Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes

June 16, 2026, at 11:00 a.m.
Conference Room 11, Government Center

Board of Supervisors Members Present:
Jeffrey C. McKay, At-Large (Chairman)
Kathy L. Smith, Sully District (Vice-Chairman)
James N. Bierman, Jr., Dranesville District (Committee Chairman)
Walter L. Alcorn, Hunter Mill District (Committee Vice Chairman)
Rachna Sizemore Heizer, Braddock District
Rodney L. Lusk, Franconia District
Andres F. Jimenez, Mason District
Dalia A. Palchik, Providence District

Board Members Absent:
Daniel G. Storck, Mount Vernon District
Patrick S. Herrity, Springfield District

County Leadership:
Bryan J. Hill, County Executive
Jennifer Miller, Deputy County Executive
Beth Teare, County Attorney

Link to agenda and presentation materials:
https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/board-supervisors-transportation-committee-meeting-june-16-2026

1. Opening Remarks

Committee Chair Bierman called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Committee Chair Bierman inquired whether there were any objections to the approval of the June 16, 2026, meeting minutes. As no objections were raised, the minutes were unanimously approved.

Committee Chair Bierman provided an update on Transit Hill Day with Supervisor Jimenez, Legislative Committee Chair, during which they advocated for the County's transportation priorities at the U.S. Capitol. Their efforts focused on securing federal capital investment grants for the Richmond Highway Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, noting that the House

Appropriations bill included $150 million for the project. Additional priorities included protecting $150 million in the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) capital funding, supporting bridge formula funding for the American Legion and Woodrow Wilson bridges, and advancing the Long Bridge project to enhance rail connectivity along the southern eastern seaboard.

3. Bus Rapid Transit Action Plan for Northern Virginia

Monica Backmon, Chief Executive Officer of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA), delivered a comprehensive briefing on the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Action Plan for Northern Virginia to the Committee. The presentation is available at: https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/sites/transportation/files/Assets/Documents/PDF/btc/6-16-2026/NVTA%20BRT%20Action%20Plan%20-%20edited%20v2-.pdf

Ms. Backmon acknowledged Chairman McKay, Supervisor Bierman, and Supervisor Herrity for their roles within NVTA's committees.

NVTA has initiated a comprehensive BRT Action Plan to enhance regional connectivity throughout the DMV area. The plan proposes up to 28 integrated BRT routes, to be implemented incrementally to create a unified system. With a regional multimodal investment of $5 billion, including nearly $2.3 billion in Fairfax County, NVTA has provided funding for various projects such as Route 1 BRT ("The One"), Route 7 BRT, Richmond Highway widening, and Fairfax County Parkway widening.

The BRT Action Plan serves as a blueprint for jurisdictions and agencies to develop BRT lines in the future and develop high-capacity, high-quality transit in the near term. The Action Plan outlines up to 28 routes to expand connectivity across the DMV. Fairfax County is a key participant, involved in 22 of the 28 planned routes, including five entirely within the County. The plan encourages local jurisdictions to integrate BRT into their planning and incorporate those plans into the TransAction update. Ms. Backmon notes the need to coordinate efforts to secure funding and ensure efficient implementation across agencies and governments.

Chairman McKay began by highlighting the importance of regional cooperation, as BRT routes span multiple jurisdictions. He stressed that the scale of The One would not have been possible without NVTA funding and underscored the political will that made such investments feasible. The One is the largest BRT system they have ever built and relies on NVTA funding to exist. He asked Ms. Backmon to explain the partnership between NVTA and the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC), clarifying that NVTA can fund capital but not operations, making NVTC critical for operations planning.

Ms. Backmon explained that NVTC focuses on transit planning and operational coordination, while NVTA funds capital transportation projects. NVTA can legally fund only capital projects, not operations or maintenance. As a result, NVTA partners with NVTC, which manages transit operations and coordinates with WMATA, to ensure a seamless system across jurisdictions.

NVTC also manages Commuter Choice funds and has statutory responsibilities related to WMATA, making it an essential partner in planning, operations, and coordination. She emphasized the importance of looking at state and federal funding as well as partnering with jurisdictions outside the WMATA Compact, such as Prince William County, Manassas, and Manassas Park, to maintain a regional transit network. Chairman McKay reiterated that this partnership avoids duplication and merges the strengths of both organizations.

