* * * * *

C O N T E N T S

SPEAKER	PAGE
 Mr. Jeff Greenfield Councilman, City of Fairfax 	4
2. Ms. Sharon Bulova Chairman, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors	9
3. Ms. Sharon Bulova, on behalf of Chairman Nohe of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority	15
4. Ms. Kelly Burke Supervisor, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors	21
5. Mr. Michael May Supervisor, Prince William County Board of Supervisors	27
6. Ms. Catherine Hudgins Chairman, Northern Virginia Transportation Commission	31
7. Ms. Kristen Umstattd Mayor, Town of Leesburg	44
8. Mr. Douglas Stewart Sierra Club	48
9. Mr. Ralph Apton Great Falls Citizens Association	51
10. Ms. Kate Schwarz Fairfax Advocates for Bicycling	54
11. Mr. Robert Chase Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance	58
12. Mr. Allen Muchnick Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation	62

^ ^ ^ ^ ^

C O N T E N T S (cont.)

SPEAKER	
13. Mr. Stewart Schwartz Coalition for Smarter Growth	65
14. Mr. Dennis Dineen Citizen	71
15. Mr. Christopher Walker Dulles Corridor Users Group	73
16. Mr. Rob Whitfield Dulles Corridor Users Group	77

PROCEEDINGS

1 2 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Good evening, 3 I'd like to welcome you to this hearing for everyone. 4 the State's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan. 5 I would like to first start by asking everyone 6 to please stand, and we're going to say the Pledge of 7 Allegiance. (Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was 8 9 recited.) 10 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Thank you very much. 11 We'd like to very much thank the City of Fairfax for 12 hosting us here at City Hall, and the person who would 13 like to do a welcome, an initial greeting, is Councilman Jeff Greenfield. 14 15 Jeff? 16 Good evening. MR. JEFF GREENFIELD: I think 17 this is one of the few times I've actually stood on this 18 side of the dais, so welcome to the City of Fairfax. 19 Secretary Connaughton and members of the 20 Commonwealth Transportation Board, on behalf of the Mayor

21

2.2

23

livable cities in the United States.

2.2

The City of Fairfax, as you may know, is located in the heart of Northern Virginia, and we are criss-crossed by four major thoroughfares, Routes 29, 50, 123 and Route 236, three of which are in the National Highway System.

On any weekday there are at least 400,000 vehicles that criss-cross the city of Fairfax. This translates into a huge investment just to maintain our roads. As you are aware, the National Highway System roads require strict federal standards; therefore, improvements to these major arterials require more time and more money.

To give you an example of how bad it is tonight, I actually am surprised that I beat Secretary Connaughton here. I had a meeting in Old Town Alexandria, and it took me over an hour to go fourteen miles to be able to get out to the City of Fairfax.

The problems that we have up here are enormous, and I certainly welcome you for being here and we look to your leadership and the leadership of the General Assembly to hopefully move us in the right direction.

We are in the same boat as other jurisdictions. We are all strapped for transportation dollars. This year the State allocation for the City of Fairfax roadway maintenance funds was reduced three percent. This impacted our ability to keep up with just regular roadway preventive maintenance. If our maintenance funds are reduced, how can we even cope with growing demands for new transportation infrastructure?

2.2

The City does have ongoing transportation projects, and with other jurisdictions we ask that VDOT somehow shorten the project approval process, which sometimes takes more than thirty days just to receive initial feedback from VDOT.

Over the life of a project this can compound into frustrating delays that eventually increase the cost of the project. The City has designated Fairfax Boulevard -- for your purposes, Route 50 -- as its primary economic redevelopment corridor.

As such, we have several projects along this corridor: the Camp Washington Intersection spot improvements, the Route 50/Jermantown Road intersection improvements, the Route 123/Eaton Place intersection improvements, and finally the Route 50 and 123 storm

1 drainage and intersection improvements.

2.2

Completing those will allow us to move forward with some much needed economic development projects in those areas.

All of these ongoing projects, however, need additional funding to the tune of about five million dollars. Therefore, we ask that urban funding, which has been eliminated, be restored to enable us to complete our projects as scheduled.

The City previously received around one million dollars annually in urban funds. We also ask that funding that was previously allocated to the City not be reduced and in fact be restored.

The Mayor and City Council work diligently with our senator and delegate from the General Assembly to identify new transportation revenue sources. We ask that you join us and other Northern Virginia jurisdictions in this effort.

Thank you, and welcome again to the City of Fairfax. I hope you all have a pleasant evening. And just as a footnote, as you depart this evening I would encourage you to find a local eatery.

(Laughter)

	8
1	Just down the street is Hard Times, north on
2	123. If we don't have transportation dollars, maybe we
3	can make up some of the shortfall with our meals tax.
4	(Laughter)
5	So, please embark
6	SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: How high is your meals
7	tax?
8	(Laughter)
9	MR. GREENFIELD: I've never voted for it
10	(Laughter)
11	but I understand it's four percent. Have a
12	great evening. Thank you.
13	SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Thank you very much,
14	and thank you for hosting us here this evening.
15	I would like to go around and introduce those
16	here at the dais, and I'll start obviously with myself.
17	I'm Sean Connaughton, and I am the Secretary
18	of Transportation for the Commonwealth
19	MS. DRAKE: Thelma Drake, Director of the
20	Department of Rail and Public Transportation.
21	MR. KOELEMAY: I'm Doug Koelemay, Northern
22	Virginia Representative on the Commonwealth Transportation
23	Board.

	9
1	MS. PANDAK: Sharon Pandak. I'm the Urban At-
2	Large Member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board.
3	MR. WHIRLEY: Greg Whirley. I'm Acting
4	Commissioner for VDOT.
5	MR. SCHWARTZ: Peter Schwartz, Rural At-Large
6	member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board.
7	MR. SALEHI: I am Morteza Salehi. I'm
8	District Administrator for VDOT here in the Northern
9	Virginia District.
10	MR. DAVIES: I'm Butch Davies, and I'm the
11	VDOT representative the CTB representative from the
12	Culpeper District.
13	MR. UTTERBACK: I'm Jim Utterback, Culpeper
14	District Administrator.
15	SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Also, I'd like to
16	introduce David Tyeryar (indicating), who is the Deputy
17	Secretary of Transportation, and then Matt Straeder
18	(indicating), who is the Assistant Secretary.
19	And with that, I would like to introduce
20	Sharon Bulova, Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of
21	Supervisors.
22	MS. BULOVA: And I would also like to just say
23	that as you're leaving and if you're looking for a place

to dine, in Fairfax County we don't have a meals tax. 1 2 (Laughter) 3 We have very nice places to dine, and so we hope you will enjoy those things. 4 5 And, Mr. Secretary, if you would permit, I 6 have testimony from the Fairfax County Board of 7 Supervisors but also from the Transportation Authority. 8 Chairman Nohe could not be here, so I will go first with 9 Fairfax County. 10 Secretary Connaughton, Acting Commissioner Whirley, Director Drake and members of the Commonwealth 11 12 Transportation Board, I am Sharon Bulova, Chairman of the 13 Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. I am here today to 14 present testimony on behalf of the Board. 15 I appreciate this opportunity to testify before you regarding the Draft Six-Year Improvement 16 17 Program for interstate, primary, urban systems and public 18 transportation. 19 On May 25th, yesterday, the Fairfax County 20 Board reviewed and approved transmittal of the letter 21 being submitted today to the record which discusses the 2.2 Board's comments and concerns regarding the Draft Six-Year 23 Program.

The Board fully recognizes the impacts of the current nationwide economic recession on all government revenues and the restrained physical climate in which the CTB must continue to operate when allocating available funds.

2.2

The Board continues to be very concerned about the General Assembly's inaction in providing long-term, sustainable funding for the State's transportation operations, maintenance and construction programs.

This inaction has left numerous long anticipated and critically needed transportation projects without adequate resources within the next six years, as well as a negative impact on previously funded projects in Fairfax County's portion of the region's Constrained Long Range Plan.

Given the current economic situation and the significant reductions in funding available to the State for transportation construction, the Board appreciates that the CTB has retained funding in the program wherever possible for continuing projects that are already under construction or nearing construction, including Fairfax County's most critical projects.

These include projects such as Metrorail to

Dulles Airport, the Capital Beltway HOT Lanes project, including funds for the Springfield Interchange Phase VIII and mitigation of community impacts resulting from the HOT lanes project, I66 outside the Beltway Environmental Impact Statement and the final two-mile segment of the Fairfax County Parkway, the County's Ridesharing Program and the match for federal dedicated funding for Metro.

The Board also appreciates CTB's inclusion of \$646,000 in state matching funds for \$3.034 million in federal funds received for BRAC Economic Development to help this area of the County address the impacts of BRAC relocations.

