.	Question
059	1	Fairfax	Innovation Metro station	Local obligation.	Comment noted.	Con
039	1	Fairfax	Innovation Metro station	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
044	1	Fairfax	New Project	Stop creating barriers before right turns. Prime example is the exit off of Clairborn Rd going east on Rt 7. You have merge left into traffic then move right to get into the right turn lane. The piece of concrete is pointless. Mark the exit with right hand turn so you know you can stay for a right or merge left to wstay straight.	Congestion on the DTR ramp to northbound Route 28 is likely attributable to weaving movements between the DTR and Innovation Interchanges. If the commenter could be more specific about the concerns at this ramp, the County and VDOT can discuss whether improvements can be made. (next 4 comments are outside Fairfax County) HOV Lanes are an important option for encouraging carpooling. HOV lanes work best when physically separated from general traffic. Driver education on their proper use and police enforcement are critical in areas where the lanes are only separated by striping.	Con
049	1	Falls Church	Bus shelters	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
059	1	Falls Church	Bus shelters	Local responsibility.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
072	1	Falls Church	Bus shelters	We support all three projects.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Pro
060	1	Falls Church	Overall	Transit oriented improvements in Falls Church will add safety considerations and accessibility within a jurisdiction that needs both. Pedestrian access to/from the West Falls Church metro stop will be greatly improved.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Pro
070	1	Herndon	East Eldon Street Improvement Project	Tom Biesiadny described to Fairfax County residents a proposed highway improvement project for widening Elden Street in Herndon. Normally, this would lead me to say "Big deal. So What?" He then described how the \$2+ million requested from NVTA would be added to \$18 million already arranged from other sources to complete the capital structure. That said, it is not clear to me how big a congestion relief is involved.	See response to comment #072 East Eldon Street Improvement Project.	Con
012	1	Herndon	East Eldon Street Improvement Project	One you had on your list is Route 606. I would absolutely endorse that as a priority. In supporting transportation improvements, we note that you have an aggressive program as a county to expand your commercial real estate tax base because that can help keep homeowners' real estate taxes down.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	1	Herndon	East Eldon Street Improvement Project	Herndon investments should be complete streets with safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	The purpose of this multi-modal project is to reduce congestion through access management controls, facilitate vehicular circulation to / from Fairfax County Parkway and increase the efficiency of Route 606 / Herndon Parkway intersection. The design will incorporate 'Complete Street' practices and intersection enhancements that will improve the safety and accessibility for the traveling public, transit users, pedestrians and bicyclists to business and residential areas along the Elden Street commercial corridor. The project is listed in both the regional TransAction 2040 Plan and Constrained Long Range Plan.	Undetermined
049	1	Herndon	Herndon Metro access	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	The project will offer bus transit, pedestrian and bicycle enhancements, accessibility and connectivity to transit-oriented development along Herndon Parkway, while also improving regional multi-modal connectivity to/from the north side area of the future Herndon Metrorail Station and the Dulles Metrorail's Silver Line. The project includes bus pull-off lanes as well as needed bus shelters and wide pedestrian walkways to create improved access for transit users, bicyclists and pedestrians in the vicinity of the northside area of the Herndon Metrorail Station that will encourage increased ridership capacity onto the Dulles Metrorail Silver Line resulting in reduced vehicle reliance.	Undetermined
059	1	Herndon	Herndon Metro access	Undeterminable regional significance.	See response to comment #49 Herndon Metro access.	Undetermined
059	1	Herndon	Herndon Pkwy Van Buren	Undeterminable regional significance.	Herndon Parkway and Van Buren is a minor arterial intersection providing regional access for commuters to/from Monroe Street (Route 666), Sunrise Valley Drive and Herndon-Monroe Park & Ride Garage in Fairfax County. The project is for street capacity improvements to address heavy traffic congestion and lengthy peak hour delays. Proposed improvements are to include road widening to accommodate major intersection traffic capacity improvements, including dedicated turning lane(s) and bike/pedestrian improvements. The intersection currently operates at failing level-of-service during both the commuting AM and PM peak hours. Implementation of this intersection capacity project will reduce signal timing delays, improve level-of-service and provide significant congestion relief for local and regional commuters.	Undetermined
059	1	Leesburg	Edwards Ferry Interchange	High regional significance.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
060	1	Leesburg	Edwards Ferry Interchange	The Leesburg separate-grade interchange will improve one of the most pedestrian unfriendly intersections in northern Virginia. It will make it safer for both automobile and pedestrian traffic for both local and through traffic.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
072	1	Leesburg	Edwards Ferry Interchange	Edwards Ferry Road/Route 15 Leesburg Bypass -- we understand this will be bike/ped compatible but remain concerned about the continued focus on interchanges in areas surrounding Leesburg. The failure to build a better connected road grid has resulted in the large arterial and interchange approach at the cost of what could have been a community character more compatible with the historic town rather than anonymous sprawl.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined

