



County of Fairfax, Virginia

---

# Alternatives for Improving Roadway Services in Fairfax County

Transportation Advisory Commission  
November 16, 2010



*TAC was briefed on the status of the study on October 5, 2010*

- ✓ *Study Goals and Objectives*
- ✓ *Existing Roadway Maintenance Funding*
- ✓ *Potential Benefits of Greater County Involvement*
- ✓ *Alternatives for Consideration*
- ✓ *Considerations*
- ✓ *Implications of Alternatives*
- ✓ *Options for Enhancing Funding / Revenues*



## TAC CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS

### **When will the draft copy of the study be available for review?**

*Tentatively the draft copy of the study will be available on November 30, 2010.*

### **Can Federal Matching Funds be used for secondary and primary maintenance?**

*Federal Matching Funds are only used for Interstate Highways and those primary roads which are classified as National Highway System Roads.*

### **Should a miles driven tax be included as a potential source of funds?**

*Requires technological modifications to vehicles and service stations.  
Widespread public acceptance not assured.  
Best implemented at state or federal level.*



## TAC CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS

**What problem are we trying to solve?**

**Study title needs to better define goals and objectives.**

*Study title was changed to reflect goals and objectives.*

**Should we target options to the problem?**

*Yes the alternatives under consideration and options for enhancing funding and revenues address options to the objectives of the study.*



## TAC CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS

What problem are we trying to solve?

Should we target options to the problem?

Areas for improvement	Possible actions that would address improvement		
	More funding (federal, state, and/or local)	Improve coordination with VDOT	Assume responsibilities from VDOT
Improve levels of service <i>More frequent mowing, more frequent repaving</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Faster response times to local requests <i>Quicker time to install citizen request for traffic signal</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility in establishing standards <i>Ability to set more urban design standards for certain areas of the County</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
More control in setting priorities <i>Ability to reallocate resources to changing needs of County</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Most effective

Somewhat effective

Least effective



## TAC CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS

**Should the recommendations include how the County interacts with VDOT and options to improve efficiencies?**

**Include in recommendations better communications with VDOT.**

*These concerns are incorporated in the draft recommendations.*

**What are the liability issues that the County would face if it were to assume maintenance responsibilities?**

*County may incur somewhat higher degree of liability.*

*Potential costs impossible to predict.*

**Does the County have Sovereign Immunity? What does that mean?**

*Yes – Sovereign immunity limits the County's liability for certain activities. More relevant in the context of changing the form of government to city status.*

*Cities do not have the same level of Sovereign immunity as counties.*



## TAC CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS

**One of the funding slides indicated a spike in FY 2010 VDOT costs to maintain the system, why the spike?**

*Additional funds were budgeted to the primary system to address pavement conditions, resulting in a significant increase in maintenance and operations budget.*