The Board would like to thank the CTB for retaining all funding shown in the previously approved Fiscal Year 2010-2015 Six-Year Program on Route 29 and Gallows Road Intersection project, including the commitment made by the Board on July 13, 2009, to provide Fiscal Year 2011 and Fiscal Year 2012 Regional Surface Transportation Program funding and up to \$14 million in the County's Commercial and Industrial Real Estate, or C&I, Revenues for Transportation for this project.

This action will ensure that this project continues to move forward to construction advertisement as

scheduled prior to the end of 2010.

Similarly, the Board appreciates that all funding shown in the previously approved Fiscal Year 2010-2015 Program has been retained for the Fairfax County Parkway Interchange at Fair Lakes Parkway and Monument Drive.

The construction contract for this project was bid yesterday. It is essential that this critical regionally-significant project, substantially funded by both state and regional American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds, continue to move forward without any further delay.

As stated in one of VDOT's goals, one of the main elements of the Adopted Six-Year Program is replacing and improving bridges. The Board would like to express its appreciation for reinstating the Route 29 bridge replacement over Little Rocky Run project, which was fully funded in the adopted Six-Year Program in June, 2009.

Finally, despite the CTB's effort to keep a number of construction projects in Fairfax County moving, I would be remiss if I did not mention the Board's significant concern that the County's Fiscal Year 2011-2016 Secondary Road Program contains only \$1,989.

1 This is not sustainable and essentially brings 2 the County's Secondary Road Program to a halt. 3 Unfortunately, the need for additional mobility continues. 4 We will continue to urge the General Assembly to address 5 the Commonwealth's transportation funding crisis as soon 6 as possible. 7 We request that the Board's testimony be made as a part of the Draft Six-Year Program public hearing 8 9 record and that the full consideration be given to these 10 comments in preparation for the final allocation document for Fiscal 2011 through Fiscal 2016 in June of 2010. 11 12 Thank you for this opportunity to provide 13 comments on behalf of Fairfax County. And if you need any 14 additional clarification, please let me know. 15 And now, Mr. Secretary, I will -- in the words of Joe Alexander, for those of you who remember Joe 16 17 Alexander, who used to serve on our Board and continues to 18 be extraordinarily active in transportation -- in the 19 words of Joe Alexander, I will now put my hat on my other 2.0 head --21 (Laughter) 2.2 -- and sometimes it feels that way. 23 Good evening again to all those folks who I

I am Sharon Bulova, Chairman of the 1 mentioned before. 2 Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, and this evening NVTA 3 Chairman Nohe has asked me to present NVTA's testimony on the Six Year Program. Chairman Nohe regrets that he is not 4 5 able to be here this evening. NVTA's comments on the Proposed Fiscal Year 6 7 2011-2016 program are as follows: First of all, we appreciate the Kaine and 8 9 McDonnell Administrations, VDOT and the CTB working with 10 NVTA to allocate regional American Recovery and 11 Reinvestment Act funding. 12 All of the projects funded with this source 13 have been obligated. Without this federal funding, it 14 would not be possible for these projects to proceed at 15 this time. We appreciate that the CTB retained NVTA's 16 17 historical role in the decision process for Regional 18 Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funds, allowing NVTA to prioritize funding for 19 2.0 the critical transportation needs of our region. 21 Given the serious transportation problems in 2.2 our region, we emphasize that construction projects that 23 were previously funded must be implemented as originally

scheduled.

2.2

While we understand the difficult position that the CTB faces due to the lack of revenue and we recognize that this public hearing is primarily about the Interstate and primary road programs, we are deeply concerned about the total elimination of the secondary and urban construction funding.

Not only will this mean that no new significant capacity improvements, widenings and interchanges will be initiated unless locally funded, but simple, cost-effective projects like signalization for new intersections, adding turn lanes and implementing pedestrian improvements will also be eliminated unless funded through other means.

Effectively, secondary and urban road improvements are at a standstill. This is unsustainable for urban areas like Northern Virginia. If not addressed, this situation will seriously impact our economy and will also compromise the movement of people and goods to and from Northern Virginia and other parts of the Commonwealth.

On the transit side, thank you for including the Virginia match for Federal dedicated funding for

Metro. We appreciate this significant commitment to maintaining Metro's assets and ensuring that Metro can continue to safely and efficiently meet the region's transportation needs.

2.2

We urge you not to reduce transit funding levels once they are approved. Since local government budgets and tax rates have already been set for Fiscal 2011, reducing the state assistance contracts mid-year, as has been done the last two fiscal years, may result in service cuts and fare increases.

At a time when transit usage has increased and the region is relying on transit to reduce congestion, making such cuts is extremely counter-productive.

With the declining revenues, we are disappointed to see that VDOT is quickly becoming a maintenance-only agency. As a result, the infrastructure necessary to serve our residents and businesses into the future is falling dramatically behind to the detriment of our economy and to the detriment of our quality of life.

New transportation investments are necessary to ensure the economic vitality of not only Northern Virginia but for the entire Commonwealth of Virginia.

We look forward to the General Assembly

1 addressing the Commonwealth's dire transportation funding 2 situation soon, hopefully during a special session later 3 this year. 4 NVTA is hopeful that new revenue sources for 5 transportation will be implemented consistent with NVTA's 6 Eight Principles for Transportation Funding adopted in 7 April of 2008, and this is attached. These principles are still valid, including 8 9 the need for stable, reliable, ongoing regional and 10 statewide transportation funds. 11 As cuts to the Six-Year Program illustrate, 12 the Commonwealth cannot afford to wait for Congress to act 13 on a new transportation authorization bill. New State 14 revenues are needed as soon as possible. Failure to build 15 infrastructure now will only cause the costs to the public 16 to be much greater in the future. 17 In addition to addressing the foregoing major 18 issues, NVTA requests: 19 That we continue to provide the match for 20 dedicated federal funding for Metro; 21 That the CTB treat transit operating expenses 2.2 like VDOT maintenance expenses and make these expenses a

higher priority than new capital projects;

23

That funding for VRE's track leases continue to be provided from federal funds;

That environmental reviews for locally administered projects be simplified and shortened;

2.2

That VDOT, DRPT and the CTB address Northern Virginia's concerns with the I-95/395 HOT lanes project, documented in multiple correspondences from NVTA, the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission and our local jurisdictions. And Fairfax County, in particular, is very committed to making sure that this project move forward;

In particular, NVTA asks the CTB to ensure that the 195 million dollars promised for transit service and facilities will be maintained as the project is modified to reduce costs. In addition, comments on the most recent transit plan prepared by VDOT consultants should be addressed;

That the CTB expedite the transfer of the Columbia Pike right-of-way within Arlington to local control at its earliest possibility so that Arlington and Fairfax Counties can move forward with plans for multimodal plan improvements and installation of the streetcar system;

That the CTB consider retaining the revenue sharing program since it is a cost effective way for VDOT and the local jurisdictions to implement projects;

2.2

Although the current 15 million dollar revenue sharing program is appreciated, the program could be much more effective in leveraging local funds if it is restored to its previous level of 50 million dollars;

That the CTB and VDOT support, promote and encourage walking and bicycling as more viable modes of transportation, and in concert with Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood's recent policy direction, look for opportunities to enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in Northern Virginia.

And I have attached, Mr. Secretary and members of the CTB, the eight principles that were adopted.

And again, thank you very much for the opportunity for us to testify. These are rocky, difficult times we will get through, but in the meantime thank you for your help, especially with reallocating projects to make sure that what has been started can be finished, and then we will work with our legislators to try to make sure that we have more money for transportation in the Commonwealth and in Northern Virginia.

Thank you so much. SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Chairman Bulova, thank	
SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON. Chairman Bulova thank	1
bleklinki commoditon. Chairman balova, chank	2
very much. Thank you for both pieces of testimony.	3
Next is Supervisor Kelly Burke from Loudoun	4
ty, from the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors.	5
MS. BURKE: Good evening. I didn't realize I	6
d be speaking second, after Fairfax.	7
(Laughter)	8
SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Well, I could put	9
ce William up there instead.	10
(Laughter)	11
MS. BURKE: Good evening!	12
(Laughter)	13
Secretary Connaughton, Director Drake and	14
ers of the Board, I am Kelly Burke and I represent the	15
ourg District on the Loudoun County Board of	16
rvisors.	17
On behalf of the Loudoun County Board of	18
rvisors, thank you for affording us the time to speak	19
ou tonight concerning the Commonwealth Transportation	20
	21
d's preparation of the Six-Year Improvement Program.	22
d's preparation of the Six-Year Improvement Program. Loudoun County is gravely concerned about the	(
On behalf of the Loudoun County Board of rvisors, thank you for affording us the time to spectual tonight concerning the Commonwealth Transportation	18 19 20 21

and in Northern Virginia. Now is the time for the Governor and the General Assembly to provide leadership by developing a sustainable revenue source for transportation in the Commonwealth and specifically in the Commonwealth's economic engine, Northern Virginia.