Supervisor Alcorn commended NVTA for helping the County overcome initial planning hurdles for the BRT system, in which local land-use planning is not fully aligned with future BRT routes. He noted that Fairfax County recently updated the Comprehensive Plan to emphasize transit-ready communities, moving beyond traditional transit-oriented development (TOD) around existing transit nodes. He also referenced Metro's newly adopted regional Bus Service Guidelines, which now define BRT and different tiers of bus priority, important for long-term capital planning. He encouraged continued regional collaboration to integrate transportation planning with future land use decisions.

Supervisor Palchik expressed excitement but cautioned that the BRT plan is still a long-term plan. She asked how the County should address interim conditions and last-mile mobility needs in areas with limited space. She noted that lessons from Tysons, where unique agreements were needed to support different development patterns, may apply to future BRT corridors. She asked how the County should coordinate with VDOT moving forward. Ms. Backmon responded that VDOT is a key player on the working group and is involved every step of the way to prevent timeline stalls since they control the road and right-of-way rules. She underscored the importance of linking BRT plans with local comprehensive plan amendments because BRT will change communities. She also emphasized that NVTA's role is not to dictate how the County plans for its community, but for the County to tell NVTA how to plan for its community. She noted VDOT's openness to considering locality preferences but clarified they maintain final authority. She stressed that early VDOT involvement avoids later delays and cost impacts.

Supervisor Palchik added that each BRT route will be unique and that engagement should begin early at the community level to assess challenges and opportunities. Ms. Backmon agreed, noting that in some corridors (such as Route 1 in Prince William), a dedicated BRT system may not be feasible and will require tailored approaches.

Supervisor Jimenez thanked Ms. Backmon for the presentation and connected the discussion back to his recent work with Supervisor Bierman on Capitol Hill. He underlined the importance of continuing partnerships with federal and state delegations, noting strong interest and support during their visits. He stated that federal funding should remain a major focus alongside state investment and thanked Supervisor Bierman, legislative staff, and County personnel for their advocacy efforts on Capitol Hill.

Supervisor Sizemore Heizer described BRT as part of Northern Virginia's economic transition, noting the need for the region's transit system to focus on moving people within Northern

Virginia, not just into Washington, D.C. She asked about the focus on current routes or creating new routes as well as any gap analysis based on economic development and housing needs. Ms. Backmon explained that the December 2022 long-range transportation plan which looked to address missing links in the transit network. Supervisor Sizemore Heizer expressed interest in the technical criteria used, such as travel patterns and future growth projections. Ms. Backmon responded that the analysis considers multiple factors, including origin-and-destination travel data and maintaining acceptable levels of service throughout the network. She offered to continue the discussion outside the meeting.

Supervisor Sizemore Heizer also asked whether transportation planning adequately considers access to human services, not just employment centers. She noted that reliable transit is essential for residents accessing shelters, healthcare, social services, and other community resources, especially as transportation costs rise. Ms. Backmon acknowledged this perspective. While access to employment is a primary objective, she agreed that access to community services is equally important and encouraged local officials to continue identifying unmet transportation needs. She also noted that NVTA uses regional land-use data from the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments in its planning.

Supervisor Lusk thanked NVTA for its continued commitment to the regional BRT program. He requested an update on potential federal funding timelines and amounts so the County can prepare its state and local budgets accordingly. Ms. Backmon stated that NVTA views The One as a model project and is fully committed to it, having already allocated $638 million to the Richmond Highway corridor, including the Richmond Highway Widening project that is also necessary for implementation of The One. She revealed that at its upcoming July meeting, NVTA will recommend adding $116 million for fiscal years 2030 and 2031. The phased funding approach is intended to provide time for federal funding opportunities while ensuring the project continues moving forward regardless of federal decisions. She stressed NVTA's intent to keep the project moving even if federal funds do not materialize.

County Executive Hill added that Fairfax County remains committed to pursuing every available federal funding source. However, he emphasized that if federal funds do not materialize, the County will continue working with NVTA and other partners to identify alternative financing options so the project can proceed. Supervisor Lusk underscored the importance of communicating this commitment to the public, noting that while challenges remain, both Fairfax County and NVTA are committed to advancing the project.