072	1	Loudoun	Leesburg park and ride	We support the Leesburg Park and Ride and new transit buses.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
059	1	Loudoun	Leesburg park and ride	Moderate regional significance.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
063	1	Loudoun	Loudoun Buses	believes that the Loudoun buses request and Fairfax buses on Fairfax County Parkway request could work together and we need to open up cross-border connections for busses.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
059	1	Loudoun	New Project	Local responsibility.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
044	1	Loudoun	New Project	We need a left hand turn lane and traffic light at Loudoun County Parkway and Shellhorn Rd going north.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
044	1	Loudoun	New Project	Decrease tolls on Greenway.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
044	1	Loudoun	New Project	Eliminate HOV lanes.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
051	1	Loudoun	New Project	Supports completion of improvements to Dulles Loop, in particular the current improvements planned for Route 606.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
003	1	Loudoun	New Project	I find it incomprehensible that there is no VRE station in the Centreville/Clifton area on the Manassas line. Given the population density in that area, there should be a station available.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
011	1	Loudoun	New Project	Putting that aside, there is one project that has been delayed for some reason. It would have helped with the Sycolin flyover and that's Miller Drive southeast on the airport property. That was originally intended to be completed around the time of the closing. As far as I know ground has not been broken on that. So if that could be expedited it would be beneficial for the Sycolin flyover alternate routes.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
011	1	Loudoun	New Project	The improvement to Route 15 north out of Leesburg up to the state line. I frequently take this route to go visit relatives in south Jersey. This is an area of Route 15 that's a major bottleneck. I believe there are restrictions on improving it any further than it is. I compare this to other sections of this 625-mile route from New York down to South Carolina. I frequented the Pennsylvania and New York portions of this. It's a modern two-lane in each direction divided highway. My thoughts are we can do better with relieving congestion heading north and south along that route on Route 15.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
011	1	Loudoun	New Project	The other projects that you have listed, one that I think, in my opinion was more important than the Sycolin flyover, is the Route 7 interchange. Having traveled on Route 7 frequently to get to work, that's a major bottleneck. I see it's on a schedule if there is a way to expedite or move that up in priority, that would be beneficial.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
072	1	NVTC	Route 7 AA	NVTC: We support the Route 7 transit study.	Comment noted.	Pro
004	1	NVTC	Route 7 AA	*NVTC Transit alternatives for the Rt. 7 corridor.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	1	NVTC	Route 7 AA	Questionable immediate need.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
013	2	Loudoun	Belmont Ridge Rd Gloucester to Hay	One thing to note, the initial project was two sections of Belmont Ridge Road and whittled down to just one. If that one is done in conjunction with the Belmont Ridge Road interchange which includes, my understanding, the widening of Belmont Ridge to Gloucester Parkway, that would have two four lane sections that would bottleneck into two lanes going downhill. That would make the two lane curve around Loudoun County Parkway and Redskins Park like a walk in the park. Just on the record for other people that may not be as familiar with Belmont Ridge Road to one day hopefully encourage them if the two projects will be done to have the third missing link completed to avoid safety hazards going forward.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
054	2	Loudoun	Belmont Ridge Rd Gloucester to Hay	Supports.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
059	2	Loudoun	Belmont Ridge Rd Gloucester to Hay	High regional significance.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
054	2	Loudoun	Belmont Ridge Road	Supports.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
072	2	Loudoun	Belmont Ridge Road	Loudoun: Belmont Ridge Road -- we support but not as part of a North-South Corridor and that justification should be deleted	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
072	2	Loudoun	Belmont Ridge Road	Belmont Ridge Road -- We only support as part of the transportation network for surrounding communities, not as part of the proposed North-South Corridor	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
033	2	Prince William	New Project	I'm really new to this world of transportation planning but regarding the bi-county parkway, I have been surprised to hear so many ways of trying to sell this road. What concerns me is that I don't understand the relationships that all these different organizations have to one another and which ones have more power than others. So my concern is that your organization could be used as a conduit to try to sneak money in to try to accomplish the building of this road. There has to be some reason that people are pushing so hard for this as it doesn't make any practical sense from where I live and my experience it's not going to help traffic, it's going to make it worse. It's going to hurt people and take their land. We're going to lose access and our way of life is going to be affected. Where can we see the relationship between these organizations laid out, like an org chart? I think that needs to be out there for us to see. So who do I ask to get this information? And who holds the power regarding the bi-county parkway?	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
020	2	Prince William	New Project	Opposes Bi-County Parkway	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
022	2	Prince William	New Project	Opposes Bi-County Parkway	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
023	2	Prince William	New Project	Opposes Bi-County Parkway	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
057	2	Regional	New Project	Wants a transit solution instead of a road solution for Bi-County corridor.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
060	2	Regional	New Project	The Bi-County Parkway is not critical.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
059	2	Regional	New Project	we ask you to endorse/include, Virginia's (VDOT's) designated and CTB approved COSS "Bi-County Parkway"	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
035	3	Fairfax	New Project	The intersection of 28 and 66 is by far the greatest impediment to travel on 28.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
036	3	Fairfax	New Project	It is recommended resources allocated for these projects be transferred to the Rt 28 / I-66 interchange.	NVTA is currently considering projects for FY 2014 funding, which means the projects should be able to proceed to construction or begin a new project development phase in FY 2014. The 3 new projects have not yet been studied, and are therefore not positioned to move ahead with implementation.	Undetermined
036	3	Fairfax	New Project	Old Centreville Rd / Compton Rd intersection	See response to comment #036 New Project.	Undetermined

046	3	Fairfax	New Project	Wants I-66 and VA-28 interchange improved.	Concerning the I-66/Route 28 interchange, VDOT is currently soliciting proposals for the design of improvements at the interchange (and nearby intersections). In addition, VDOT's draft Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) does include \$50 million in funding over the next 4 years toward this project. VDOT has concluded the planning study phase of this project, with information posted on their website: http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/northernvirginia/i-66_and_rt_28.asp	Undetermined
051	3	Fairfax	New Project	Wants interchange improvements to I-66/VA-28 interchange.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
055	3	Fairfax	New Project	Are there any plans to do away with the traffic lights at the intersection of I-66 and Rt 28 in Centreville?	Concerning the I-66/Route 28 interchange, VDOT is currently soliciting proposals for the design of improvements at the interchange (and nearby intersections). In addition, VDOT's draft Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) does include \$50 million in funding over the next 4 years toward this project. VDOT has concluded the planning study phase of this project, with information posted on their website: http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/northernvirginia/i-66_and_rt_28.asp	Undetermined
017	3	Fairfax	New Project	Would like to see money allocated to finishing Route 28/I-66 interchange because it's regional. I'd hate to spend money on projects that don't provide much congestion relief.	The project will improve capacity on a segment of Route 28 which currently carries over 60,000 vehicles per day, for an LOS F. The intersection/signal improvements will improve through travel as well as travel to other corridors such as Route 29 and New Braddock Road. The I-66/Route 28 interchange project is now funded at \$50 million in the VDOT 6-Year Program. This funding level will allow VDOT to move forward with design of the improvements.	Undetermined
028	3	Fairfax	New Project	For Route 28 you mentioned it's shovel-ready. The insistence on shovel-ready projects is like a monument to the sales tax. The better use of money is to change the traffic light timing and to align the traffic lights together. That's a relatively low cost solution to congestion. You can connect the traffic lights wirelessly or using a hard-line cable so the computers can control the traffic lights. You can use sensors. Talking about the east/west route, maybe we need another interchange on 66 to take the relief off of the smaller feeder roads. I know that would be a long term project. Another way is to build another secondary feeder road.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
072	3	Fairfax	Route 28 Widening	Fairfax County: Any new lanes on Route 28 should be HOV and dedicated transit or just dedicated express bus.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
017	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	On the projects for PWC and Fairfax County, both have Route 28 projects, both to widen roads. The areas they are widening don't compare in traffic and congestion to other areas.	Comment noted.	Con
017	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	On the projects for PWC and Fairfax County, both have Route 28 projects, both to widen roads. The areas they are widening don't compare in traffic and congestion to other areas.	Comment noted.	Con
035	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	I drive 28 every day and that area is just about the only stretch that is not congested.	These projects provide additional capacity on the highly congested north-south Route 28 corridor that provides travel within and between three counties in northern Virginia, as well as connections to the Dulles International Airport and major east-west highways such as I-66, Route 50, and the Dulles Toll Road/Greenway. The current Average Daily Traffic count of 111,000 vehicles puts this segment of Route 28 at a Level of Service (LOS) E, which is very congested for freeway conditions. Route 28 is a significant technology corridor in both Loudoun and Fairfax County as well as an important access to Washington Dulles International Airport. With its links to Prince William County, Manassas and Manassas Park, and future link to the Metrorail Silver Line, it is well qualified for regional investments by NVTA. In addition, VDOT and its contractor have developed plans to implement this widening which are "ready to go." This project readiness criteria plays an important role in NVTA's FY 2014 project selection. Concerning the I-66/Route 28 interchange, VDOT is currently soliciting proposals for the design of improvements at the interchange (and nearby intersections). In addition, VDOT's draft Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) does include \$50 million in funding over the next 4 years toward this project. VDOT has concluded the planning study phase of this project, with information posted on their website: http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/northernvirginia/i-66_and_rt_28.asp	Con
036	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	While these projects are easier to implement, they do not provide any congestion relieve to the current traffic conditions compared to other areas of the Rt 28.	See response to comment #035 Route 28 Dulles to 50.	Con
059	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	High regional significance.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	High regional significance.	Comment noted.	Pro
063	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	great that the project lists include widening Rt. 28, but what about the intersection with the Dulles Toll Road	If the commenter could be more specific about the concerns with the DTR/Route 28 interchange, the County, VDOT, and MWAA could consider future improvements.	Pro
063	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	great that the project lists include widening Rt. 28, but what about the intersection with the Dulles Toll Road	Comment noted.	Pro
039	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
054	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	Supports all route 28 projects regionally.	Comment noted.	Pro
058	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 Dulles to 50	If the Route 28 widening project is funded, it must include a parallel bicycle facility that is included in the Fairfax County Trail Plan	Comment noted.	Pro
035	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 McLearn	I drive 28 every day and that area is just about the only stretch that is not congested.	Comment noted.	Con
036	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 McLearn	While these projects are easier to implement, they do not provide any congestion relieve to the current traffic conditions compared to other areas of the Rt 28.	Comment noted.	Con
039	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 McLearn	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
054	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 McLearn	Supports all route 28 projects regionally.	Comment noted.	Pro
058	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 McLearn	If the Route 28 widening project is funded, it must include a parallel bicycle facility that is included in the Fairfax County Trail Plan	Comment noted.	Undetermined