2.2

The Loudoun County Board of Supervisors supports the Governor's initiative to attract businesses to the area in order to provide economic stability and employment for the residents of Virginia.

However, Loudoun's experience in talking to potential economic development prospects is that they are very concerned about how their employees will get to work via an established transportation system, the roads and transit options, that won't mean hours and a sea of traffic congestion.

Traffic congestion negatively impacts the quality of life and family time for our current and future residents. In a recent article in the Washington Post regarding a poll conducted by the newspaper, in the Washington region sixty percent of the respondents indicated that traffic had grown worse in the region over the last five years.

(703) 591-3136

The article continued, to state that traffic

congestion has become a form of personal purgatory for our million and a half regional residents who commute to work every day, each spending an estimated sixty-two hours a year battling heavy traffic.

2.2

This is not encouraging news to potential prospects considering relocating their businesses to the Washington region, nor to the existing businesses while trying to develop future expansion plans.

The Washington Post also found that residents in the region making less than \$50,000 a year do not have the ability to telework. These are residents who work in the service, retail and construction industries, where teleworking just isn't an option. These workers suffer through the congestion for longer periods of time because they often live further away from the jobs in order to find affordable housing.

It is unconscionable that the fifth fastest-growing locality in the United States, Loudoun County, will receive \$1,024 over the next six years towards its secondary road system.

Road funding in Virginia is the responsibility of the Commonwealth. This crisis has been in the making for many years and didn't happen overnight.

We acknowledge that this is a huge issue. 1 2 Loudoun's needs alone would require tens of millions of 3 dollars to ensure our current road system and our growing transit infrastructure meets the future transportation 4 5 needs of our residents. 6 Loudoun County leads the way in the State in 7 local road-building efforts. Five interchanges are now completed on Route 28 with seventy-five percent of private 8 9 funding. 10 The interchange on Route 7 at River Creek is 11 open to traffic and was completed with one hundred percent 12 private funding. 13 The Route 7 and Ashburn Village Boulevard 14 interchange is nearing design approval and will be 15 constructed without state funds. 16 The Route 7 and Claiborne Parkway interchange 17 was opened without state funds. The Loudoun County Parkway interchange will be completed this fall and is 18 19 funded totally through local funds, no state funds. 20 We have demonstrated that we as a community 21 and the Board of Supervisors are committed to 2.2 transportation improvements, but we need the State to

recognize and accept its responsibilities as well.

23

Loudoun County transit initiatives are a top priority. The County continues to use its local gas tax resources to purchase buses and provide a small subsidy towards the operation of those buses.

2.2

In June of 2010 the County will begin bus service to the Tysons Corner area to try to relieve congestion during the construction of several of the mega projects now underway in that area.

The County has received significant public interest in the service, and a concern is whether we will be unable to meet the demands of the public in terms of providing the infrastructure needed to support the service.

Loudoun has a critical need for additional Park&Ride lot facilities, as well as a bus maintenance facility. Loudoun continues to work diligently with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transport to secure funding to assist in building these facilities.

The design of bus maintenance and storage facilities should be completed soon, and matching capital funds will be needed towards this construction.

Loudoun County, in its effort to create a truly multimodal system of transportation, continues to

focus on bicycle and pedestrian access for work and recreational uses.

2.2

The County is reviewing what is currently available or proffered to be available in or around the two new Metro stations that are planned for Route 606 and Route 772. Gaps in the network are being identified along with a plan to fill in the gaps.

We are committed to a walkable community to provide our residents safe and convenient access from their houses to the parks, destination shopping, schools and other public facilities.

Where possible, these are being planned and constructed with available proffer funds; however, where proffer funds are not available, the State's assistance is desperately needed.

Loudoun County will continue to play a significant role in meeting these transportation needs, but the State must help us. Much more needs to be done.

Some of our critical transportation needs are: the Route 15 and Route 7 Bypass widening, the Route 15 Bypass and Sycolin Road overpass, the Route 7 west of Leesburg to Route 9 widening, the Route 7 and Route 659, Route 7 and Battlefield Parkway, Route 7 and route 690

interchanges, the Route 7/Lexington Drive overpass, turn 1 2 lanes at Route 7 and 711 and Route 7 and 601, the 3 interchanges on Route 50, the Route 28 widening, the completion of all the parallel roads for 7, 28 and 50, and 4 5 completion of the Loudoun County Parkway. Thank you for your hard work. 6 I know you have 7 some very difficult decisions to make, and we really 8 appreciate all that you do. 9 Thank you. 10 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Supervisor, thank you 11 very much. Thanks for being here. 12 Supervisor Mike May, Prince William County 13 Board of Supervisors. Secretary Connaughton, Acting 14 15 Commissioner Whirley and members of the CTB, good evening and thank you for the opportunity to be here this evening. 16 17 My name is Mike May and I currently serve as the Vice-18 Chairman of the Prince William County Board of 19 Supervisors, and I'm here this evening to deliver remarks 2.0 on behalf of the Board. 21 I'd like to start by thanking you for your 2.2 continued efforts in trying to resolve our transportation 23 issues in Northern Virginia and in Prince William County.

With the continued major reduction in our program due to the economically stressed climate, Prince William County truly appreciates the efforts you have made to ensure that projects currently programmed in the Six-Year Plan for construction continue to receive the funding necessary to complete them.

With the recent approval by Governor

McDonnell to sell \$500 million in HB 3202 bonds to

complete transportation projects in the Plan, the

County acknowledges and applauds the efforts of the

administration and its commitment to advance

transportation projects, as Prince William County has

done with its own Road Bond Program for the past twenty

years.

The Board is particularly delighted to see that the regionally significant I-66/Route 29 Gainesville Interchange is on the list of projects that will continue to move forward due to the sale of these bonds.

This project has been a top priority for the Board and the region for many years, and we sincerely thank you for your continued efforts to maintain it in the program.

We kindly ask that the CTB consider

programming additional bond funding towards the construction of the Route 1/123 Interchange, which is another regionally significant project, which is actually \$18 million short of the funds needed for construction.

2.2

The receipt of these funds would allow the widening of Route 1 from Annapolis Way to Dawson Beach Drive. This would help complete another link in the ultimate widening of the Route 1 corridor region-wide.

We'd like to thank the CTB for fully funding the reconstruction of the bridge and widening of Route 1 at Neabsco Creek. This funding resulted in the completion of this project, which eliminated a safety hazard as well as a longstanding bottleneck.

The Prince William County Board continues to thank VDOT and the CTB for fully funding the I-66 widening and HOV Lane extension from Route 234 Bypass to Route 29, and we ask that this project remain on the Program with a timely completion.

The Board kindly requests that VDOT and the CTB consider additional funding in the Six-Year Plan, if funds become available, to begin the process of getting them to construction.

These projects are the next priorities for

	30
1	Prince William County and should be considered if
2	additional funding becomes available through a stimulus
3	package or other Federal or State legislative actions.
4	Specifically, they are:
5	The I-66 extension of HOV lanes from 29 to
6	Route 15, including the interchange improvements at 66 and
7	Route 15 and the grade separated interchange at Route 15
8	and Route 55;
9	Construction of Route 234 North Bypass from
10	I-66 to Loudoun County;
11	Construction funds for the Route 1 and 123
12	interchange, Phase 2;
13	Widening of Route 1;
14	Widening of Route 28 between Manassas and
15	Fauquier Count;
16	Extension of I-95 HOV lanes from Route 234
17	into Stafford County;
18	And the Route 28 Bypass or Tri-County
19	Parkway/Route 28 improvements.
20	Thank you again for your time and effort in
21	trying to solve these critical transportation matters.
22	We in Prince William County understand and will continue
23	to work with you as we have done over the past twenty

years in moving projects forward and solving the 1 2 increasingly serious funding, mobility and air quality 3 problems facing the County, region and Commonwealth. Thank you again for the opportunity to be 4 5 here. 6 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Supervisor May, thank 7 you very much. We appreciate your being here. Supervisor Cathy Hudgins actually is here for 8 9 the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission. 10 MS. HUDGINS: Good evening, Secretary 11 Connaughton, Director Drake, Acting Commissioner Whirley 12 and members of the CTB. 13 I'm here to present the Northern Virginia 14 Transportation Commission's comments on the Six-Year Plan. 15 I'm also here to present the WMATA Board's testimony, that 16 I'd like to do after this. 17 I serve as Chair of the Northern Virginia 18 Transportation Commission, and I am pleased to join you 19 tonight. And with the help of the state funding 20 administered by DRPT, transit has continued to perform 21 exceptionally well in Northern Virginia despite severe 2.2 financial constraints. For example, a stunning half 23 million transit trips are currently taken each day here in Northern Virginia.

2.2

The CTB, we ask, should give top priority to the region's transportation needs, including flexing federal stimulus and funds to transit projects, because transit indeed is an effective means to create jobs and sustain economic recovery.