Committee Chair Bierman concluded the discussion by summarizing the presentation as a forward-looking transportation strategy focused on improving mobility throughout Fairfax County and the broader Northern Virginia region. He highlighted the importance of long-range planning, regional partnerships, and continued investment in major corridors such as Route 1 and Route 7. He thanked Ms. Backmon and NVTA for their leadership and continued support of the region's transportation initiatives.

4. Transportation Project Timelines

Martha Coello, Deputy Director, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), presented the update following prior audit recommendations related to developing a standardized project delivery guide for active transportation projects. The presentation is available at: https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/sites/transportation/files/Assets/Documents/PDF/btc/6-16-2026/2026-06-16_Standard_Project_Delivery_Guide.pdf.

FCDOT has developed a detailed plan to improve timelines, oversight, and management of active transportation projects following a recent audit. The plan establishes deadlines for operational improvements, including launching a Project Management Information System by March 2027, updating cost estimation methods, and completing a standardized project delivery guide for managers by August 2026. The guide defines roles and responsibilities to promote effective collaboration and accountability.

The plan standardizes project phases for pre-scoping, pre-design, design, land acquisition, utility relocation, and construction and offers timeline benchmarks based on project scale. For instance, a small pedestrian project may require 34 to 43 months, while a large intersection upgrade could extend up to 66 months, with design phases typically lasting around two years. The plan establishes clear protocols for decision-making, departmental handoffs, and addressing obstacles. It introduces a process that requires project managers to notify District Supervisors of schedule delays, budget overruns, environmental issues, or non-responsive external agencies.

Chairman McKay thanked staff for the update and emphasized that improving project delivery is a high priority for the Board. He stressed that the goal is not simply to create another guide but to fundamentally improve project management by reducing unnecessary delays, identifying problems earlier, and using technology to proactively flag issues before they affect the schedule. He noted that the guide should help distinguish delays caused by County processes from those caused by outside agencies, particularly VDOT. Understanding where delays originate would strengthen the County's credibility when working with state agencies to improve their own review processes.

Chairman McKay expressed concern that relatively simple pedestrian projects, particularly those requiring no land acquisition or utility relocation, can still take more than three years to complete. He said such timelines are difficult to justify to residents, especially when projects involve important public safety improvements. He noted that the end goal is to be more efficient, faster, and identify where our outside agencies need more help. He also emphasized that accountability must extend to consultants and contractors hired to manage projects as they should also be held to the County’s performance expectations and quality standards.

Ms. Coello agreed that consultant accountability is an important part of the overall effort. She noted that staff had previously identified the need for stronger quality assurance procedures and standardized checklists for consultants and contractors. She explained that active transportation projects vary significantly in size and complexity, from large initiatives, such as BRT projects, to relatively small pedestrian improvements, requiring different levels of consultant involvement. Nevertheless, staff intend to improve oversight and accountability wherever outside resources are used.

Chairman McKay added that while the current effort focuses on active transportation projects, the principles being developed should eventually apply across all Fairfax County projects. Regardless of project size, the same goals should become standard practice throughout the department. He praised staff for embracing the audit findings, conducting an honest assessment of current practices, and pursuing meaningful improvements.

Vice Chair Smith expressed appreciation for the proposed guide, particularly for its potential to help preserve institutional knowledge during staff turnover. She asked whether the new process would include early identification of projects funded through proffers, noting that staff is not always aware of those funding sources. Ms. Coello agreed that this represents an opportunity for improvement adding additional checkpoints into the project initiation process so funding sources, including proffers and any associated requirements, are identified early and incorporated into project planning.

Supervisor Alcorn supported the standardized guide but emphasized that many project delays result from broader structural challenges rather than internal project management alone. He noted that many County transportation projects are constructed on VDOT-owned roads, whose priorities may differ from Fairfax County's goals for pedestrian and bicycle improvements. While improved project management will help, he encouraged staff to also identify larger systemic issues that may require legislative or policy changes. Supervisor Alcorn questioned why straightforward projects still require more than three years to complete and suggested that overlapping County and VDOT review processes create unnecessary duplication. He encouraged staff to consider recommending a more unified project approval process or other creative ways to move forward and assured them that the Board would support broader reforms where appropriate. County Executive Hill responded that he would soon meet with Virginia's Secretary of Transportation and suggested using the opportunity to raise concerns identified during the discussion. He indicated that the County could formally present recommendations to improve coordination with VDOT. Committee Chair Bierman agreed with Supervisor Alcorn's recommendations and expressed support for raising these issues with state transportation officials.

