

## **Northern Virginia Transportation Authority Meeting**

Thursday, November 13, 2025

7:00 p.m. EST

2600 Park Tower Drive, Suite 601

Vienna, VA 22180

This meeting will be held in person and accessible via YouTube

### **AGENDA**

1. **Call to Order** Chair Randall

2. **Roll Call** Ms. Henderson, Board Secretary

### **Presentations**

3. **DMV Moves Update**

Mr. Mercer, Executive Director, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

Mr. Hill, Fairfax County Executive

4. **Transform 66 Outside the Beltway Concession Fee Projects Status Update**

Ms. Shropshire, P.E., DBIA, Northern Virginia Megaprojects Director

Virginia Department of Transportation

### **Action Items**

5. **Approval of October 9, 2025, Meeting Summary Minutes** Chair Randall

*Recommended Action: Approval of the October 9, 2025, Meeting Summary Minutes*

6. **Acceptance of the FY2025 Audited Financial Statements and Compliance Reports**

Vice Chair Snyder, Finance Committee Chair

Mr. Garber, Partner, PBMares

*Recommended Action: Acceptance of the FY2025 Audit*

7. **Adoption of the 2025 Strategic Plan** Ms. Sink, Project Delivery/Grants Manager

*Recommended Action: Approval of the 2025 Strategic Plan*

8. **Approval to Transmit the Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report to House and Senate Transportation Committee Chairs**

Ms. Couso, Transportation Planning and Program Manager

*Recommended Action: Approve Transmission of the Report*

9. **Approval of Recommendation to Allocate Additional Transform 66 Outside the Beltway Concession Funds for the City of Fairfax** Ms. Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

*Recommended Action: Approve Additional Allocation Recommendation*

10. **Approval of Authority Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2026**

Ms. Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

*Recommended Action: Approve CY2026 Meeting Schedule*

### **Discussion/Information Items**

11. **HB1915 Annual Report**

Ms. Beyer, Regional Transportation Planner

12. **Joint Commission on Transportation Accountability (JCTA) Report**

Ms. Sarik, Regional Transportation Planner

13. **Governance and Personnel Committee Report**

Chair Randall

14. **Finance Committee Report**

Vice Chair Snyder, Chair

A. **Investment Portfolio Report** - Ms. Sen, Investment & Debt Manager

B. **Monthly Revenue Report** - Mr. Longhi, Chief Financial Officer

C. **Monthly Operating Budget Report** - Mr. Longhi, Chief Financial Officer

15. **Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC) Report**

Mayor Colbert, Chair

16. **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Report**

Mr. Boice, Chair

17. **CEO Report**

Ms. Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

18. **Chair's Comments**

Chair Randall

A. Other Business

19. **Adjournment**

Chair Randall

### **Next Meeting:**

Thursday, **December 11**, 2025

7:00 p.m. EST

2600 Park Tower Drive, Suite 601

Vienna, VA 22180






Moving our region forward, together.

Clark Mercer  
COG Executive Director

*Northern Virginia Transportation Authority  
November 13, 2025*

3.



# Region is growing and has aspirational goals

The region is still projected to grow significantly by 2050. That means more people making more trips – and a lot more traffic congestion, worse air quality, and pressures on quality and cost of living. But the region has many aspirational goals to guide that growth to better outcomes.

## The region in 2050:



Population 7.2 million  
**+1.25M people (+21%)**



Jobs 4.2 million  
**+800K jobs (+24%)**







Vehicle miles traveled **+15%**  
Vehicle hours of delay **+70%**



**GHGs -24% vs. target -80%**


## The region's goals & priorities:





# World-class transit is critical to the region's goals

**In the DMV, transit drives economic activity**



**Within half-mile of Metro stations and bus stops:**

- **60%** of population • **2.8M** people
- **70%** of jobs • **1.7M** jobs
- **50%** of employers • **134,400** businesses
- **\$9.4B** in business output supported by transit
- **\$330B** in property value around Metro stations
- **\$3.2B** in tax revenue generated around Metro stations

**improves mobility & accessibility regionwide**




**and connects us to the world**



# DMVMOVES is a joint initiative to develop a unified vision and sustainable funding model for public transit in our region

## Transit Funding Crisis:

Metro faces a **serious and permanent capital funding gap starting in 2028**. State and local systems also have funding shortfalls.