Northern Virginia's transit needs, performance and level of local effort far exceeds the rest of the Commonwealth. The level of transit assistance for FY 2011 for NVTC's jurisdictions and VRE, while less than in FY 2010, is significant and appreciated. A good example is the CTB's provision for the \$50 million to match new federal funding.

The American Public Transit Association reports \$6 in economic returns for each \$1 investment in transit. Cambridge Systematics found 570 jobs created in the short run for each 10 million dollars in transit capital investment and in the long run over \$30 million in increased sales for businesses.

In January of 2010 a study by USPIRG and Smart Growth America noted the effectiveness of the federal stimulus program revealed that each 1 billion dollars spent on transit created 19,299 job-months compared to

only 10,000 job-months from highway expenditures. This is because transit requires less land and more operators.

2.2

NVTC studies showed that since Metrorail's inception it has been a major job generator and state revenue for both the State and the localities. Transit saves jobs, and it provides access to job sites and educational opportunities. Transit provides the "to" for welfare to work.

On September 11, 2001, transit provided its importance -- proved its importance by carrying people out of harm's way during the disaster.

We are proud that in Northern Virginia we have many interconnected partners with the other Northern Virginia transit providers. We know that transit ridership data shows continued positive regional performance. With 140 million annual passenger trips, ridership was up three percent in 2009 compared to 2008 and 21 percent since 2003.

Seventy-five percent of Virginia's transit trips are here in Northern Virginia. Northern Virginia, with its 2.2 million residents took sixty-four transit trips per capita in 2009, while in NVTC's WMATA jurisdictions, those residents took eighty-two transit

trips.

2.0

2.2

The statewide average outside of Northern

Virginia was approximately eight transit trips. Thus,

Northern Virginia jurisdiction residents took ten times as

many transit per capita trips. Transit systems operating

in Northern Virginia carried 914 million passenger miles

in 2009.

Transit is a successful venture; it is a smart investment. Transit and ridesharing carries two-thirds of commuters in our major corridors inside the Beltway in peaks periods and about half outside the Beltway.

Despite the brutal economic downturn and the February blizzards, transit ridership is strong in 2010; and Metrorail is still experiencing some of their highest riderships every day.

There is a direct relationship between the investment in quality transit by DRPT and its partners and subsequent ridership success, as illustrated by Arlington ART's explosive growth facilitated by purchases of new clean fuel buses. The next chart illustrates the growth of the accomplishment of Arlington in its purchase of those new vehicles.

Northern Virginia's current and future transit

needs are well documented. WMATA is developing a detailed and transparent multi-year capital funding agreement to cover the next six years, and it has documented the 11 billion dollars of needs over the next decade.

2.2

While it is completing a system plan for 2040 addressing core capacity of Metrorail, integration of bus, BRT, streetcar, light rail and HOV/HOT services in new and emerging markets to facilitate transit-oriented development.

The Northern Virginia regional transportation plan, TransAction 30, documented the transit requirements of a half billion dollars a year for expansion and \$414 million annually for operations and preservation. In 2012 the TransAction 40 Plan will be updated -- will update the 2030 plan.

Northern Virginia's current and future transit needs are documented again with the TPB Constrained Long Range Plan updated 2010 that shows that \$2 billion annually of transportation needs in Northern Virginia, a large and growing proportion of available revenues will be required to operate and preserve the existing transportation system.

The TPB's Scenarios Study provides in its

"aspiration scenario" a long-term vision for land use and transportation. In its "what will it take" scenario it goes further to assess what interventions will be needed to meet the region's global warming prevention goals.

2.0

2.2

The scenarios envision transit supportive, walkable density and mixed use developments to relocate growth of populations and jobs to activity centers.

The task force is trying to more closely link the existing distribution of activity centers to high-quality transportation access. To improve, better transit is needed including the 500-mile BRT network and priced highway lanes.

Metro's Corridor Network includes 24 corridors with the highest ridership and geographic significance.

Appropriate roadway improvements are being identified that would facilitate exclusive bus lanes, queue jumpers, signal priority and limited stops.

Analysis shows exclusive busways are warranted along 100 miles, and 135 additional miles should receive lesser improvements. Ridership should grow by 25 percent, or 100,000 new daily riders, plus 90,000 diverted from Metrorail for overcrowding.

All of these plans demonstrate that Northern

Virginia has vital transit projects ready to go and has effective plans to sustain and expand the integrated transit information.

2.2

Various transit -- various vital transit expansion projects are underway. We know of the rail to Dulles, the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project, the extensions to Gainesville/Haymarket.

The Northern Virginia transit systems are working with DRPT and VDOT to identify new transit service to take full advantage of the Beltway HOT lanes and mitigate traffic congestion using both the construction along the Dulles Rail and around Tysons Corner. And Northern Virginia faces the looming challenge of coping with major traffic generating federal -- traffic generated around federal facilities such as BRAC.

The local funding effort has been noted again earlier tonight. For FY 2010 it is costing just under 700 million dollars annually to operate, maintain and invest in public transit in NVTC's jurisdictions. Local sources provide 65 percent of that amount, but economic challenges are threatening transit revenues.

For calendar year 2009 NVTC's gas tax revenues were 35 percent lower than 2008, and local property tax

revenues are sharply lower, necessitating tax increases in the local jurisdictions.

2.2

Transit fares have been increased on most of our transit services in Northern Virginia, affecting our customers in the area.

Despite the ongoing challenges of the recession, for FY 2010 Northern Virginia Transportation District has a local level of effort funding transit of \$211 per person. NVTC's five WMATA jurisdictions have a combined local effort of \$255 per person, and the next largest effort is in the Richmond District with \$30 per person.

The statewide average excluding the Northern Virginia is \$19.50, so Northern Virginia's per capita level of local funding is more than ten times greater than the rest of the Commonwealth.

State transit aid for 2011 -- in the draft of the 2011 DRPT program, statewide assistance for transit in Northern Virginia from state sources is about 175.5 million dollars, up from \$129 million in the FY 2010 program.

For the state to meet the statutory target of 95 percent of eligible transit expenses for its programs,

another \$129.3 million is needed for NVTC alone.

2.2

Including the new \$50 million for WMATA, NVTC would receive about 60 percent of statewide allocations; and Northern Virginia, including VRE, Loudoun County and PRTC, would receive 67 percent.

With about 75 percent of statewide transit ridership in Northern Virginia, correcting the Commonwealth's transit funding shortfalls is of paramount importance to the region.

In summing up, I would give as top priority of the transit projects in Northern Virginia would be to support job creation and sustain economic recovery. This region has the greatest use of transit, the best performing transit system and the greatest funding needs and the greatest per capita.

I want to close by thanking you, Secretary

Connaughton and Director Drake and all the members of the

CTB. NVTC and the region's transit operators and local
jurisdictions will conduct a transit tour in June -- on

June 30th and July 1st for state officials, and we include
the CTB members. We wish that you could please join us on
this experience and have an opportunity to experience

Northern Virginia's transit network.

I would now like to present the WMATA presentation, if I might, thank you. I guess I could follow the proceeding. This is a different organization and, I guess, a different hat some days. This is a testimony I'm giving tonight for -- as first Vice Chair of the WMATA Board of Directors. Again, thank you for the opportunity of presenting it.

2.2

On behalf of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, I would like to thank the Commonwealth of Virginia for its dedication to funding and supporting transit in Northern Virginia and the National Capital region.

We are especially appreciative of the Commonwealth's commitment to provide the 50 million dollars in dedicated funding for Metro beginning in Fiscal Year 2011.

The allocation of these matching funds, in conjunction with similar amounts from the District of Columbia and Maryland, allows Metro to match 150 million dollars in federal funds, thereby creating 300 million dollars in additional funding for Metro to address our most critical needs -- safety, reliability and financial stability.

Why is the funding so important to Metro? Not considering the cost of financing, we have determined that our capital needs over the next ten years exceed 11 million dollars, not including any system expansion. Over 7 million dollars is required just to maintain Metro's aging bus and rail systems in a state of good repair. Many of those needs are safety-critical.

2.2

We have a thirty-four-year-old rail system.

It has old rail cars, track beds, power equipment and communication systems. More than half of our bus garages are over fifty years old, and some of our buses are over fifteen years old.

As the equipment and facilities age, they become less reliable, break down more often and need more maintenance. We have to replace our tracks, trains and buses and must rehabilitate our stations, bridges and maintenance facilities.

We have thirty-year-old ventilation, lighting and communication systems which must be maintained or replaced. Some of our station platforms are crumbling.

Our escalators and elevators need major repairs, and water is leaking into our tunnels.

We must do all of the work required while

providing service to 1.3 million customers daily on Metrorail and Metrobus.

2.2

We have been fortunate that the Commonwealth and our other funding partners have demonstrated such strong support for Metro's capital program. As a result, Metro has been able to build our 106-mile rail system, operate a fleet with 1500 buses and provide paratransit services to thousands of customers.