039	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 PWC to Rt 29	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
054	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 PWC to Rt 29	Supports all route 28 projects regionally.	Comment noted.	Pro
058	3	Fairfax	Rt 28 PWC to Rt 29	If the Route 28 widening project is funded, it must include a parallel bicycle facility that is included in the Fairfax County Trail Plan	Comment noted.	Undetermined
015	3	Loudoun	New Project	One of the critical projects is the proposed Bi-county Parkway. I know there is considerable work that must be done before the project is ready for state or regional funds. The Bi-county Parkway is clearly of significant regional importance. By connecting major employment population centers in Loudoun County and Prince William we'll help reduce traffic congestion in the region, home to Virginia's fastest growing and most economically vibrant communities. I would ask you to urge the transportation authority to make the Bi-county Parkway a priority at the appropriate time and support a road to help improve the quality of life in our communities by getting traffic off the neighborhood roads, making it easier to get to work, school, church, and the grocery store and ultimately home to their families.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
059	3	Loudoun	Route 28 Hot Spot	High regional significance.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
054	3	Loudoun	Route 28 Hot Spot	Supports all route 28 projects regionally.	Comment acknowledged.	Pro
072	3	Loudoun	Route 28 Hot Spot	Route 28 hot spot improvements -- any lane expansion must be limited to use for HOV and bus or just express bus	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
044	3	Loudoun	Route 28 Hot Spot	Are you improving the exit off the Dulles Toll Rd onto Rt 28 going north? If you put expansions without improving that exit it will be a nightmare.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
045	3	Manassas	New Project	Reverse timing of lights on Rt 28 in the am. They are timed for the evening in the am.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
005	3	Manassas City	New Project	I noticed that you are discussing Rt. 28 in PWC only to Old Centreville Rod. What about from Old Centreville Rd. to Liberia Ave in Manassas City and then on to the PW Parkway and 234 ByPass? This is the main congested area that causes the PWC backups on Rt. 28 South in the evenings. The lights are not timed correctly. It seems that the concern is always for correcting and helping congestion in Fairfax County but not on the route cause which is the traffic through Manassas Park City and Manassas City areas. The proposal for the South side of Rt. 28 (after you get through Manassas City) is just another means to not assist the Manassas Park City or Manassas City residents.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
027	3	Manassas City	New Project	I guess I just don't understand why 28 widening from the city of Manassas to Fairfax County line was not on anybody's radar screen. This has been a problem for 10 years and to say it's not on the comp plan, I have to say someone was asleep at the wheel. So I have to say I'm very disappointed in the County and whoever was in charge of that area for not doing that. You just stepped in, I know you just took over that region but it's bizarre. You've seen the people have had problems there for 10 years now, so it's an excuse and it's a bad excuse. It should have been on the comp plan and why it's not is a real question that I as a voter and as a citizen want to know. But I want to jump to something else.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
026	3	Manassas Park	Route 28	Improving 28 on the border of Fauquier County and Prince William County, it's a great improvement, however if you look at it as a whole and the traffic flow during rush hour you still get a bottle neck and that's right there at Manassas Park at Old Centreville Road and US 29. And so, although you improve the southern part you still get this bottle neck, so therefore those residents that are going to be happy that in Prince William and Fauquier that this road has been expanded near their area, they're still going to get this traffic as they try to go up north and south on the way home. However your criteria is skewed because you need to consider traffic flow and also the approach as a whole to the improvements you're making because you're improving one portion but you've got a bottle neck here. You're really not improving the road. And in addition you've got Orchard Bridge development that's coming along that's going to provide more cars and more traffic.	Comment noted.	Pro
054	3	Manassas Park	Rt 28	Supports all route 28 projects regionally.	Comment noted.	Pro
045	3	Manassas Park	Rt 28	What does it mean this section does not meet requirements?	NVTA conducted a project screening of all projects submitted for consideration for FY 14 regional funding. The project submitted by Manassas Park did not meet the Tier I screening requirement that requires that all projects considered for regional funding be included in the Authority's regional long-range plan TransAction 2040. This project, as proposed, is not in the TransAction 2040 plan.	Undetermined
036	3	Prince William	New Project	It is recommended this project be changed to Rt 28 widening from Old Centreville Rd in Prince William County to the Fairfax County line.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
050	3	Prince William	New Project	RT 28 from Manassas to Fairfax County Line. If existing RT 28 is widened it would help to get traffic moving towards I-66 and Dulles	Comment noted.	Undetermined
026	3	Prince William	New Project	Regarding Route 28: Well just because we don't specifically get it right or it's not doable, how about five lanes, how about synchronizing the signals in that area, how about not providing for opposite turns on the road during rush hour. Those are innovative ideas that can improve the traffic flow in that area. It doesn't seem like you're considering traffic flow in these plans. How am I going to tell my citizens that they're getting more for the money, their tax dollars, when we didn't even make the list so I can't give them a timeline for the future? A courtesy would have been to put our project on the list with a date but it isn't even on the list.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
017	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	On the projects for PWC and Fairfax County, both have Route 28 projects, both to widen roads. The areas they are widening don't compare in traffic and congestion to other areas.	Comment noted.	Con
025	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	What is disturbing to me, among other things, is that fixing 28 near Nokesville is of primary benefit to Fauquier who is not stuck with the taxes, we should focus on fixing congestion in the areas that are being taxed.	Comment noted.	Con
072	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	Route 28 -- we oppose additional Route 28 expansion west of the 234 Bypass because it will fuel more long-distance commuting and sprawling development.	Comment noted.	Con
031	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	I have no problem with Phase 1. Phase 2 from the relocated Vint Hill Road to Fitzwater Drive will not relieve any congestion. There are about 40 houses there and only 3 new ones have been built in the last 30 years. How will that relieve congestion? If it's not going to go all the way to 29 there is no reason to displace all those people and take their land. Who is the proffer from? Is Avondale the only place they're coming from for Fitzwater? Do you think this is really worth it for 40 houses? Is that really a benefit to the people of Prince William? If it only stops at Fitzwater? I ask that the money be used for something else like VRE to Bealeton.	Comment noted.	Neutral
026	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	I'm going to follow up from some of what Del. Marshall said. All of us here are familiar with 28, with the rush hour and traffic flow there. Improving 28 on the border of Fauquier County and Prince William County, it's a great improvement, however if you look at it as a whole and the traffic flow during rush hour you	Comment noted.	Pro
059	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	High regional significance.	Comment noted.	Pro
038	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	Urge you to include widening of Rt 28 from Fitzwater to Linton Hall.	Comment noted.	Pro
054	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	Supports all route 28 projects regionally.	Comment noted.	Pro