Metro's capital program:

- ⚠ Capital funding sources **not indexed to grow**
- ⚠ **Inflation** significantly reduced capital buying power
- ⚠ **Debt capacity will be exhausted** by FY 2029
- ⚠ Will be forced to **reduce annual capital investments**

## DMV Transit Today:

**14 transit operators and 12 bus systems** each have their own service guidelines, fare policy, signs, fleet, assets and procurement, facilities



## DMVMOVES

### Regional Transit Task Force

Officials appointed by COG and WMATA Boards

### Government Partner Advisory Group Community Partner Advisory Group

Government, transit, business, and community leaders to provide input, guidance, and recommendations to Task Force



Metropolitan Washington  
Council of Governments






# Proposed DMVMoves Plan prioritizes maximum use and value of the existing transit and road network


## New DMVMoves Funding Reinvesting in/Modernizing Metro

### Metro Rail Modernization



**\$460M in FY28 + 3%  
per year**

## Metro + Jurisdictional Partnerships Regional Bus Priority Network



**Joint project development  
Local funding for priority infrastructure  
Metro operates fast, frequent service all  
day/all week**

## Separate State and Local Needs Improved Local Bus Service


**Achieving new, customer-focused  
regional service guidelines.  
\$65-80M in FY28 + 3%/yr**


## Commuter Rail Needs

**\$60M in FY28 + 3%/yr**

## Transition to Regional Rail







**Fully fund VRE and MARC long-range  
plans**

 **System Plan 2050**

 **Growth and Transformation Plan**

**+ Implementation of Action Plan for Transit Integration**

# Advisory Groups recommend key actions for a more integrated and customer-focused regional transit network


	Action Area	Key Actions	Regional Benefits
	Regional Bus Priority	Endorse and implement priority bus corridors; Metro and jurisdictions partner on design, funding, and implementation, Metro operates main service	Faster, more reliable, and more cost-effective service in high-demand corridors
	Service Guidelines & Reporting	Adopt common regional service guidelines and performance metrics; report progress annually	Consistent service quality and transparent regional accountability
	Fare Integration	Provide transfer credits across modes and consistent fare discounts, adopt free fares for youth, and enable revenue sharing for regional passes	Simpler, more equitable fare experience
	Customer Information & Facilities	Standardize bus stop design and common customer information; create a regional bus stop ID system and stop sign design; Metro maintains regional signs	Easier wayfinding, clearer rider information, and more uniform stop experience
	Shared Resources	Pool purchasing power for vehicles and technology, share procurement opportunities, and coordinate contract terms	Reduced duplication, lower procurement costs, stronger negotiating power
	Consistent Training & Requirements	Expand participation in Metro's training programs, create a working group to explore potential skilled trade training partnerships, and streamline reporting requirements across agencies	Strengthened regional workforce and reduced administrative burden



# Proposed DMVMoves Regional Bus Priority Plan concept

DMVMoves Plan calls on the region to advance bus priority.

- Officials recognize NVTa's leadership in creating a vision and plan for regional bus rapid transit.
- Realizing this goal will require continued and strong partnership with NVTa, the localities, states, and Metro.