Supervisor Palchik asked how project proposals are evaluated before being presented to the Board. She wanted to better understand how engineering reviews, feasibility studies, risk assessments, and VDOT coordination are incorporated early enough to identify potential obstacles and manage expectations. She acknowledged that Fairfax County does not control most of its roadway network and therefore must understand how VDOT is likely to respond before advancing projects. She questioned whether early coordination with VDOT could reduce delays later in the process. Ms. Coello explained that staff already conduct preliminary discussions with VDOT during the pre-scoping phase to evaluate feasibility and identify potential concerns. However, as projects advance into detailed design, additional issues often emerge, and VDOT comments may evolve as design standards change. She said project feasibility is evaluated multiple times throughout development but acknowledged that later reviews can still introduce new requirements that affect schedules.

Supervisor Palchik compared the process to Fairfax County's development review system, where additional issues frequently emerge as project details become more refined. She suggested there

may be opportunities for more frequent communication between County staff and VDOT to identify potential concerns earlier, reducing the need for redesign and improving overall coordination. County Executive Hill agreed that early coordination is important. He said the County intends to better measure how frequently developers participate in voluntary pre-scoping meetings, noting that many developers do not know the process exists, and to explore ways to encourage greater use of those early coordination opportunities. He added that similar early engagement strategies may also benefit active transportation projects. Ms. Coello agreed that both development projects and active transportation projects would benefit from stronger early collaboration and continued coordination with VDOT throughout project development.

Committee Chair Bierman concluded by reiterating that the audit and standardized project delivery guide were intended to answer one fundamental question: "Is there a better way?" He said the Board's objective is to create a project delivery system that proactively identifies problems, reduces delays, and improves coordination across all phases of project development. He wanted to reduce the unacceptable 34- to 37-month timelines for small pedestrian improvements and to use tools like Smartsheet to proactively flag potential issues. He emphasized identifying friction points, coordinating overlapping tasks (such as land acquisition-related steps), and applying lessons from small projects to major ones. He stressed that Fairfax County must be willing to pursue structural changes when needed, given its size and influence.

Committee Chair Bierman emphasized that the guide should not merely document existing processes but challenge staff to rethink them. He encouraged staff to pursue ambitious reductions in project timelines rather than accepting current schedules as unavoidable. Fairfax County has an opportunity to become a statewide leader in project delivery by building transportation infrastructure faster, more efficiently, and with greater accountability. Committee Chair Bierman underscored the importance of modernizing transportation infrastructure to meet the needs of future generations. He encouraged staff to "be big, be bold," assuring them that the Board would support innovative approaches and continued collaboration as the project development guide is finalized for presentation at the August 31, 2026, meeting.

5. Phase 2 Changes to Proffered Transportation Demand Management

Matthew Koprovic and RJ Wiersma, Transportation Planners, FCDOT, reviewed the proposed changes to the Proffered Transportation Demand Management (TDM) guidelines. The presentation is available at: https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/sites/transportation/files/Assets/Documents/PDF/btc/6-16-2026/TDM_Guideline_Updates-BTC_Presentation.pdf.

The proposed Phase 2 Changes to Fairfax County's TDM Guidelines build on the successful Phase 1 implementation of TDM rates from 2013. TDM programs have reduced average peak-hour trips by 60 percent and surpassed trip reduction targets by 31 percent. As of 2025, 58 active TDM programs submit annual reports.

The proposed updates, informed by industry feedback and program data, include both pre- and post-build-out improvements. Pre-build-out changes feature updated sample proffer language, simplified TDM requirements for Residential Use Permits (RUPs) and non-RUPs, clearer

guideline text, and standardized templates for TDM plans and annual reports. Post-build-out, the updates introduce more flexibility for multi-phase reporting. Buildings may be considered stabilized after one year of occupancy, and multi-phase sites can address applicant control periods individually for each building. The updates also standardize review timelines and clarify site trip count procedures. Under the new guidelines, entitlement applicants will proffer to the TDM Guidelines in a manner similar to existing Road Fund and Bicycle Parking proffers. Applicants must specify their program type and reduction rate in a primary proffer, then provide a secondary proffer outlining the TDM requirements to be met before issuing any RUPs or non-RUPs. Staff is seeking Board feedback on the proposed changes to the TDM guidelines and reduction rates.