050	3	Prince William	Route 28 Widening	Spending to speed up the RT 28 from Linton Hall to Fitzwater to complete the construction sooner ... is commendable. However, should evaluate necessity of widening roadway to four lanes where intersection and spot improvements might give the same outcome.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
031	3	VRE	New Project	If Route 28 in Prince William County cannot be extended to Route 29, commenter asks that the money be used for something else like VRE to Bealeton.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
063	5	Fairfax	Fairfax Buses	believes that the Loudoun buses request and Fairfax buses on Fairfax County Parkway request could work together and we need to open up cross-border connections for busses.	Comment noted.	Pro
039	5	Fairfax	Fairfax Buses	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	5	Fairfax	Fairfax Buses	General: We support the remaining transit improvements listed for the jurisdictions, VRE, WMATA.	Comment noted.	Pro
037	5	Fairfax	New Project	I wanted to express my thoughts on adding a project. Rolling Rd is in desperate need of improvements. Most importantly, the road needs to be widened from the Fairfax County parkway to Old Keene Mill Road here in Springfield.	Although the Rolling Road Widening project is in Transaction 2040, Fairfax County felt that it might be unlikely to rise to the level of "project readiness" for prioritizing FY2014 regional NVTA projects. In addition, until the final VDOT Six-Year Improvement Program was released in mid-June, the County had hoped that some additional state or federal funding might be applied to the project. Fairfax County is considering this project for the NVTA 30 percent funding that is returned to the local governments for FY2014. This would allow a design update which would better position the project for FY2015-2019 NVTA regional funding by improving project readiness. Fairfax County is using a cost-benefit analysis tool to evaluate a number of unfunded projects, including this section of Rolling Road. The results of the analysis and other factors will be used in preparing project recommendations for the Board of Supervisors' consideration this fall. These recommendations will include a number of different funding sources, such as the NVTA local funding and the County's commercial and industrial property tax for transportation.	Undetermined
065	6	Arlington	New project	Would like Courthouse Second Elevator	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
065	6	Arlington	New project	Rosslyn-Ballston Streetcar	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
036	6	Fairfax	New Project	Stone Rd / New Braddock Rd / I-66 connection	See response to comment #036 New Project.	Undetermined
072	6	Fairfax	Route 29 Widening	Route 29 Widening (Legato to Shirley Gate) -- We oppose unless the new lane capacity goes to HOV/express bus. This is another example of the never-ending and costly widening that fuels continued spread out development. More compact development and urban style boulevards would serve better over the long term	Comment noted.	Con
039	6	Fairfax	Route 29 Widening	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	6	Fairfax City	Chain Bridge Road widening	Fairfax City: We are concerned about the VDOT proposed design for this project and recommend an area-wide solution that includes a better street network on both sides of Route 123 and parallel to Route 50, evaluation of routes around the core of the City of Fairfax, and evaluation of transit improvements between GMU and other areas south of the City of Fairfax and Vienna Metro. Major expansion of the 123/Route 50 interchange is only a short term approach and will create an area hostile to pedestrians and bicyclists, and hinder the walkable, mixed-use redevelopment of the area.	The improvements to the 123/50 intersection are first steps in a longer term vision for the area. The City is exploring options for an improved street network on both sides of 123 that could occur with redevelopment of the area. There have been modifications to the design to improve safety for pedestrians at the intersection.	Con
039	6	Fairfax City	Chain Bridge Road widening	I especially support the City of Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	6	Fairfax City	Chain Bridge Road widening	Undeterminable regional significance.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
003	6	Fairfax City	New Project	I also have no idea why there is no bus service along Route 123 between Fairfax Station and Fairfax City.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
049	6	Falls Church	EFC bridge	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
059	6	Falls Church	EFC bridge	Local responsibility.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
072	6	Falls Church	EFC bridge	We support all three projects.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Pro
049	6	Falls Church	Pedestrian access	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
059	6	Falls Church	Pedestrian Access	Local responsibility.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
072	6	Falls Church	Pedestrian access	We support all three projects.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Pro

004	6	Falls Church	Pedestrian access	Falls Church-pedestrian access to public transportation Thank you for the chance to comment. Thanks, Heidi Bonnaffon	The Comprehensive Plan for the City of Falls Church establishes several transportation goals, including ensuring the safety of the traveling public and encouraging the use of non-automotive modes of transportation within the City and to the region. These goals are well-supported by the traveling public. Every day, 2,300 City residents, 37 percent of employed residents, travel to work by a mode other than driving alone. Regionally, the importance and effectiveness of providing transportation choices has been recognized as a key strategy for alleviating traffic congestion. The Region Forward plan was endorsed by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and the 21 local member governments, including the City of Falls Church. The plan notes the following, "In many parts of the region, however, a lack of transportation choices for residents has led to a growing number of drivers contributing to congestion, longer commutes, and air pollution." Providing transportation choices, such as transit, walking, and bicycling, in addition to automobiles is part of a regional strategy for reducing travel congestion. The selection of projects aligns with the statutory requirements set forth for NVTA regarding project selection and prioritization. The projects being considered for FY14 are included in the NVTA's long term transportation plan, TransAction 2040. As part of that planning process, each project was evaluated for its impact on congestion relief and its benefit to cost ratio. That evaluation showed that all of the proposed projects affecting the City of Falls Church will reduce roadway congestion and have strong benefit to cost ratios for the region. The statutory requirements anticipate spending money in support of multiple modes of transportation. The legislation calls for spending on projects included in the NVTA's existing transportation plan or on mass transit projects that increase capacity. Given that the NVTA's existing transportation plan is multimodal and additional transit projects are explicitly permitted, it is clear that the funding was meant to be spent in a multi-modal fashion. The proposed regional projects affecting the City of Falls Church are effective, efficient, and equitable. They are effective in that they will address congestion in regional travel corridors. See the map below describing the connections between the projects and regional travel corridors. They are efficient because of their strong benefit to cost ratios. They are equitable because they align with established local and regional goals.	Pro
049	6	Falls Church	Pedestrian signals	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
059	6	Falls Church	Pedestrian signals	Local responsibility.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Con
072	6	Falls Church	Pedestrian signals	We support the pedestrian signal improvements.	See response to comment #4 Pedestrian access.	Pro
043	6	Falls Church	W&OD lighting	My initial review of the strawman project list suggesting funding for projects such as a Potomac yard Metrorail Station EIS and for a W&OD Trail Lighting Connecting To Future Intermodal Plaza will have a hard time demonstrating compliance with the funding test under this statutory mandate.	The W&OD project was removed from the projects for consideration by NVTA for FY 14 funding.	Con
046	6	Prince William	New Project	Wants I-66 widened to Haymarket.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
030	6	Prince William	New Project	One of the questions I have is about I-66 improvement on Rt 15. When Route 15 between 29 and 66 with the rail crossing, that portion doesn't get improves until 2035. That's what I saw. What about Balls Ford Road? We have the crossing there. Is that something that you would consider?	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
046	6	Regional	New Project	Widen Rt 15 from I-66 to VA-7 instead of building Bi-County.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
060	6	Regional	New Project	The Silver Line is critical.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
038	6	VRE	Gainesville	Urge you to include planning for extension of VRE to Gainesville/Harmarket.	Comment noted.	Pro
042	6	VRE	Gainesville	Fully support.	Comment noted.	Pro
046	6	VRE	Gainesville	Supports.	Comment noted.	Pro
002	6	VRE	Gainesville	My wife and I strongly support the extension of VRE service to the Gainsville-Haymarket area. The explosive growth in that area reflects an increasing demand for reliable public transportation. We plan to move that direction in the next two/three years as we downsize from our Burke home. Rail service would definitely support our plan to move to Gainsville-Haymarket. Thanks!	Planning for the Gainesville-Haymarket extension is in the intial stages and full funding to construct the extension has not been identified. As such it is difficult to predict when the extension might be realized. The extension is important to VRE and we continue to seek out opportunities such as NVTA funds to advance the project.	Pro
033	6	VRE	Gainesville	Thanks for hosting this meeting and I want to express my support for the VRE proposals to increase the number of coaches and to build a Gainesville station. I'm a commuter that drives from Gainesville to Manassas City to take the train and I feel Like that would really help.	See response to comment #002 VRE Gainesville.	Pro
072	6	VRE	Gainesville	VRE: We support the three VRE requests and note that the Alexandria station improvement is an important state solution for intercity rail.	See response to comment #002 VRE Gainesville.	Pro
059	6	VRE	Gainesville	Questionable immediate need.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
042	6	WMATA	New Project	Supports extension to Gainesville.	Extension of the Orange Line to Gainesville, while included in TransAction 2040, is not a project for which FY2014 funds would be timely.	Undetermined
051	6	WMATA	New Project	Supports completion of Silver Line.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
070	6	WMATA	Traction Power	By contrast, for Metrorail related projects, no NVTA funding should occur in FY 2014 unless the local jurisdictions involved provide written evidence of prior approvals within their respective capital budgets to fund the majority of costs. In the case of design of traction power stations in Arlington County and Alexandria, no NVTA funding should occur until an overall funding plan for Metrorail capital improvements and the appropriate funding commitments and financing plan have been approved by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as well as the District of Columbia and Maryland state authorities.	The NVTA would take a leadership step by allocating FY2014 funds for Metrorail, and facilitate getting DC & MD commitments for funding Momentum.	Con
054	6	WMATA	Traction power	Supports	Comment noted.	Pro
059	6	WMATA	Traction power	High regional significance.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	6	WMATA	Traction power	WMATA: We support the two WMATA projects.	Comment noted.	Pro