We have also been able to make a number of critical investments in the system, including for the first time (inaudible) eight-car trains.

Metro also makes numerous contributions to citizens' quality of life and the environment. Every year the Metro system saves the region 75 million gallons of gasoline and reduces congestion, saving area residents approximately sixty hours of travel time each year.

Metro takes 500,000 cars off the road each day and eliminates the need for 1400 miles of highway lanes.

Metro also contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. If Metrorail and Metrobus passengers chose to drive, they would generate one million tons of carbon dioxide a year.

The entire 1500 bus fleet is eco-friendly with

a combination of CNG advanced technology diesel and hybrid electric buses, plus ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel and exhaust treatment devices to lower emissions.

2.2

In addition to environmental and quality of life benefits, Metro stimulates the region's economic development and is a linchpin in the region's 359 billion economy.

There are more than forty Metro-related joint development projects under development or completed, and today the value of development at any or within a quarter mile of Metrorail's stations exceeds 25 billion dollars.

Metro is crucial to the economic vitality and sustainability of Northern Virginia and the National Capital region.

Going forward, it is critical that Metro and the region make the necessary investments to keep the system in a good state of repair.

The Commonwealth's contribution of \$50 million annually will allow us to secure and match federal funds and continue making urgently needed investments in the aging infrastructure of our system so that we can continue to provide millions of people with safe and reliable service.

The Commonwealth's commitment to the 1 2 program and this 50 million local match in the Six-Year 3 transportation program is essential in keeping our system 4 safe and in a state of good repair. 5 Again I want to thank you for your commitment 6 to the Metropolitan -- the Metro system and to the transit 7 users of Northern Virginia. Thank you very much for the opportunity to 8 9 present our testimony. 10 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Supervisor Hudgins, We appreciate both full testimonies. 11 thank you very much. 12 MS. HUDGINS: Thank you very much. 13 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Mayor Kristen Umstattd 14 of the Town of Leesburg. 15 Secretary Connaughton, Director MS. UMSTATTD: Drake, Acting Commissioner Whirley and members of the 16 17 Commonwealth Transportation Board, I am Kristen Umstattd, 18 Mayor of the Town of Leesburg and I'm speaking to you 19 today on behalf of the Town. 20 I appreciate this opportunity to testify 21 before you regarding the Town's transportation priorities. 2.2 We look forward to working with you over the next year to 23 help manage the region's transportation problems.

And I would like to mention our deep appreciation for all the help we've received from VDOT.

I know Farid Bigdeli is here, Morteza is here, and VDOT has always tried to help Leesburg and Loudoun County.

2.2

There are many pressing transportation issues facing the region, and we understand the difficult position that the CTB has faced with lack of revenue. We recognize that this public hearing is primarily about Interstate and primary road programs, but we are deeply concerned about the total elimination of secondary and urban construction funding.

The Leesburg Town Council, on May 11 of this year, adopted by unanimous vote a resolution that I think has been handed out to all of you, Resolution #2010-054.

Although the Council's comments and priorities are provided in detail in this resolution, I would like to highlight one issue that is especially important to the Town; in particular, the construction of the flyover at Sycolin Road at the Route 7/15 Bypass.

These proposed road improvements are included in the Northern Virginia 2030 Transportation Plan and are supported by our General Assembly representatives, the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, and we deeply

appreciate Supervisor Kelly Burke's support on this -- and Congressman Frank Wolf.

2.0

2.2

The Council is concerned that all of the construction funding for the flyover at Sycolin Road at the Route 7/15 Bypass has been eliminated. This project has substantial regional benefits. Because of this, every effort should be made to keep the project moving.

The flyover at Sycolin Road will help relieve a major traffic jam for Leesburg and the region.

Commuters from West Virginia, Western Loudoun, the Shenandoah Valley and central Maryland pass through Leesburg on their way to employers in Eastern Loudoun and Fairfax Counties.

Leesburg has over 50,000 vehicle trips a day that cut through the Town. The Town Council has listened to the growing outcry from citizens from Leesburg to Winchester that traffic safety problems on the Leesburg Bypass are dramatically escalating and that increasing traffic congestion is causing inordinate delays in travel time.

Parts of the Leesburg Bypass have now reached VDOT 2030 traffic projections. The Sycolin Road at-grade intersection has experienced one of the highest accident

rates in Leesburg for the last ten years, and the Town of 1 2 Leesburg respectfully requests that this critical project 3 be fully funded and proceed immediately. Any assistance would be greatly appreciated by the citizens of Leesburg 4 5 and the surrounding area. 6 And I wanted to just, in support of the 7 region, Northern Virginia -- I remember that about ten 8 years ago Culpeper lost a business that was looking 9 seriously at locating there, because of the traffic jams 10 in Northern Virginia. So, we have an impact that goes 11 beyond even our own borders. 12 Thank you for the opportunity to provide 13 comments on behalf of the Town of Leesburg. 14 forward to reviewing the allocations that you will be 15 preparing, and we know they will be scarce as a result of 16 these public hearings. 17 Thank you very much. 18 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Mayor Umstattd, thank you very much. We appreciate you being here. 19 20 Is there anyone else from any other 21 jurisdiction -- representing any jurisdictions? 2.2 (No response) 23 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Okay. At this point

we're going to open up to citizens and ask that everyone as you come up please identify yourself and your organization. We have several organizations -- or just members of the public, and we'll generally just try to keep people to around three minutes, depending on how things go.

2.2

But the first person is Douglas Stewart, the Sierra Club.

MR. STEWART: Good evening. I am speaking for the over 15,000 members of the Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club, for whom the quality of our air, water, land and wildlife is considered of utmost importance.

We believe it is the responsibility of citizens to protect these aspects of the earth and the Commonwealth. Transportation policies can have a profound effect on the environment, either directly or indirectly, so we have an important stake in the Six-Year Improvement Program.

Northern Virginia is an urbanizing community, but most Northern Virginians lack easy access to other transportation options besides driving. The lack of alternatives is what's choking our road network with traffic.

A shift in just a few percentage points from driving to walking, bicycling and transit can significantly relieve traffic congestion. It's also critical that there be state support for local land use policies that will be compatible with the alternative travel modes.

2.2

This is where federal transportation policy is heading. The federal government's commitment to putting walking and bicycling on an equal playing field with the auto and the Sustainable Communities Program integrating transportation land use are signals that states and localities that plan for all transportation modes will be the most competitive in getting federal transportation dollars.

Furthermore, there are overarching needs to address our dependence on oil and climate change -- the issue of climate change. Virginia must position itself to fit in with and take advantage of this newer approach to transportation issues.

In general, this will mean development of new types of infrastructure so that our citizens and our economy will be able to adapt to a variety of new options. Virginia's urban regions in particular need to be able to

do this so as to begin a migration away from total dependence on the automobile.

2.2

We desperately need more transit of many types, from highspeed rail to commuter and light rail, bus systems including bus rapid transit and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

More of our freight should be shifted to rail. We do not need to exclude roads, but they need to compete with these other options on a broad basis according to more relative criteria.

These types of non-auto projects are less familiar to many local governments, their staff and citizens, such that a transition may take a little more time. The CTB should use this period of reduced revenue to enhance planning for a new transportation future.

Planning can be done on a low budget with existing staff, and there is time to engage the public in a meaningful way. The Virginia 2035 Plan lays out many good objectives, but without greater adoption at the local government levels it will not be implemented.

Please use this time to plan a better transportation future for Virginia.

Thank you.

1 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Mr. Stewart, thank you 2 very much. We appreciate your being here. 3 Ralph Apton, Great Falls Citizen's 4 Association. 5 MR. APTON: Mr. Chairman, members of the 6 Commonwealth Transportation, I'm here to talk about Route 7 7 again. And first I'd like to say, I want to thank VDOT 8 for the excellent work it's done. 9 Thirty-five years ago Route 7 went through 10 every little town if you went from Winchester to Tysons 11 It was two lanes in many places; it was 12 difficult. Now it's six lanes most of the way with lots 13 of good bypasses. 14 However -- and you heard this from other 15 people before I came up here -- there is a problem in that 16 6.5 miles is still four lanes instead of six lanes. 17 There's a project, Number 52327, Route 7 widened to six 18 We're only talking about 6.5 miles, and that's 19 causing the jams we've heard about in Leesburg. 20 What's the funding for that? Well, your plan, 21 which we've just gone over, starting in 2014 has zero 2.2 funding with everybody screaming that we have to complete those 6.5 miles. 23

Please get us back federal, state and county funding to do maybe one mile a year, a mile and a half a year. We know there's a funding problem. Do something for us, not just for the Great Falls Citizens Association. I'm talking about the whole region.

2.2

Why is this essential? It's essential for the smooth coordination with Tysons Corner, where the growth -- the economic growth -- it's the most important economic center. And what's the main road? Route 7.