- Bus Priority Lines**
- Crosstown DC
  - Georgia Ave & 7<sup>th</sup> St NW
  - Rockville Pike/ MD-355 & Wisconsin Ave NW
  - New Hampshire Ave to White Oak
  - Rhode Island Ave & Annapolis Rd
  - Columbia Pike & 14<sup>th</sup> St Bridge to L'Enfant Plaza
  - VA Route 7
- Metrorail Lines**  
Purple Line

# Call to Action and Path Forward

- Advance necessary legislative and budget actions to raise \$460M/year that grows annually and is dedicated for WMATA's capital needs
  - DMVMoves financial modeling work aligned with SJ28, funding numbers are consistent
- Advocate for necessary legislative and budgetary actions to increase PRIIA funds to reflect inflation since 2010
- Work to secure state and local funding to meet the needs of local bus and commuter rail systems
- Commit to work with partners to implement the action plan to better integrate the services of the various transit systems in the region

***Through a unified vision, a realistic funding solution, and bold leadership, we can build a seamless, modern transit network that powers our economy and enhances the lives of every resident.***

## **November 2025 — Boards Review**

WMATA and COG Boards consider the Plan and Joint Resolution

## **2026 — Regional Advocacy & Local Actions**

Partners coordinate messaging and local councils adopt resolutions

## **2026 — Legislative Approval**

State legislatures enact funding legislation

## **July 1, 2028 — Implementation Funding Begins**

Dedicated regional funding available for Metro's use

# **I-66 Outside the Beltway Concession Fee Projects Annual Update**

## Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

Michelle Shropshire, P.E., DBIA  
Northern Virginia District, Megaprojects Director  
Virginia Department of Transportation

November 13, 2025

# I-66 Concession Fee Project Requirements

## Projects must:

- **Benefit the toll facility user (Virginia Code)**
- **Be federally eligible**
- **Meet one of the project improvement goals**
  - Move more people
  - Enhance transportation connectivity
  - Improve transit service
  - Reduce roadway congestion
  - Increase travel options
- **Be selected and recommended by NVTa**
- **Be approved by the Commonwealth Transportation Board**



# I-66 Concession Fee Project Categories and Status

## Projects within Transform 66 Project Construction Limits

- Poplar Tree Road Bridge Widening to Four Lanes: *Complete*
- I-66 Median Widening at Route 29: *Complete*
- Jermantown Road Bridge Widening: *Complete*
- Monument Drive Pedestrian Improvements: *Complete*

## Transit Improvement Projects

- Monument Drive Commuter Parking Garage and Transit Center: *Complete*
- East Falls Church Metro Bus Bay Expansion: *Construction began August 2025; estimated completion fall 2026*
- Western Bus Maintenance & Storage Facility: *Complete*
- VRE Manassas Line Upgrade: *4 distinct project components*
  - Expansion Rail Cars (Passenger Coaches): *Design 95% complete, manufacturing underway, expected delivery spring 2028*
  - Real-time Traveler Information: *Underway, in conjunction with VRE's systemwide upgrade of Variable Message Sign (VMS) network, ongoing implementation with some milestones met*
  - Broad Run Expansion (BRX) and Manassas Third Track: *90% design, estimated completion 2027*
  - Manassas Station Improvements: *Early design phase began April 2025, on-schedule, estimated completion 2026*
- VRE Manassas Park Parking Garage: *Complete*

# I-66 Concession Fee Project Categories and Status (continued)

## Pedestrian Improvement Projects

- Nutley Street SW Shared Use Path: *Final design and right of way underway; estimated construction to begin Dec. 2026, completion August 2028*
- George T. Snyder Trail: *Advertised; award pending*
- Lee Highway Pedestrian Improvements – Nutley Street to Vaden Drive: *Complete*

## Roadway Projects

- Route 234 At Balls Ford Road Interchange: *Complete*
- Devlin Road Widening, Balls Ford Road to University Boulevard: *Construction to begin Nov. 2025; estimated completion May 2028*
- Balls Ford Road Widening from Groveton Road to Route 234: *Complete*
- US Route 50 and Waples Mill Road Intersection improvements: *Complete*
- Route 29 Widening Phase I – Pickwick Road to Union Mill: *Complete*
- Route 29 Widening Legato to Shirley Gate: *Complete*
- Route 29 Widening Phase I and II - Union Mill Road to Buckley's Gate: *Estimated completion spring 2026*