Chairman McKay thanked staff for the presentation, noting that standardization and flexibility are long overdue, and expressed support for the effort to simplify and standardize the TDM process. He asked how the proposed standards would apply to developments located outside Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) areas, specifically beyond one-half mile from a Metro station. Chairman McKay asked whether there would ever be a situation where an eligible development would not be subject to a TDM program. Mr. Koprovic responded that all qualifying office and multifamily developments would be required to implement a TDM program.

Chairman McKay noted that while he supported the overall approach, conditions can change significantly outside the one-half-mile Metro radius. He emphasized that transportation infrastructure, surrounding development, and site characteristics vary widely across the County, making a single standard inappropriate for every location. He stressed that flexibility would be critical when applying the guidelines to individual projects. Mr. Koprovic agreed and explained that the proposed framework intentionally provides that flexibility. Rather than requiring developers to implement specific TDM strategies, applicants would submit a TDM plan identifying a menu of potential measures tailored to their site. County staff would evaluate whether the development meets its overall trip reduction commitments rather than prescribe how those goals must be achieved.

Supervisor Alcorn commented that the proposed changes represented a positive outcome, noting that existing TDM programs have consistently exceeded their trip reduction goals. He voiced support for the updates but asked how the new countywide guidelines would interact with existing Comprehensive Plan provisions that contain area-specific TDM requirements, such as those for Reston and Merrifield. He questioned whether those plans would need to be updated. Jeff Hermann, Site Analysis and Transportation Planning Division Chief, FCDOT, explained that the County intends to rely on the new TDM guidelines when evaluating development proffers. Since both the Comprehensive Plan language and the guidelines serve as policy guidance, the updated guidelines would become the primary basis for future TDM commitments. As area plans are revised over time, existing TDM reduction targets would likely be removed from the Comprehensive Plan to simplify the language. He acknowledged that this would be a gradual process rather than an immediate change. Supervisor Alcorn expressed support for that approach and emphasized the importance of clearly communicating the transition to the development community and other industry partners.

Supervisor Palchik thanked Chairman McKay for raising the issue of flexibility and said the concepts of flexibility and consistency were exactly what she hoped to hear. She then asked how the County plans to manage the growing number of active TDM programs, noting there are currently 58 programs and that the number is expected to increase. She asked whether there were opportunities for greater coordination among programs, particularly in areas such as Tysons. Mr. Hermann responded that only a relatively small number of consulting firms manage most of the County's TDM programs. Because County staff maintain strong working relationships with those consultants, they can administer multiple programs efficiently. Although the number of individual TDM programs may grow, many operate within similar frameworks, allowing staff to oversee them effectively without substantially changing their management or enforcement.

Supervisor Palchik noted that residents sometimes assume the County requires services such as private shuttle buses, when in reality those services are implemented through individual TDM programs. She suggested that adjacent developments might be able to coordinate services, for example, operating a shared shuttle instead of multiple separate shuttles, and asked whether the County was exploring those types of regional solutions. She commented that areas with many active developments may be ready for a more advanced and coordinated approach to TDM. Ms. Coello responded that those conversations could certainly take place. She said County staff could evaluate the number of existing programs, assess the level of interest among participating property owners and managers, and determine whether there is support for more coordinated transportation solutions while maintaining the flexibility built into the TDM program. Mr. Koprovic added that County staff meet monthly with the consultants who administer most TDM programs and serve as a forum for identifying emerging issues.

With no further questions from the Board members, Committee Chair Bierman thanked staff for their work and emphasized the importance of TDM as Fairfax County continues to grow. He noted that reducing vehicle trips from new developments is an important part of the County's transportation strategy and that we should continue communicating that to our residents.

6. New Business

No new business was raised.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:29 p.m. The next Board Transportation Committee meeting is scheduled for September 22, 2026, at 3:00 p.m.