We need that last 6.5 miles. We need to improve the traffic flow. We need to reduce -- just during the rush hours there's jams in both directions every day. That's what you heard from the Leesburg people, and you're hearing it from us.

Am I representing just Great Falls? No, I'm representing most of the Dranesville District, because we have resolutions -- that I'm not going to go over now -- passed by the McLean Citizens Association and the Great Falls Citizens Association, so you've got about one-fifth of Fairfax County talking about this. But it also affects the Tysons area, which is not within our jurisdiction.

And we want to eliminate bailout traffic which is occurring because of the traffic jams. If you want to

provide the linkage to the toll roads and the Metro -toll roads that you're building and also the Metro stops,
you need that 6.5 (inaudible).

2.2

There's one thing that you've got in the plan in the next two or three years, and that is a turn at Route 7 and Georgetown Pike. It's controversial.

We don't want the project stopped, but we would like the consideration of rethinking that turn and using those funds -- don't eliminate the funds -- but use the funds to widen Route 7 instead of the turn. The turn would create the beginning of the widening of Georgetown Pike, which is a historic byway, and that's creating some problems.

I just in closing would like to say that State Senator Janet Howell, Delegate Barb Comstock and, from the Dranesville District, John Faust have approved the principles of the two resolutions that were passed.

I thank you very much for your consideration, and we do appreciate -- in spite of the fact that we want that extra funding which is zero right now, we appreciate the funding (inaudible).

SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Mr. Apton, thank you. Thanks for being here.

Ms. Kate Schwarz of the Fairfax Advocates for 1 2 Bicycling. 3 MS. SCHWARTZ: Good evening. Is someone acting as the time facilitator? 4 5 Sure, I'll do that. SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: MS. SCHWARZ: Can I get a one-minute warning 6 7 when I have one minute left? SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: You just go ahead and 8 9 say what you want to say. 10 MS. SCHWARZ: Okay. Thank you. 11 Again, thank you for the opportunity to 12 present comments this evening. I'm Kate Schwarz; I'm here 13 representing Potomac Pedalers -- that's 3500 members and 14 the largest bicycling club in the Washington D.C. area and 15 we're number two in the United States for bicycling -- and 16 the Fairfax Advocates for Better Bicycling. 17 I'd like to talk to you all on the comments 18 made by Chairman Bulova, whereby invoking the words of 19 Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, to consider 20 walking and bicycling as equals with other forms of 21 transportation. 2.2 So, what can we do along those lines? 23 the first thing is to dedicate funding for bicycling and

pedestrian facilities, especially funds for operating facilities like the Fairfax County Parkway trail.

2.2

That facility has never been repaired, and it's littered with debris. I barely go near the southern portion of it any longer because it's just been uprooted, there's gravel, there's a lot of hazards for cyclists in particular. And it's really a shame because it is a fantastic facility. It could be a major bicycling north/south thoroughfare to take us across the entire county.

Bike lanes and shoulders don't get swept;

paved trails, as we've said, are cracked and degraded and
they're littered with debris and vegetation growth, these
kinds of things; and these are real hazards.

So, when funding becomes available I encourage you to please dedicate some funding for making these facilities better and for adding new ones -- make them useful by bicyclists.

Along those lines as well, in making any enhancements that are occurring now or are going to occur in the future also allow -- don't make conditions any worse for pedestrians and cyclists.

Some examples of that are things like any

decorative tree plantings, paving stones that just are making things -- I think they create more maintenance issues for VDOT and they also create some hazards in terms of bike friendliness. So, I think you can consider those kinds of issues with future enhancement projects.

2.2

One thing that ties into that real well is the HOT lanes project. We support UPC 94363 to have bike facilities that are to be built, most of the bridges and overpasses in conjunction with the HOT lanes project, and when that project is completed, we'd really love to see those new pedestrian and bike facilities connected with existing infrastructure or to add on (inaudible).

So, for real dangerous spots like crossing

Gallows Road on the Beltway -- I think that's going to get

better -- but to get to the hospital on one side and to

get to some of the neighborhoods on the other side and to

get to Annandale, it's still going to be a real challenge

for cyclists. There is, in fact, a school right on the

southbound side of Gallows Road.

So, we're excited about the new bridges, and we'd really love to see some new facilities that those hook into -- again, to create these connections that are so critical for bicyclists and pedestrians.

And the other thing is Route 28. Great job with all the cloverleaves. It's great to drive on it, but it's a huge barrier for cyclists. You can't get to (inaudible) for a trip to Sully Plantation, these kinds of cultural sites; plus all the public centers along that corridor and the enormous employment opportunities there could really, again, take lots of cars off Route 28 and let people go on non-motorized transportation, cut our carbon footprint, improve our cardiovascular health, all good stuff for Route 28.

2.2

Then the last thing -- and we've seen some efforts in this area. We're real excited about Gallows and Lawyers Road in Fairfax County. They put those on the Road Diet recently, and we've got some bike lanes there. And those are great; they get us over to Metro, get us from Reston and Vienna.

We would love to see some more of that, and we know that funds are limited, so this is a great way to kind of stretch those transportation dollars and, again, a low-cost way to inform motorists that cyclists are entitled to share the road as legally as vehicles under the Commonwealth's law.

Or maybe even just some signage. If there's

1 not room for pavement, maybe some signage that cyclists 2 may use the lane, again just to educate the folks at the 3 steering wheels that cyclists are entitled to use those facilities. 4 5 So again, just to kind of wrap things up, an overarching theme to stick with and comply with Secretary 6 7 of Transportation Ray LaHood's overarching statement and 8 his theme that he's presented as part of our current 9 presidential administration, to consider walking and 10 bicycling facilities as equals with other forms of 11 transportation. 12 Thanks for your time tonight. 13 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Thank you very much. 14 Thanks for being here. 15 Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance. 16 17 MR. CHASE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; it's good 18 to be with you. 19 I was trying to think this morning as I was 20 busy cutting myself shaving what you could possibly say 21 when you're asking people to, you know, give advice on 2.2 shaping a transportation program that has no money. And I was kind of reminded of a Candid Camera 23

episode years ago in which there was an actor dressed as a State Police officer who was stopping motorists on a rural road at the Maryland/Delaware border and informing motorists that Delaware was closed.

2.2

People would say, "Delaware is closed?" He'd say, "Yes, we just decided it was kind of too busy today and the Governor just asked that we close the State today." And the people would say, "Well, could we come back tomorrow?" And he'd say, "Well, maybe tomorrow," so then they'd turn around. But, anyway, just "Delaware is closed."

Virginia's transportation program is in danger of becoming much like Delaware, not just for a day but for a longer period. For example, the statewide allocation formula, over which folks argued and fought for years, is now closed for lack of funding.

The transportation and revenue-sharing program has been drastically cut back and soon may be closed for lack of funding.

The secondary road funding program that you've heard a lot about today has so little money that it might as well be closed. The Draft SYIP contains \$50 million a year to address the needs of 48,000 miles of secondary

roads in Virginia.

2.2

The SYIP contains less than \$200 million a year for the Commonwealth's 8,000 miles of primary roads and only slightly more for our 1,100 miles of interstate roads at a time when the system in Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads is becoming increasingly congested and in a state of disrepair.

Urban road and transit funding levels are also down from previous plan levels.

Funding in the Draft SYIP that you are now looking at is approximately half of the 2002 level. And back in 2002, you'll remember, we thought we had a transportation funding problem when we did the referendum, when we had twice as much money as we have today.

Although these hearings are advertised as an opportunity for citizens to help shape Virginia's future transportation program, in reality there is not much money to do much shaping. In fact, absent the \$500 million in new bond funding, even more previously approved programs would be dropped from the SYIP.

At a time in which Virginia is intent upon letting the world know it is open for business and jobs, the reality of it is that its transportation program is

moving closer to a closed-down mode that will make it increasingly difficult to attract and keep the jobs we seek.

Mr. Secretary, the Alliance knows that you and other CTB members well understand the magnitude of this problem and are working to address it, but we would also ask you to know and remember that last year the Transportation Alliance and virtually every major business organization in Northern Virginia endorsed the need for new dedicated sustainable funds and acknowledged the reality that putting the Commonwealth's transportation program back on a sound fiscal footing will require a broad range of measures and a range that includes new taxes and fees. We said essentially that, if you do the math, you cannot solve the problem without including new taxes and fees.

So, we hope that you will look at various methods and various options, and we know what certain parties -- certain directives and statements that have been made in the past, but the reality of it is that I think we better put -- if we're going to solve the problem, we have to put -- and get everybody to the table -- we have to put all transportation funding options on

that table. 1 2 Thank you. 3 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr. Chase. Allen Muchnick, the Arlington Coalition for 4 5 Sensible Transportation. MR. MUCHNICK: Good evening, Secretary 6 7 Connaughton and members of the Commonwealth Transportation 8 I'm Allen Muchnick, and I'm speaking for two distinct organizations that advocate effective and 9 10 sustainable 21st century transportation, the Arlington 11 Coalition for Sensible Transportation and the Virginia 12 Bicycling Federation. My remarks are divided between

these two organizations.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

For more than a decade, ACST has asked the CTB to expeditiously and permanently end traffic congestion on I-66 inside the Beltway. Doing so requires little or no money or disruptive and counterproductive construction. It only requires vision, common sense and political will.