# I-66 Concession Fee Projects

Project Description	Responsible Organization	Concession Fee Amounts Approved Through June 2025	Concession Fee Potential Shortfall/Surplus
Poplar Tree Road Bridge Widening to Four Lanes	VDOT/66 OTB	\$ 2,620,000	\$ 12,582
I-66 Median Widening at Route 29	VDOT/66 OTB	\$ 48,050,736	\$ (10)
Jermantown Road Bridge Widening	VDOT/66 OTB	\$ 9,500,000	\$ 46
Monument Drive Pedestrian Improvements	VDOT/66 OTB	\$ 3,800,000	\$ 494
Rte. 234 At Balls Ford Road Interchange	Prince William	\$ 102,654,911	\$ 2,924,870
Devlin Road Widening, Balls Ford Road to University Boulevard	Prince William	\$ 39,498,288	\$
Balls Ford Road Widening from Groveton Road to Rte. 234	Prince William	\$ 43,346,000	
Monument Drive Commuter Parking Garage and Transit Center	Fairfax County	\$ 40,850,000	\$ 3,437,555
George T. Snyder Trail	City of Fairfax	\$ 20,265,000	
Nutley Street SW Shared Use Path	Town of Vienna	\$ 495,000	

# I-66 Concession Fee Projects

Project Description	Responsible Organization	Concession Fee Amounts Approved through June 2025	Concession Fee Potential Shortfall/Surplus
US Route 50/Waples Mill Road Intersection	VDOT	\$ 2,597,076	
Lee Highway Pedestrian Improvements – Nutley Street to Vaden Drive	VDOT	\$ 3,777,652	\$ 360,251
Route 29 Widening – Phase I (Pickwick Road to Union Mill)	VDOT	\$ 1,210,904	
Route 29 Widening Phase I and II - Union Mill Road to Buckley's Gate	VDOT	\$ 21,700,597	
Route 29 Widening – Legato to Shirley Gate	Fairfax County	\$ 4,762,000	
East Falls Church Metro Bus Bay Expansion	DRPT/Arlington	\$ 7,041,000	
Western Bus Maintenance & Storage Facility	DRPT/PRTC	\$ 11,070,000	
VRE Manassas Line Upgrade	DRPT/VRE/VRPA	\$ 105,013,000	
VRE Manassas Park Parking Garage and Bridge	DRPT/VRE	\$ 23,483,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 500,000,000</b>	
<b>Funds Available</b>		<b>\$ 6,648,803</b>	<b>\$ 6,735,787</b>



# Manassas Park Parking Garage

Ribbon cutting on October 21, 2025, for 740-parking space garage at Manassas Park Station that supplements existing 600-space VRE lot.

540 new spaces for VRE riders and visitors to Park Central mixed-use development area.

Provides 200 spaces for City Hall and City Library (both opened in 2022).

Project combined funding from I-66 concession fee (\$23.4M), Commonwealth of Virginia, I-66 Commuter Choice Program, NVTA, NVTC, Virginia DRPT and City of Manassas Park.



*Ribbon Cutting Ceremony, October 21, 2025*



# East Falls Church Metro Station Bus Bay Expansion

Project is expanding bus capacity by adding 3 bays (from 4 to 7), replacing existing shelters, improving accessible parking and upgrading crosswalks at North Sycamore Street.

Construction began in August 2025, with completion expected in fall 2026.

Arlington County is sponsoring and leading the project in coordination with WMATA. Funding includes \$7M from I-66 concession fee.



*Clearing has begun; Bus loop remains open (October 2025)*



# Route 29 Widening in Fairfax County

VDOT project is reconstructing 1.5 miles of Route 29 between Union Mill Road and Buckley's Gate Drive from 4 to 6 lanes, relieving a bottleneck and improving sight distances. The project is adding shared-use path on both sides of Route 29, with connectivity to trails on the Fairfax County Parkway.

