



# Transportation Priorities: Project Timelines and the 2014 Bond Referendum

Tom Biesiadny, Karyn Moreland, Todd Minnix,  
Ray Johnson

Board Transportation Committee  
May 6, 2014



# Project Timelines



## Background on Six Year Project Priorities

- Virginia General Assembly approved HB 2313 in April 2013, authorizing new revenues for use specifically on transportation projects.
- Staff created a list and an interactive map of more than 200 unfunded projects located throughout the County.
- In the Fall of 2013, staff conducted extensive outreach through the Countywide Dialogue on Transportation to gain input on project selection.
- Staff considered numerous criteria, including cost-benefit analysis, congestion reduction, school and park access, regional consideration, public input, and mode balance.
  - <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/fcdot/cdot/>
- On January 28, 2014, the Board of Supervisors adopted the six-year project priorities for FY 2015-FY 2020. The Six-Year Program includes approximately 170 projects worth about \$1.4 billion from multiple local, regional and state sources.



# Project Timelines

- On January 28, 2014, the Board directed staff to return with project timelines
- Several considerations:
  - Advance highest priority projects
  - Spread projects across six-year timeframe
  - Respect funding limitations, restrictions, and availability
  - Follow guidelines or requirements set by funding decision-makers (NVT, CTB, etc.)
  - Consider project complexity, size, and geographic location
  - Consider input from implementation partners, particularly VDOT



# Draft Timelines and Project Priorities

- After drafting timelines, staff discussed timelines and priorities with each Board member.
- Adjustments made based on feedback received.
- Project timelines reflect reasonable expectations for projects of similar size and type.
- More specific project schedules will be developed as each project advances through scoping/preliminary engineering process.





# Explanation of Draft Timelines on the Next Slide

- Project phases are color coded
  - Planning - **Blue**
  - Scoping/Preliminary Engineering - **Green**
  - Design - **Red**
  - Right-of-way - **Yellow**
  - Utilities - **Black**
  - Construction - **Orange**
- Not all projects will have all phases. Length of phases varies based on project specifics.
- Project Titles/Descriptions abbreviated.





# Draft Timelines

DRAFT – MAY 6, 2014				6 YEAR PLAN																
				Planning	Scoping / PE				Design	Right-of-Way				Utilities	Construction					
ID #	Project Name	6-Year Funding Recomm. (\$M)	% funded in 6-yr period	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021										
1	Fairfax County Parkway and Popes Head Road	\$68.00	75%																	
3	I-66 and Route 28	\$54.00	44%																	
4	I-95 and Fairfax County Parkway/NB Flyover	\$59.00	71%																	
9	Seven Corners Interchange Improvements	\$3.00	TBD																	
10	South Van Dorn St. and Franconia Road	\$4.00	3%																	
12	Dulles Toll Road - Rock Hill Overpass	\$0.50	0%																	
13	Dulles Toll Road - South Lakes Drive Overpass	\$0.50	1%																	
14	Dulles Toll Road - Town Center Parkway Underpass	\$13.85	9%																	
15	Dulles Toll Road - Soapstone Drive Overpass	\$2.50	3%																	
16	Frontier Drive from Franconia Springfield Parkway to	\$63.00	75%																	
18	Shirley Gate Road from Braddock Road to Fairfax County	\$30.00	76%																	
19	Stone Road Overpass over I-66 from Route 29 to Route 28	\$5.00	6%																	
21	Backlick Road and Industrial Road	\$2.09	100%																	
22	Balls Hill Road and Old Dominion Drive	\$0.20	2%																	
23	Burke Road from Aplomado Drive to Parakeet Drive	\$7.00	100%																	
26	Electric Avenue and Cedar Lane NB Left Turn Lane	\$1.61	100%																	
27	Fairfax County Parkway from I-95 to Telegraph Road	\$19.25	100%																	
30	Fort Hunt Road and Collingwood Road	\$2.22	100%																	
32	Hunter Mill Road and Lawyers Road	\$15.50	100%																	
33	Kirby Road and Old Dominion Road	\$0.50	5%																	
34	Lewinsville Road and Spring Hill Road	\$0.10	1%																	
35	Old Courthouse Road and Besley Road	\$3.30	100%																	
38	Route 123 (Dolley Madison) and Great Falls/Lewinsville Road	\$6.90	100%																	
40	Silverbrook Road and Lorton Road	\$0.50	14%																	
45	Braddock Road - Burke Lake Road to Guinea Road - 4 to 6	\$1.00	5%																	
46	Braddock Road - Burke Lake Road to I-495 - 6 to 8 Lanes	\$47.00	75%																	
54	Frying Pan Road - VA 28 to Centreville Road - 2 or 4 to 6 Lanes	\$40.80	75%																	
55	Hoopes Road - Fairfax County Parkway to Silverbrook Rd 2 to 4	\$15.00	73%																	
57	Pohick Rd - US 1 (Richmond Hwy) to I-95 - 2 to 4 Lanes	\$22.00	75%																	
58	Rolling Road - Old Keene Mill Rd to Franconia Springfield	\$27.70	79%																	



## Draft Timelines (Continued)

- Projected timelines are based on preliminary information.
- Project timelines will be posted on the FCDOT - Countywide Dialogue on Transportation (CDOT) web page.
  - <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/fcdot/cdot/>
- Project descriptions and background information is also available on the website.
- Projects that enter scoping/preliminary engineering will be incorporated into a status report with specific scheduling.





Questions?



# Proposed 2014 Transportation Bond Referendum



## Funding Background

June 2010 - Ten-Year Transportation Needs/Revenues (FY11-FY20) presented to the Board Transportation Committee (BTC).