072	7	Fairfax	Franconia Van Dorn	Franconia/South Van Dorn Interchange (Project 5) -- we oppose this project in light of the scale of the projects on Franconia previously built as part of the Springfield Interchange. This new interchange would further divide communities on both sides of Van Dorn and Franconia. Instead we need a new approach of local connections, dedicated HOV/transit lanes, and urban style interchange that shrinks pedestrian crossing distances. That a major interchange is proposed here is a direct and predictable outcome of the construction of the massive Kingstowne development without effective transit connections.	Comment noted.	Con
039	7	Fairfax	Franconia Van Dorn	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
049	8	Alexandria	Bus shelters	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	See response to comment #059 bus shelters.	Con
059	8	Alexandria	Bus shelters	Local responsibility.	Bus shelters proposed in Alexandria City are regionally significant. This is indicated in the comprehensive justifications for this project.	Con
039	8	Alexandria	Bus shelters	I especially support the Alexandria plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	Alexandria	Bus shelters	2014 Projects: Alexandria: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	8	Alexandria	Dash expansion	Local responsibility.	DASH expansion buses is regional significant. This is indicated in the comprehensive justifications for this project.	Con
039	8	Alexandria	Dash expansion	I especially support the Alexandria plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	Alexandria	Dash expansion	2014 Projects: Alexandria: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
067	8	Alexandria	New Project	Cameron Yard Metro stop; Rail to Manassas, Woodbridge, and Fredericksburg;	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
049	8	Alexandria	New Project	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
043	8	Alexandria	Potomac Yard EIS	My initial review of the strawman project list suggesting funding for projects such as a Potomac yard Metrorail Station EIS and for a W&OD Trail Lighting Connecting To Future Intermodal Plaza will have a hard time demonstrating compliance with the funding test under this statutory mandate.	Comment noted.	Con
039	8	Alexandria	Potomac Yard EIS	I especially support the Alexandria plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
067	8	Alexandria	Potomac Yard EIS	Supports rail in the following areas: 1) Potomoc Yard Metro Stop;	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	Alexandria	Potomac Yard EIS	2014 Projects: Alexandria: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
039	8	Alexandria	Traffic signals	I especially support the Alexandria plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	Alexandria	Traffic signals	2014 Projects: Alexandria: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	8	Alexandria	Traffic signals	Moderate regional significance.	Traffic signals proposed in Alexandria City are regionally significant. This is indicated in the	Undetermined
049	8	Alexandria	VRE Tunnel	Disregard projects like bus shelters and pedestrian walkways.	See response to comment #001 VRE Tunnel.	Con
072	8	Alexandria	VRE Tunnel	We support the three VRE requests and note that the Alexandria station improvement is an important state solution for intercity rail.	Comment noted.	Pro
001	8	Alexandria	VRE Tunnel	Glad that there is a plan to put a tunnel between the VRE/Amtrack station and the King St. Metro station. It will be a very nice convenience for me. But, honestly, is it really worth the money? With funds so tight and there being so many useful projects, I just have to wonder if saving several steps is a good reason to spend the money on this project.	The investment in the VRE-WMATA King St Tunnel will make a significant investment in time savings for people throughout the region, will make the facility compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and will leverage significant amounts of federal funds. The Alexandria Station is served by three tracks. VRE trains typically use one of two tracks that run between the station building and the second, island platform located east of the station building (Tracks 2 and 3). The platform adjacent to the station building that is served by a single track (Track 3). The island platform has tracks on either side –Track 1 on the east or Metrorail side of the platform and Track 2 on the Alexandria Station side of the platform – although VRE trains only use Track 2 on the Alexandria Station side of the platform. It is difficult for VRE trains to access the platform from Track 1 and it is not at the right height for VRE trains. The pedestrian tunnel project at the Alexandria Station will allow passengers to more safely and conveniently get to the island platform as well as the Metrorail station (Old Town/King Street). The project will also make improvements to the island platform so it is more accessible and usable by VRE trains on both Tracks 1 and 2. Opening up the Alexandria station to service from any of the three tracks provides a great deal of operational flexibility and capacity to the railroad. VRE and its partners are working with the host railroads to receive benefit from capacity improvements such as this and other VRE platform projects in the form of additional service considerations as well as considerations for additional stations, such as Potomac Shores Station.	Undetermined
059	8	Alexandria	VRE Tunnel	Moderate regional significance.	See response to comment #001 VRE Tunnel.	Undetermined
059	8	Alexandria	Potomac Yard EIS	Local responsibility.	The Potomac Yard EIS is a regionally significant project. This is indicated in the comprehensive justifications for this project.	Con
072	8	Arlington	Blue / Silver Line Mitigation	2014 Projects:Arlington: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro

059	8	Arlington	Blue/Silver mitigation	Local responsibility.	Extending the ART 42 to the Crystal City Metro and nearby Virginia Regional Express (VRE) station will enable commuters from four rail lines to transfer to a bus route to destinations in Clarendon, Virginia Square, and Ballston at an estimated peak frequency of 16 minutes. This measure will moderately increase ART's north-south bus capacity within Arlington to coincide with the opening of the Silver Line. While the ART bus service is provided within the geographic borders of Arlington County, the benefits of the service provided are regional in scope. The ART 45 serves commuters who walk or transfer from Metrobus 16-line service, with a catchment areas along Columbia Pike to Annandale, to jobs in Rosslyn. Those commuters formerly transferred to Metrorail's Blue Line at Pentagon City or Pentagon Metro stations. Addition of a fourth peak period ART 45 bus will increase capacity to absorb more passengers - the other three buses already have standing peak period passenger loads. Metrorail's Blue Line provided a direct connection for residents living in the corridor from Pentagon City to Springfield and by transfer to Fredericksburg and Manassas to jobs in Rosslyn, Foggy Bottom, and Farragut Square. Residents in the Orange Line corridor transferred to the Blue Line to reach jobs in Pentagon City and Crystal City. The current reduction in Blue Line Metro service from 6 minute peak frequency to 9 minutes has already resulted in reduced Metrorail ridership and diversion to single-occupancy automobile trips. The further reduction to 12-minute frequencies planned for the Blue Line will increase traffic congestion, unless a viable transit alternative is available to people. Extending ART 42 to Crystal City will provide that direct connection from the Blue Line and VRE to employment centers in Ballston.	Con
039	8	Arlington	Blue/Silver mitigation	I especially support the Arlington plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
039	8	Arlington	Boundary Channel interchange	I especially support the Arlington plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
065	8	Arlington	Boundary Channel interchange	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
068	8	Arlington	Boundary Channel interchange	This is a regional project which he supports.	Comment noted.	Pro
069	8	Arlington	Boundary Channel interchange	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	Arlington	Boundary Channel interchange	2014 Projects:Arlington: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	8	Arlington	Boundary Channel interchange	Undeterminable regional significance.	The primary benefit of the Boundary Channel Drive Interchange project will be the reduction of congestion of vehicular traffic on I-395 in the most congested areas of the Greater Washington region. The project also proposed to create multimodal connections for pedestrians and bicyclists from Virginia to the Humpback Bridge Trail connection and over the 14th Street Bridge. The existing Boundary Channel Drive Interchange is inadequate to meet current travel demands. The 14th Street Bridge Environmental Impact Study (EIS) called for the Boundary Channel Drive Interchange to be redesigned to eliminate ramp access points to I-395; based on the EIS rankings, the ramp eliminations for th einterchange were ranked third amongst the top priorities for the Highway Action Alternatives. This project proposes to eliminate two on/off ramps on Boundary Channel Drive by creating a roundabout at the ramps terminus. Additional information about the 14th Street Bridge EIS can be found at http://www.14thstreetbridgecorridoreis.com/deis.html .	Undetermined
059	8	Arlington	Crystal City multimodal	Local responsibility.	The Crystal City Multimodal Center will improve multimodal and transit access to the Crystal City Metrorail station which sees 13,837 weekday boardings, as well as Metrobus (cumulative) ridership of 12,294 on lines stopping in the vicinity (9A, 9S, 10AE, 16GHK, 23AC) and connection to VRE. The four new bus bays being proposed as part of this project will be utilized by local and regional commuter bus providers. Currently three regional commuter bus companies operate in the area in addition to WMATA: Fairfax Connection, Loudoun County, and PRTC Ombiride. During the AM Peak (6:00am to 9:00 am) there are 26 scheduled trips, while in the PM Peak (3:00 pm to 6:00 pm) there are 23 scheduled trips. Planned implementation of the Crystal City Potomac Yard Transitway may require relocation of co-located commuter stops due to longer dwell times. Access to these bus routes may become increasingly important with reduced Blue Line Metro service expected with the opening of the Silver Line by 2014. Additional curb space will be provided for kiss and ride and shuttle buses. Shuttle buses are operated by a number of providers including the Department of Defense, local hotels, car dealerships, and other private providers. During a recent (April 2013) observation, 40 shuttle trips were counted during a 1.5 hour peak period, with up to six different shuttles stopping concurrently by the Metro entrance on 18th Street South and South Bell Street. There is currently no designated space for their use and stopping patterns are informal and often interfere with traffic and Metrobus operations on South Bell Street.	Con
039	8	Arlington	Crystal City multimodal	I especially support the Arlington plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
065	8	Arlington	Crystal City multimodal	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
069	8	Arlington	Crystal City multimodal	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	Arlington	Crystal City multimodal	2014 Projects:Arlington: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro

067	8	Arlington	New Project	Crystal City Streetcar	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
067	8	Arlington	New Project	Rail along I-395 and I-495;	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
072	8	Prince William	US-1 Featherstone to Mary's Way	Prince William: Route 1 -- we remain concerned about the focus on widening and the wide lanes. Route 1 should have 11 foot lanes and safe bike/ped facilities and be designed for future dedicated lane transit.	Comment noted.	Con
038	8	Prince William	US-1 Featherstone to Mary's Way	Urge you to include widening Rt 1 from Featherstone to Mary's Way.	Comment noted.	Pro
050	8	Prince William	US-1 Featherstone to Mary's Way	Design RT 1 from Featherstone Rd to Mary's Way is commendable	Comment noted.	Pro
054	8	Prince William	US-1 Featherstone to Mary's Way	Supports.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	8	Prince William	US-1 Featherstone to Mary's Way	High regional significance.	Comment noted.	Pro
059	8	PRTC	PRTC Bus	Local responsibility.	PRTC's project is an element of a regional transit improvement aimed at enhancing transit access between NVTA jurisdictions and serving multiple NVTA jurisdictions' residents. The new Gainesville Service bus will provide more direct service between western Prince William and Tyson's Corner as well as DC, serving residents in Prince William County, Manassas, and Manassas Park. In fact, this transit improvement plan is among the service improvements most often requested by the residents in our service area. A "one seat" transit service to more destinations is known to increase the use of public transit, helping to ease congestion, and thus the regional transit project prompting your comment will not only benefit those who use the service, but motorists as well. Thus we respectfully submit that the PRTC transit service improvement is a project of regional significance which is deserving of funding from the regional pot.	Con
072	8	PRTC	PRTC Bus	PRTC: We support the PRTC bus.	The Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC) appreciates your support for the new Gainesville Service bus. PRTC's project is an element of a regional transit improvement aimed at enhancing transit access between NVTA jurisdictions and serving multiple NVTA jurisdictions' residents. The new Gainesville Service bus will provide more direct service between western Prince William and Tyson's Corner as well as DC, serving residents in Prince William County, Manassas, and Manassas Park.	Pro
054	8	VRE	Crystal City	Purchase more VRE passenger cars instead of proposed platform improvements.	Comment noted.	Con
072	8	VRE	Crystal City	General: We support the remaining transit improvements listed for the jurisdictions, VRE, WMATA.	As VRE works to increase the lengths of trains to meet the growing demand, efforts need to take place to extend existing platforms as well. Crystal City is an example of this need. As part of this project it is likely that consideration will be given to eventually add a second platform to further increase the capacity of the system as noted in the previously described projects.	Pro
054	8	VRE	Lorton second platform	Purchase more VRE passenger cars instead of proposed platform improvements.	Expanding platform capacity by constructing second platforms, such as at the Lorton and Rippon stations, not only provides room for more passengers to board and longer trains to use the station but also enhances system efficiency by minimizing station dwell times and enabling a train to service a station from either of the tracks that serve these stations. As with the Alexandria project, the increased operational capacity and efficiency, in turn, enable more trains to run on the system. While improvements at an individual station may appear to be a local improvement, in fact they directly affect, and in this case expand, the capacity of the overall system.	Con
059	8	VRE	Lorton second platform	Questionable immediate need.	See response to comment #054 Lorton second platform.	Undetermined
041	8	VRE	New Project	Please work to develop wi-fi on the VRE trains.	VRE continues to explore options to provide WiFi service on its trains. Through a number of different tests and studies have been done as noted, we have discovered several areas along the tracks we use where a signal cannot be received. Until a provider is able to offer continuous service, we will not offer WiFi on our trains.	Undetermined
006	8	VRE	New Project	Gail Parker advocated moving forward with rail projects that serve densely populated areas. Ms. Parker supports rail to Fort Belvoir and other rail projects listed in the newspaper.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
067	8	VRE	New Project	Dedicated passenger (VRE) rail so that they can increase capacity;	Comment noted.	Undetermined
060	8	VRE	Overall	Investments in VRE will improve transit in the entire NVTA region by further improving that transit option.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
054	8	VRE	Rippon	Purchase more VRE passenger cars instead of proposed platform improvements.	Expanding platform capacity by constructing second platforms, such as at the Lorton and Rippon stations, not only provides room for more passengers to board and longer trains to use the station but also enhances system efficiency by minimizing station dwell times and enabling a train to service a station from either of the tracks that serve these stations. As with the Alexandria project, the increased operational capacity and efficiency, in turn, enable more trains to run on the system. While improvements at an individual station may appear to be a local improvement, in fact they directly affect, and in this case expand, the capacity of the overall system.	Con
072	8	VRE	Rippon	VRE: We support the three VRE requests and note that the Alexandria station improvement is an important state solution for intercity rail.	See response to comment #054 Rippon	Pro