Began construction in March 2023; scheduled for completion in spring 2026.

Funding includes \$21.7M from I-66 concession fee.



*Pipe replacement under Route 29 (June 2025)*

# Moving More People, Providing More Travel Options



## Thousands Travel Toll-Free\*

27K

Bus transit trips/month  
On Average

Allowing local transit to consistently provide safe, efficient, and timely transportation services to passengers

12K

HOV3+ trips/day  
On Average

*\* Transit toll-free travel benefit is in addition to the \$800 million over the concession term, paid out annually to support additional corridor bus transit operations and maintenance*

865

motorcycle trips/day  
On Average

400

Students 2x/day  
On Average

School buses benefit from safe, free and reliable travel

23 Fairfax County Public School bus routes use 66 Express OTB, safely transporting over 400 students twice a day

Note: data as of November 2024



# 495 Express Lanes Northern Extension Project (495 NEXT)

## 495 Express Lanes Extension planned to open in late November 2025

- 2.5 miles of express lanes between the Dulles Corridor Interchange and George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) Interchange
- New express lanes access at Dulles Toll Road and GWMP
- **Other project benefits to be completed in mid-2026:**
  - New bridges with sidewalks at Old Dominion Drive, Georgetown Pike, and Live Oak Drive
  - Stormwater improvements and stream restoration
  - Parking area at Georgetown Pike Interchange for Scotts Run Nature Preserve visitors
  - **Shared-use path from Lewinsville Road to near Live Oak Drive**





## **SUMMARY MINUTES**

Thursday, October 9, 2025

7PM, EST.

2600 Park Tower Drive, Sixth Floor Authority Board Room

Vienna, VA 22180

*This meeting was conducted in person and livestreamed via [NVTA's YouTube Channel](#)*

1. Call to Order

Chair Randall

- ✓ Chair Randall called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Henderson, Board Secretary

- ✓ Membership Attendees: Chair Phyllis Randall, Vice Chair David Snyder, Chairman Jeff McKay, Chair Deshundra Jefferson, Board Member Susan Cunningham (for Vice Chair Matthew de Ferranti), Mayor Catherine Read, Mayor Michelle Davis-Younger, Mayor Alanna Mensing, Senator Jennifer Boysko, Delegate Karrie Delaney, Delegate Brianna Sewell, and Mr. Nick Roper (for William Cuttler). Absent: Mayor Alyia Gaskins, Ms. Tiffany Robinson, and Mayor Linda Colbert.
- ✓ Staff Attendees: Chief Executive Officer Monica Backmon, Chief Financial Officer Michael Longhi; Principal, Planning and Programming Keith Jasper, Deputy Chief Financial Officer Peggy Teal, Communications and Public Affairs Manager Abigail Hillerich, Senior Manager Transportation Planning and Programming Dr. Sree Nampoothiri, Planning Analytics Manager Harun Rashid; Regional Transportation Planners Griffin Frank, Alyssa Beyers, Kristen Sarik, Starla Couso, and Matthew Bewley; Project Delivery/Grants Manager Amanda Sink; Strategic Communications Specialist Sharara Faisal; Comptroller Lu Han, Senior Accountant Gary Armstrong, Senior Accountant Lauren Wilber, Accounting Assistant Margaret Duker, and Board Secretary Lee Ann Henderson.
- ✓ Council of Counsel Attendees: Mr. Daniel Robinson-Fairfax County.
- ✓ Other Attendees: Tracy Baynard-McGuire Woods, LLC.

*Members of the public, jurisdiction and agency staff were in person and were able to watch the meeting livestreamed via [NVTA's YouTube Channel](#).*

Chair Randall reminded the Authority that, as determined at last month's meeting, the I-495 Southside Express Lanes Support Letter could be reconsidered at this evening's meeting in order to reach an agreement on the motion.