Prior to February 2012 – Staff reexamined needs, revised assumed revenues, and subsequently reduced the ten-year deficit.

February 2012 - The revised Ten-Year Transportation Needs/Revenues was presented to the Board during its retreat.

June 2010

\$10.1 B in expenditures
- \$ 4.7 B in assumed revenues
<hr/>
<b>\$ 5.3 B deficit (\$530M/year)</b>

February 2012

\$8.1B in expenditures
- \$5.1B in assumed revenues <sup>1</sup>
<hr/>
<b>\$3.0B deficit (\$300M/year)</b>

**[1] Assumes receipt of \$50M in EDA bonds, and \$100M in General Obligation bonds from November 2014 referendum.**



# HB 2313, Tysons, and the Ten-Year Transportation Needs and Revenues

Impact of new revenues on the Ten-Year Plan:

\$3.00 billion deficit (10-year total) , February 2012

-\$0.40 billion in assumed revenues from Tysons Funding Plan\*

-\$1.30 billion in new regional funding from HB 2313

-\$0.56 billion in new state funding from HB 2313\*\*

---

**\$0.74 billion deficit (10-year total)**

**\$74 million per year still needed.**

\*January 8, 2013—The Tysons Funding Plan approved by the Board.

\*\*Staff estimate of state revenues anticipated to be expended in Fairfax County over the next ten years. Estimates include construction and transit revenues, not maintenance expenditures.

HB2 and transit allocations recommended by TSDAC to the CTB will impact this figure.



## The Board's Four-Year Plan (FY13-FY16)

- On July 10, 2012, the Board of Supervisors approved its third Four-Year Plan (FY 2013 – FY 2016) for transportation projects.
- The plan included \$100 million in transportation projects to be funded by new General Obligation bond funds.
  - Assumed going to referendum in Fall 2014 .
  - Included a variety of roadway, transit capital, spot improvements, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- The 2014 Bond is one of several funding sources addressing project priorities over next six years.



## Proposed Changes to 2014 Bond Projects

Projects previously intended to be funded by the 2014 transportation bond:

- ~\$87 million for large-scale roadway projects, transit facilities, and spot/intersection improvements.
- ~\$13 million in bicycle, pedestrian, trails, and walkway improvements.
- Since July 2012, many of the large-scale roadway and transit projects have other funding sources programmed.
- HB 2313 limits the types of projects that can be funded

Staff now recommends Board consideration of the proposed 2014 transportation bond funds be used primarily for the implementation of spot improvements, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.



## What has Prompted the Change?

- HB 2313 revenues provide new funding for roadway projects.
- The project priorities approved by the Board on January 28, 2014, included over \$200 million in bicycle and pedestrian improvements over the next six years.
- There is a need to optimize the various revenue sources with the Board's project priorities.
- General Obligation bonds are the most flexible source of revenue for transportation projects.





# Why a Spot Improvement, Bicycle & Pedestrian Focused Bond

Limited sources of funding currently available for spot improvements, bicycle and pedestrian projects:

- Commercial & Industrial Taxes
  - Transit Operations for Expanded Service
  - Debt Service for Qualifying Projects
  - Bike, Pedestrian, and Roadway projects in the Four-Year Plan
- Transportation Alternative Program Grants
  - \$1M/year
- General Obligation Bonds
  - Bond funds would be available in FY 2015.



## Why a Spot Improvement, Bicycle & Pedestrian Focused Bond (continued)

- Limited sources of state and federal funds fully committed.
  - Primarily CMAQ
- Federal funding makes these types of projects more complicated, time consuming, and costly:
  - Use of federal funds require agreements between the County and the state.
    - In some cases, this could take months.
  - Federal approval prior to moving to each phase of a project (30-60 days for approval at each phase).
  - Additional right of way requirements must be met prior to land acquisition.
- Use of local funds facilitates the most efficient implementation of bicycle, pedestrian, and spot projects.



## Why a Spot Improvement, Bicycle & Pedestrian Focused Bond (continued)

- Guidelines for use of HB 2313 regional revenues ensure qualifying projects reduce congestion and are regional in nature.
- HB 2313 local revenues can be used for road construction, capital projects reducing congestion, projects included in TransAction 2040, or public transportation purposes.
  - Most bicycle and pedestrian do not qualify for HB 2313 local or regional revenues.
- Sources of state funding:
  - Transportation Trust Fund, Mass Transit Fund cannot be used for these projects.
  - Revenue Sharing, and Secondary Road Funds are currently not available for these projects.



## Criteria for Selection of Bond Projects

- Projects originally proposed to be funded by the bond continue to be funded by the bond.
- Those projects proposed to be included in the first and second thirds of the six-year plan.
- Countywide balance was considered.

There remains a significant backlog of bicycle and pedestrian projects in need of funding.



## Financial Feasibility

- Bonds are expected to be sold according to actual cash requirements over the next several years as part of the County's annual general obligation bond sales.
- Financing costs associated with the 2014 Transportation Bond Referendum have been incorporated into the County's long term debt ratio projections.
- Referenced in the FY 2015-FY 2019 Capital Improvement Program.



## Next Steps

- Modifications to proposed bond project list (see attachments.)
- Board feedback requested.
- Staff will return to the Board during its June 3, 2014, meeting requesting authorization to proceed with planning for the 2014 bond referendum and a final list of projects.
- Staff will work with other County agencies and citizen task force to educate the citizens about the November 2014 Transportation Bond Referendum



# Questions?