054	8	VRE	VRE Rolling Stock	Purchase more VRE passenger cars instead of proposed platform improvements.	VRE is a system of components; trains, stations, parking, track, storage yards, etc. Increasing VRE's capacity involves adding capacity to all of these components. While adding rail vehicles is the most tangible and immediate way to increase capacity, the VRE station-specific projects also add capacity, enhance safety and improve operational flexibility.	Pro
004	8	VRE	VRE Rolling Stock	I would like to see the VRE add more trains to increase the frequency of their service (especially, to add one more later train on the Manassas Line morning trip into DC).	Expanding VRE capacity through the projects proposed for NVTA funding will enable more trains to be operated over the VRE system.	Pro
005	8	VRE	VRE Rolling Stock	With the proposed extension of VRE to Gainesville and Haymarket, is there any plan to provide funds for an increase in the number of VRE trains? Currently, by the time the current trains pass through Manassas Park City, they start to become crowded. Adding stations in Gainesville and Haymarket will help alleviate traffic on Rt. 28 South of Manassas City. But it will increase the number of riders which will crowd the trains even more.	Planning and analysis for the Gainesville-Haymarket extension will include an estimation of the potential new riders as well as impacts on existing service. At this time the level of service to support a Gainesville-Haymarket extension is unknown. A service/operating plan will be developed for the extension as well as a financial plan detailing both capital and operating costs. Once a decision is made to move forward with the extension and funding through construction has been committed, recommendations for funding additional service forwarded to the VRE Operations Board as appropriate.	Pro
020	8	VRE	VRE Rolling Stock	You've talked about increasing VRE priority to get more rails to decrease traffic on the road which is a great suggestion.	Comment noted.	Pro
032	8	VRE	VRE Rolling Stock	We need to build new track and add more trains that run more often and to more places. Adding more roads just creates more traffic and we need less. I encourage you to move the rail projects to first priority.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	VRE	VRE Rolling Stock	General: We support the remaining transit improvements listed for the jurisdictions, VRE, WMATA.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	8	WMATA	Interlocking Girders	We support the remaining transit improvements listed for the jurisdictions, VRE, WMATA.	Comment noted.	Pro
071	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	<p>I question whether the \$12 million in the NVTA's list for the Columbia Pike Multi-Modal project is an improvement in reducing congestion which is the major goal of NVTA. There is a long history of how Col Pike is seen by the county board. A little background: Mr. Zimmerman as chairman of Arlington County Board in 2006 stated that the "Streets" section of the MTP is focused on the "Urban Village." After adoption by the Board the Streets section stated that the only efforts to improve highway capacity involved improvements in key intersections (such as left turn lanes) of several four lane roads. Expanding overall capacity of main roads was not part of the plan. The \$12 million in the plan is simply a partial payment. Arlington's FY 2013-22 Transportation Capital Improvement Plan shows the total cost of the project is \$69 million.</p> <p>The Multi-Modal project is the result of the Board approved the Streetscape Plan for the Pike. This plan among other items included a) narrowing the curb travel lane to 11 feet, and the outer lane to 10 feet; b) eliminating bus pull-outs; c) putting a 7 foot-wide parking lane on each side of the Pike in "Town Centers" which comprise 2.5 of the 3.5 mile length of the Pike being redeveloped; and, d) reducing speeds from 30 mph currently to 20 in town centers and 25 elsewhere on the Pike. These changes were later included in the Multi-Modal plan. The VDOTs early as 2005 stated (in an appendix to the July 2005 Columbia Pike Streetcar report) that a 7 foot width was dangerous!</p> <p>On March 19, 2007 I attended a Public Forum on the Master Transportation Plan; a discussion issue was whether arterial streets should be rebuilt with narrower lanes to "manage" traffic speeds. After the meeting I asked the Arlington Traffic Bureau Chief whether VISSIM was going to be used to model narrower lanes and parking lanes. Modeling was not done and there were no plans to do it, I was told. He also stated he didn't know how highway capacity would be affected by lane narrowing. In an Oct.23 2007 meeting I was told by the Chief of Arlington's Transportation Division that only traffic counts were needed to determine effects of narrowing lanes.</p> <p>In TAC meetings from 2008-12 I was frequently told by county staff that VISSIM would be used by the Col Pike Multi-Modal project staff. At a Multi-Modal project design meeting on 3/26/12 a bus representative from METRO objected to on-street parking with 7 foot wide lanes. I asked the county staff representative and consultant (from Kimley-Horn) about the impacts of the 7 foot parking lane and travel lane narrowing. They said no VISSIM analysis had been done; the consultant was sure that the 10 foot outer travel lane was safe, even for vehicles of 8 1/2 wide passing each other. They said VISSIM analysis was the responsibility of the streetcar team.</p> <p>In view of these facts it is clear why Arlington wanted a transfer of the Pike from the State to county control. I discussed the proposed transfer of the Pike to Arlington with a local state rep on April 1, 2012. I was told that after a transfer to the county VDOT would have no role in modeling traffic effects or determining safety of a 7 foot parking lane width.</p> <p>In the absence of specific information about Multi-Modal project's traffic impacts I believe it is most unwise and ill-advised to approve this project for FY 14 funding. At the June 20 NVTA meeting, Mr. Zimmerman expounded at length about the need for projects that will reduce congestion. This appears hypocritical in view of the absence of any formal modeling of specific roadway changes to Col Pike. This project should not receive funding until such analysis is done.</p>	See response to comment #59 Columbia Pike Multimodal.	Con
039	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	I especially support the Arlington plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
060	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	The Columbia Pike Multimodal Project contains all the elements of forward thinking combined with more immediate benefits. It helps to implement not only an improved roadway, but also smart growth planning (Columbia Pike neighborhood plans) and preparation for future mass transit improvements (streetcar). It will improve the busiest bus transit corridor in the region.	Comment noted.	Pro
065	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
068	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	This is a regional project which he supports.	Comment noted.	Pro
069	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Pro
072	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	2014 Projects:Arlington: We support all four proposed projects.	Comment noted.	Pro