Widening I-66 is unwarranted, unnecessary and counterproductive because I-66 already has adequate capacity for private vehicles. The Commonwealth's management of I-66 congestion, however, has been grossly inadequate.

As VDOT's uncompleted Idea-66 Study found more than five years ago, extending the hours of HOV-2 restrictions, establishing a shoulder busway and/or implementing congestion-priced tolling are all viable and superior alternatives to roadway widening.

2.2

DRPT's I-66 bus and TDM study, conducted last year, had useful findings and recommendations, but the study was scoped too narrowly, few specific recommendations are being implemented and the segment inside the Beltway is not being studied further.

The CTB should create a full-time, uncongested busway on I-66 both inside and outside the Beltway via HOV restrictions, congestion pricing and/or bus-on-shoulder operations.

Over the past nine years the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board has authorized VDOT to complete a full, fair and open study for the future of I-66 inside the Beltway on three distinct occasions.

Moreover, in 2009 the TPB prohibited VDOT from advancing I-66 spot improvements #2 and #3 -- which now have different names -- or at least one of them does -- until such a study is completed. ACST once again asks the CTB to expeditiously commission a full, fair and

transparent study for the future of the I-66 multimodal corridor inside the Beltway.

2.2

The Virginia Bicycling Federation appreciates the CTB's support of bicycling and walking in recent years. VDOT has been making considerable progress in advancing and integrating these modes, but much remains undone and substantial progress will not occur without more staff and financial resources and a paradigm shift at VDOT, starting with the establishment of VDOT bicycle and pedestrian committees for each VDOT district, MPO and/or PDC. Nowhere is the need for a regional bicycle advisory committee greater than for Northern Virginia.

In addition, we eagerly await the completion and adoption of VDOT's first statewide bicycle plan and VDOT's rehiring of a highly competent statewide bicycle coordinator, a federally mandated position that has stood vacant since December of 2009.

I'm disappointed that the 2010 tentative enhancement program allocations have such a small proportion of proposed awards for trail and bicycle projects.

Furthermore, the Northern Virginia district, with more than twenty-five percent of Virginia's

1 population, is slated to receive less than ten percent of 2 the total transportation enhancement money. 3 To improve the objectivity, quality and transparency of transportation enhancement awards, the CTB 4 5 should disclose the individual project application scores for all submitted project applications when releasing the 6 7 tentative transportation enhancement program allocations 8 for public comment. 9 Regarding DRPT, VBF urges that all publicly-10 funded rail improvements, such as highspeed rail corridors 11 and the Intermodal Center near Roanoke, provide public 12 trail access along and across the rail facility, as 13 appropriate. Rail corridors are often ideal for long-14 15 distance trail facilities, including the East Coast Greenway, a developing national project that will connect 16 17 urban centers from Maine to Florida. 18 Thank you for your consideration. SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: 19 Thank you, Mr. 20 Muchnick. Stewart Schwartz of the Coalition for Smarter 21 2.2 Growth. 23 Thank you, Mr. Secretary and MR. SCHWARTZ:

members of the CTB, for being here tonight and for listening to our testimony.

2.2

The Coalition for Smarter Growth has been around for about thirteen years now, and we represent many of the conservation and transit advocacy and housing —— even some of the housing advocacy groups in the region, working on the integrated issues of housing, transportation, land use and the environment.

I recognize the stress that you're under and that our budgets are under here, and I think that it's reflective of a world that has changed and some significant challenges we face.

First, on the energy side, we are five percent of the world's population -- or less than five percent -- and we use twenty-five percent of the world's oil. We use seventy percent of it for transportation.

The individual household transportation costs have risen precipitously. Triple A tells us there's seven to eight thousand dollars a year for a four-door car. Own two or three cars in a family, and there goes some college savings or money to start a small business.

It also makes us much less efficient than many other countries in the shipment of goods, in the conduct

of daily business in general, the amount of money our economy spends just on moving around -- and, of course, the national security implications of that oil dependency.

2.2

Second is climate change. We're going to see sea-level rise in Virginia as a result of it. It would be nice to minimize it and not lose the ports in the process over the coming decades.

And we need to do things like reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled and the CO2 emissions that come from our automobiles. VMT has been rising about three times the rate of the population growth over the last twenty years.

Aging infrastructure -- you know all about that. Last year Secretary Homer talked about 3.7 billion dollars in structure-deficient bridges, 1 billion in deficient interstate pavement, and we know Metro needs about 10 billion in capital replacement needs.

But don't just think transportation. Think about our aging water and sewer systems which seem to be blowing up in our older inner suburbs, not just our cities, right now.

Another cheery notes is national bankruptcy. We don't have the money, as you know, unless we borrow it

from the Chinese at this point.

2.0

2.2

The good news -- one piece of good news is that we do have existing infrastructure. We do know how to build cities and towns that are walkable and have a lower transportation demand, and we have changing demographics and market demand.

We have empty-nesters, retirees, young professionals and others coming back to cities, towns or looking for simply a more walkable mixed-use community in the suburbs. That's part of your -- a big part of your transportation solution.

So, we're recommending, first, continue to meet Virginia's policy of fixing it first, and I think you probably have even more maintenance than you are already doing that you could be doing based upon that backlog.

Second, think about these world trends that we're facing and invest very differently in your new capital projects. First, freight rail -- and I think Virginia deserves huge kudos for its investment in freight rail and associated investment in passenger rail and for having a very methodical plan for that. I think it's positioned us well.

Land use and local street networks -- support

these mixed-used communities, whether it's North
Woodbridge, which has a new plan, the areas adjacent to
Warrenton or to Leesburg or the Route 1 corridor
revitalization we need to do in Fairfax and Prince
William.

2.2

But that means you have to change your formulas. We can't have all the money just go to Interstates and zero-out and dump the primary and secondary street networks that would support these sorts of walkable communities.

We have to invest in transit to support these communities, but you don't invest in transit, though, if you're not going to do the transit (inaudible) development with it. We didn't plan it ahead of time for Dulles Rail, like we should have, and we're catching up.

Buses will be a bigger part of it. Dedicated bus lanes are amazingly efficient. Again, don't do it unless you're going to focus on land use. Think about a Route 1 corridor and doing the mixed-use development.

Doing redevelopment, I think, is much more efficient for us all the way around. If we have to repair old bridges and fix Route 1 and fix the water and sewer, why not incentivize developers to come there, help us

replace that aging infrastructure.

2.2

But if they go out to a new green field, we have to give them some new roads and access. They're going to build a bunch of new roads, and all that capital will be expended out there and nobody is left at home minding the store and repairing the old. So, that's why we should be redeveloping where we already have existing infrastructure.

You did great stuff with HB 3202 back in 2007. The urban development area, secondary street (inaudible) activity and access management performance standards are all things that Delegate Athey, the Speaker, the Governor and the CTB all supported as a way to reduce your transportation costs. Let's do more of that.

I'll skip over a couple of things here. We are concerned that we not spend money on rural bypasses where there's nobody living and we can't make these things, you know, really pay themselves -- and that can include Route 460 and it certainly includes the Tri-County Parkway -- when we need to fix I-66.

And we've got a challenge in Loudoun.

They have about a 2 billion dollar transportation wish

list that they are reviewing right now as part of their

	/1
1	County transportation plan, and in our view it is a
2	product of flawed modeling and a failure to look at
3	alternatives. And the CTB and the Governor can't meet
4	this demand if every county comes up with a wish list like
5	that. We do need to look at alternatives.
6	On the PPTA, we know there's a good report
7	out today that we're going to review, and we're going to
8	make some recommendations. I think a lot of the push for
9	the PPTA, of course, is to look for revenue.
10	I will say here that, yes, let's look for
11	revenue, gas tax, VMT tax, parking pricing, congestion
12	pricing; let's consider all those alternatives. But the
13	key is, you can't throw revenue at it without these
14	fundamental reforms we need in where and how we grow and
15	how we (inaudible) urban design and our communities.
16	So, thank you very much.
17	SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Mr. Schwartz, thank
18	you very much.
19	Dennis Dineen.
20	MR. DINEEN: I'm Dennis Dineen, and I've lived
21	in this area most of my life in fact, all of it; I was
22	born in Washington.
23	I have been to a lot of meetings over the

years. In fact, I was involved back when I was in college with the plans in the '60s for Metro, which was very, very controversial at the time.

2.2

The only model for transportation in those days was highways, and the only Metro system that anybody saw in those days was New York City's, which was a disaster at the time. It was falling apart and it was crime-ridden and people said, "We will never do that in Washington; that's stupid and too expensive and no one will ever ride it anyway."