- ✓ Chairman McKay noted that the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) meets next week and if this item is not included in their long range plan, further evaluation work on the project cannot move forward. He stated moving forward will allow the questions and issues about the project to be answered.
- ✓ Chairman McKay made a motion to amend the letter to the TPB asking them to move

forward with the long range plan, but defer inclusion of the I-495 Southside Express Lanes Project until April 2026. The motion was seconded by Chair Randall.

- ✓ Chair Jefferson asked for a copy of the original letter of support. Chair Randall tabled the motion until later in the meeting to give staff time to distribute copies of the letter to Authority members.

### **Presentations**

#### 3. Virginia Passenger Rail Authority – Investments and Initiatives Update

Mr. D.J. Stadtler, Executive Director, Virginia Passenger Rail Authority

- ✓ Mr. Stadtler gave a presentation outlining Virginia Passenger Rail Authority (VPRA) projects and their status, including the Long Bridge project to create rail tracks for passenger trains separate from freight tracks into and out of Washington, D.C.

#### 4. Bike-Ped Infrastructure Initiative

Mr. Jasper, Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming

- ✓ Mr. Jasper introduced Kate Widness, Project Manager for Kimley Horn and Associates, who has been working on the project to answer the Chairs of the Virginia Senate and House Transportation Committees request to come up with strategies and sources for funding Northern Virginia's bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- ✓ Mr. Jasper noted that Ms. Widness was project manager for the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) study that was the catalyst for the request from the Virginia Senate and House Transportation Committee Chairs.
- ✓ Ms. Widness presented an overview of the 2024 VDOT study, which identified a planned bicycle and pedestrian network for the Northern Virginia area.
- ✓ She also discussed the strategies and approach used to formulate the study.
- ✓ Ms. Backmon stated that the final report and strategies will be brought back in November for acceptance by the Authority.

### **Action Items**

#### 5. Approval of September 11, 2025, Meeting Summary Minutes

Chair Randall

- ✓ On a motion by Chair Randall, seconded by Vice Chair Snyder, the Summary Minutes of the meeting of September 11, 2025, were approved with Delegate Sewell, Board Member Cunningham, and Mr. Gribbin abstaining.

#### 6. Request for Regional Transportation Planner Position

Mr. Longhi, Chief Financial Officer

- ✓ Mr. Longhi gave some background on the request for an additional planner to support the TransAction update.
- ✓ On a motion by Chair Randall, seconded by Senator Boysko, an additional Regional Transportation Planner position and the related FY2026 budget adjustments, were





approved unanimously.

7. Communications Insourcing Mr. Longhi, Chief Financial Officer  
✓ On a motion by Chair Randall, seconded by Chairman McKay, this item was tabled until at least April 1, 2026.
8. Approval of the FY2032 CMAQ/RSTP Call for Projects Ms. Beyer, Regional Transportation Planner  
✓ Ms. Beyer gave some background on the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funding program and the Regional Surface Transportation Program funding program. She noted that the upcoming application cycle will occur on NVTAs Project Information Management and Monitoring System (PIMMS) platform creating a much more streamlined process.  
✓ On a motion by Chair Randall, seconded by Vice Chair Snyder, the FY2032 CMAQ/RSTP Call for Projects was approved unanimously.

Chair Randall noted that the Letter of Support for the I-495 Express Lanes has been distributed to the members and asked, without objection, to take up the matter and picked up the motion, which had been made by Chairman McKay and seconded by herself.

- ✓ Chairman McKay noted that the changes would appear in the final two paragraphs.
- ✓ Chair Jefferson stated that she abstained last month as she wanted to have more conversations around the project and expressed concern about the questions around the project. She stated for the record, that she feels uncomfortable with Mayor Gaskins being absent and unable to comment.
- ✓ Chair Randall stated that she has spoken to Mayor Gaskins who is aware that this will be heard.
- ✓ Chairman McKay clarified that NVTAs will not be taking a position on the project. He noted that his jurisdiction has submitted a long list of questions and concerns, and that it would be reckless to kill the project before the answers to the questions can be worked through.
- ✓ The motion was approved with Board Member Cunningham abstaining.