059	9	Arlington	Columbia Pike Multimodal	Undeterminable regional significance.	The Columbia Pike Multimodal Improvements Project will reduce congestion and improve traffic flow through the addition of left-turn lanes in several locations where they currently don't exist. Currently vehicles turning causes traffic to back up causing significant travel time delays. Redundant commercial drive entrances will be consolidated. Currently vehicles turning into and out of these driveways interrupt and block traffic flow. A thorough and extensive transportation and multimodal level of service study was undertaken for this project and was completed in June, 2012. The study analyzed existing and future forecasts for traffic volumes, levels of service, average traffic delay times and queue lengths, and other transportation conditions. The multimodal study analyzed current and future conditions for all travel modes. The project design was developed based on the study and the resulting recommendations. The study and recommendations can be found on the project website at: http://www.columbiapikeva.us/multimodal-street-improvements/ .	Undetermined
064	9	Arlington	New Project	Opposes Columbia Pike Streetcar.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
065	9	Arlington	New project	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
065	9	Arlington	New project	ART to DC	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
072	9	Fairfax	Braddock HOV	Braddock Road Expansion (Project 3) -- we oppose general purpose lane expansion and urge the new lane be dedicated to HOV/express bus service	Comment noted.	Con
039	9	Fairfax	Braddock HOV	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
070	9	Fairfax	Braddock HOV	Tom outlined another proposed highway improvement project: Braddock Road widening with HOV/bus lanes from Burke Lake Parkway to I 495. Having lived between Braddock Road and Little River Turnpike thirty years ago, I readily understand his claim of travel time savings involved.	Comment noted.	Pro
039	9	Fairfax	West Ox	I especially support the Fairfax plan.	Comment noted.	Pro
003	9	General	General	I am a strong proponent of public transportation of all sorts. I think we have too many cars on the roads we have and too many big vehicles. People driving large SUVs by themselves make no sense. I think there should be more access to e-vehicles, and charging stations for those vehicles. Related to public transportation. Finally, weekend bus service could be more available and reduce private vehicular traffic throughout the NVA area.	Comment noted.	Undetermined
011	9	Loudoun	New Project	The last point I want to make is we need another Potomac River crossing. It's been talked about extending Route 28. We have Maryland to deal with, Fairfax County and Loudoun County. But having just one route north of the capital beltway to get across into Maryland is a big impediment. Having grown up in southern New Jersey for instance, they have six Delaware River crossings. Six between Wilmington, Delaware, and Philadelphia. We have one. I think we can in Virginia, Loudoun County, and Maryland, work to make a crossing a reality in the future.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
072	9	Loudoun	New Project	We recommend greater focus on east-west commuter needs	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
060	9	Overall	Overall	The thirty-two projects included in the June 3rd version of the NVTA proposed project list provide a good initial balance of projects for consideration.	Comment acknowledged.	Undetermined
036	9	Prince William	New Project	Balls Ford Rd / Bull Run Dr connection	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
050	9	Prince William	New Project	Widening of Balls Ford RD and RT 15 between RT 29 and I-66.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
072	9	Prince William	New Project	We recommend funds be targeted to supporting a grid of "complete streets" (ped/bike friendly) for North Woodbridge redevelopment	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
046	9	Regional	New Project	Opposes.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
051	9	Regional	New Project	Supports	Comment noted.	Undetermined
047	9	Regional	New Project	Wants southern end to be at Godwin Drive.	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
040	9	VRE	New Project	Is there any way NVTA can expedite the opening of the proposed VRE stop in the new Sun Can Development on Cherry Hill?	VRE is working with both Sun Cal and CSX, who owns the railroad right-of-way, to come to agreement on a station at the Potomac Shores development. Ultimately CSX must grant permission for a station stop at that location.	Undetermined
067	9	VRE	New Project	Rail to Manassas, Woodbridge, and Ft. Bellvior	Project not submitted for consideration for FY 2014 NVTA regional funding.	Undetermined
060	9	WMATA	New Project	WMATA's request for ten new buses will have multiple benefits and will provide additional capacity to fit into the wide regional transit improvements that are planned. The Route 1 buses are needed as the BRT option is implemented. Route 16 buses for Columbia Pike, already the most heavily travelled bus corridor in NoVa, will need revision when the streetcar comes on-line, but until then will help WMATYA address population increases that current redevelopment is bringing.	In addition to US 1 and Columbia Pike, VA 236 is a corridor for bus priority, and these buses will improve service frequency in that corridor.	Pro
067	9	WMATA	New Project	Metrorail Potomac Crossing	Though TransAction 2040 includes a new tunnel under the Potomac for the Blue Line, this project is not suitable for timely use for FY2014 funds.	Undetermined
059	9	WMATA	New Project	Undeterminable regional significance.	Buses along VA 236 serve a regional function, traversing Alexandria, Fairfax County and Fairfax City.	Undetermined
068	9	WMATA	WMATA 10 buses	This is a regional project which he supports.	Buses along VA 236 serve a regional function, traversing Alexandria, Fairfax County and Fairfax City.	Pro
072	9	WMATA	WMATA 10 buses	WMATA: We support the two WMATA projects.	See response to comment #068 WMATA 10 buses.	Pro
069	9	Arlington	New project	Supports all Arlington's projects.	Comment noted.	Undetermined

FY 14 Project Selection Ranking Methodology (July 8, 2013)

Tier I Screening Criteria	Assigned Value
Contained in the regional transportation plan (TransAction 2040/CLRP/TIP)	"Y/N" given for each category
Mass transit project that increases capacity	"Y/N"
Reduces congestion	"Y/N"
Within locality embraced by the Authority or in adjacent localities but only to the extent that such extension is an insubstantial part of the project and is essential to the viability of the project within the localities embraced by the Authority.	"Y/N" if project or service is contained within the geographic boundaries of the NVTAs. "TBD" if type of project request requires additional guidance.

Tier II Screening Criteria	Assigned Value
Improve auto and pedestrian safety	1 pt – Yes, 0 pts - No
Project Readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project is included in TIP/CLRP or is air quality neutral. b. Have completed (or will complete prior to project selection) major regulatory reviews and/or public input processes. c. Resources available to move forward with project when funding becomes available. d. Funding will provide expedition of project phase. e. Projects will begin or complete next phase with requested funding. 	Maximum Points: 6 1 pt – Included in CLRP/AQ Neutral 1 pt – Included in TIP 1 pt – Completed major regulatory reviews and/or public input processes 1 pt – Resources available to move forward 1 pt – Funding will expedite project/phase 1 pt – Projects will begin or complete next phase in FY14
Mode Balance (Transit, Road, Multimodal)	R – Road, T – Transit, M - Multimodal
Short-term priorities of the jurisdictions that are partially funded in Commonwealth's SYIP or by individual jurisdictions or agencies. (Leverages External Funding)	1 pt – Yes, 0 pt – No

Tier III Screening (Criteria Overlay)
Priority given to greatest congestion reduction relative to cost.
Locality's total long-term benefit shall be approximately equal to the proportion of revenues attributable to the locality.*(use for 6-year plan, but not for FY14)
Counties and cities embraced by Authority must work cooperatively with towns and populations greater than 3,500 located within such counties to ensure that the towns receive their respective share of the revenues. (Pending additional guidance on collection/distribution process)

Bond Project Screening
Projects with 20 year lifespans (previously approved by PIWG 5/10/13)
Size of estimated total cost of project
Mode Balance
Geographic Balance
Leverages External Funds
High Rating (if on list of projects for consideration of future Six-Year Program)