Well, luckily they were wrong, because now 750,000 people a day ride Metro, and a lot more would if it went a lot of other places. And now they're finally going to Dulles Airport, twenty years after they should have started.

But my greater point here is not a history lesson but that you can't pave your way out of this mess, never. If paving your way out of this mess worked, Los Angeles would be a great city to drive around in. Anyone who has spent hours on the Harbor Freeway and those tenlane backups knows that it doesn't work.

Now, not everybody can take transportation, but when a lot of people take transportation, the roads

1	and infrastructures that exist are adequate or at least
2	less congested. It's cheaper to pay to put people on
3	public transportation, take them off the road, rather than
4	building more lanes, more parking lots, more interchanges,
5	bridges, whatever, to try to provide them with enough room
6	to drive around. Because you never catch up. Again, Los
7	Angeles would be a classic example. They've been trying
8	for seven years, and they're worse now for the effort than
9	they were in the 1930s.
10	I would say simply this. You do need to think
11	of things a different way. You can't pave your way out.
12	It will never you'll never catch up.
13	And for every you'll put more bridges,
14	tunnels, expressways, overpasses and what have you, and
15	when you're finished they'll be coming back to you and
16	saying, "We need another billion dollars to build more
17	expressways, overpasses, parking lots, whatever."
18	That's all.
19	SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr. Dineen.
20	That's all we have who is signed up. Anyone
21	else like to make a statement?
22	Come on down, Mr. Walker.
23	MR. WALKER: I'm Christopher Walker, and I

founded the Dulles Corridor Users Group. I'm dressed like this because unlike a lot people who said they favor bicycling, I actually biked over here tonight, so -- it's a pleasure, and I want to thank you all for coming up.

2.2

I'm just going to pat VDOT on the back, and
Secretary Connaughton, for just a superb study on the I-95
Priority Bus system. It's available at the Virginia Mega
Projects site.

It's a study that concluded that for 51 million dollars in capital improvements we can serve a huge shed, commuter shed, south of Washington almost all the way -- half way down to Richmond and get 36,000 boardings a day, which is pretty much what Dulles Rail is projected at capital cost; it's going to approach six billion dollars.

So, getting the same bang for our buck at one percent of the capital investment is consistent with the studies that have been done by Maryland on I-270. They concluded Priority Bus (inaudible) was worthwhile.

The same conclusion was reached on I-405 in Seattle, the Bellevue area, which goes east of Lake Washington, a very wealthy area comparable to Fairfax County; it's where Microsoft is located.

So, I commend Secretary Connaughton and all of you to do cost-effective studies. We're heard from the transit lobby tonight. You should know that in Virginia overall the transit mode (inaudible) demand by passenger miles, freight miles is about two percent.

2.2

The Washington Metropolitan area is spending more than fifty percent of its constrained long-range plan on transit to satisfy modes of currently 4 percent, projected to climb 2.7 percent in 2030.

So, I have to say, despite all the good intentions of the people who spoke tonight, transit as a relative proportion is grossly over-funded. I don't know what the allocation is for the State -- I think it's around 30 percent -- but keep in mind that there is no distinction today between transit and roads.

Typically, rail operations -- and there are many of them around the country operating at about 25 miles an hour, so they're not competitive and they're extremely expensive.

Dulles Rail is costing about the same as doubling the size of the Panama Canal and, believe it or not, it would be cheaper to buy -- it would be cheaper to offer a chauffeured Rolls Royce to every new rider that

Dulles Rail will attract. The numbers are staggering.

It's about \$100 per new rider.

So, please do your cost-effectiveness studies

-- I commend the Secretary for getting into this -- and
look at the numbers the way they are, because roads are
very, very mildly subsidized, certainly less than a penny
a mile. Transit is typically subsidized around 80 cents a
mile. It's necessary, but I would leave the transit
component up to the localities and focus on primary and
Interstate roads the way you're doing now.

I think the Secretary and the CTB -- hopefully it's going to move in that direction, and I commend you.

Look at the cost benefits on it, because Virginia is still basically a rubber tire surface transportation type of state. You've got to remember transit does not serve freight, okay?

And don't get confused by commuter share versus overall share. Commuter share is a transit number related to people going in and out of central cities, but Virginia is very dispersed now, about 98 percent of people either driving or van-pooling, and about seven times as many people car or van-pool nationwide, including Virginia state transit.

And that's the mode you should encourage. We can put congestion-managed lanes, put a couple of people in the vehicle the way that Shirley Highway works -- it works brilliantly -- and I commend you all for having come up with a study on I-95.

Thank you.

2.2

SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Thanks, Mr. Walker.

MR. ROBERT WHITFIELD: I'm Rob Whitfield, and I also work in the Dulles Corridor Users Group. I didn't even see Chris down in the front.

Secretary Connaughton, thank you for coming up here tonight along with the members of the CTB. I don't envy you your task of how you deal with the problems that we face, but I assure you that there are many, many thousands -- millions of people in Virginia who rely on the road system whose interests need to be properly represented.

Unfortunately, what we've heard -- as Chris Walker just said, the transit lobby is always very heavily evident when we have these kind of proceedings. And in fact, as I understood the purpose, it was about the secondary road system.

But since the transit lobby has spoken a lot,

what I would want to tell you about is that three or four weeks ago Supervisor Pat Herrity of Fairfax County held a hearing on I-66 improvements outside the Beltway, and what was significant -- and I didn't -- I went into that with an open mind -- is that people of different political persuasions, including State Senator Chap Petersen, who was here before, basically concluded that bus rapid transit was the most effective solution for the 66 corridor. And I think that's because they recognize that bus rapid transit would be one-tenth the cost of a heavy rail system.

2.2

And what Fairfax County didn't tell you is that they're coming up with this plan in which the council government's TPB is proposing tolls on local highway systems. I haven't seen the details, but I gather they have a transportation committee upcoming in the next couple of weeks.

So, I don't have the details of this, but what I can only tell you is that we who live in the Dulles Corridor do not feel it's fair that we have been taxed basically on the Dulles Toll Road to pay for a benefit which is the rail system, which the County's own studies this last month have shown that only 20 percent of the

people who live in the upper Potomac planning district, which is northwest Fairfax County -- I think the numbers were 9 percent work in Tysons, 7 percent in D.C. and 3 percent in Arlington County -- so roughly only 20 percent of the people who live in northwest Fairfax County would be able to use the Dulles Rail system.

So, one of the things that needs to happen when you are considering funding for anything is who is going to use this facility, and whether it's a road or a rail project, we have to have much better understanding of what the market demand is really going to be, because in the case of Dulles Rail, the cost including the financing costs will be close to 10 billion dollars over the next forty years.

Somebody has to pay for this, and in this instance the State has abdicated its responsibility for what is truly a regional and, in fact, national project. And so, we're going to be paying for this for the next forty years under the present financing plan.

So, as to how we come up with money for local roads, I think in Prince William County -- when you were chairman in Prince William County, as I recall, you did about 500 billion dollars in local road funding bonds over

1 a fifteen-year period. And Loudoun County is doing some 2 of that. 3 But, unfortunately, in Fairfax County they seem to have been unable -- basically unable to finance 4 5 local road projects, and indeed yesterday the County Board approved 120 million more in funding for Metro Matters. 6 7 But I didn't hear anything for roads at the 8 local level, so maybe what we need to do from your end of the world is to encourage states by matching-formula 9 10 processes that give the incentive to counties to raise 11 local bond monies to help match what the State is doing. 12 I don't know how that should be done, but I 13 hope the Governor can convene a special session of the 14 General Assembly later this year and come up -- look for 15 some interesting proposals to help us, because we do have 16 to fund our road system. 17 Thank you, sir. 18 SECRETARY CONNAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr. 19 Whitfield. 20 At this time we're going to close out this 21 evening's public hearing. I appreciate everybody coming 2.2 out this evening.

We will be having hearings next Tuesday in

23

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	Chesapeake, which is for the Hampton Roads District, and
2	then next Wednesday out in the Salem District and
3	Southwest Virginia and the Valley out in actually
4	Dublin, Virginia.
5	So, I appreciate everybody coming out this
6	evening, and this will conclude this evening's meeting
7	unless anyone wants to hear from the Board.
8	No? All right. Then, thank you very much.
9	Have a good evening.
10	* * *
11	(Whereupon, at approximately 8:40 p.m., the
12	public hearing was concluded.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, KATHLEEN M. ELIAS, a Certified Verbatim
Reporter, do hereby certify that I took the stenographic
notes of the foregoing proceedings, which I thereafter
reduced to typewriting; that the foregoing is a true
record of said proceedings; that I am neither counsel for,
related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the
action in which these proceedings were held; and, further,
that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially
or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

KATHLEEN M. ELIAS, CVR Court Reporter