### **Discussion/Information Items**

9. Strategic Plan Update Ms. Sink, Project Delivery/Grants Manager  
✓ Ms. Sink reviewed the actions taken so far in the Five-Year Strategic Plan adoption and the next steps, highlighting the draft strategies developed to achieve the approved Goals.  
✓ Ms. Sink noted that a finalized Strategic Plan is anticipated to be on the November Authority agenda for action.
10. Governance and Personnel Committee (GPC) Report Chair Randall  
✓ Ms. Baynard discussed the issue of dedicated funding for local and regional transit agencies. She emphasized that this needs to be net new funding, not funding from existing sources.



- ✓ Chair Randall stated that she has asked staff to craft language to that effect for the Legislative Program so that Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) and DMV Moves will all be using the same language.

11. Finance Committee Report

Vice Chair Snyder, Chair

- ✓ Vice Chair Snyder stated the Finance Committee heard from the Auditors who have given NVTA a clean audit which will be presented for acceptance at the next Authority meeting.

12. Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC) Report

Mayor Colbert, Chair

- ✓ Chair Randall noted that the report is in the agenda packet.

13. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Report

Chair Boice, Chair

- ✓ Chair Randall noted that the report is in the agenda packet.

14. Transportation Technology Committee (TTC) Report

Vice Chair Snyder, Chair

- ✓ Vice Chair Snyder noted that the report is in the agenda packet and any questions could be directed to himself.

15. CEO Report

Ms. Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

- ✓ Ms. Backmon reminded everyone that Governing Body Resolutions of Support for the Six Year Program applications are due October 31, 2025, by 5 p.m.
- ✓ Ms. Backmon also reminded everyone of the State of the Region's Transportation Network event will be held on Wednesday, October 22, 2025. She asked that Authority members who would like to attend either register online or let her know.
- ✓ She stated that the Request for Proposals for the TransAction update is out.

16. Chair's Comments

Chair Randall

- ✓ Chair Randall congratulated Ms. Backmon on her inclusion in the Power List 500 in Virginia. Ms. Backmon stated that the recognition speaks to the hard work of the NVTA staff.

17. Adjournment

Chair Randall

- ✓ There being no further business before the Authority, Chair Randall adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.



**NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY****MEMORANDUM**

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Michael Longhi, Chief Financial Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** FY2025 Audited Financial Statements and Compliance Reports

---

- 1. Purpose:** To seek the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) acceptance of the FY2025 Audited Financial Statements and Compliance Audit reports as recommended by the Finance Committee.
- 2. Suggested Motion:** *I move Authority acceptance of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority's Audited Financial and Compliance Reports, and the Results of the Audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025.*
- 3. Current Situation:**
  - A.** The Finance Committee serves as the Authority's Audit Committee.
  - B.** As a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Authority is required to complete an annual audit of its financial activities for each fiscal year following standards contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Specifications for Audits of Authorities, Boards and Commissions issued by the Auditor of Public Accounts of the Commonwealth of Virginia.
  - C.** The Authority contracted with the independent, external, licensed certified public accounting firm PBMares, LLP to complete the required FY2025 audit.
  - D.** The Authority's FY2025 Financial and Compliance Reports received an unmodified audit opinion also known as a clean opinion. This is the highest level of assurance an auditor can provide and confirms the financial statements are presented fairly in all material respects, reflecting the Authority's sound financial position for FY2025.
  - E.** Mr. Michael Garber, CPA, a partner with PBMares, LLP, is presenting the Financial and Compliance reports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2025.
  - F.** Mr. Longhi will be presenting a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the key highlights of the Financial Statements.

**Attachments:** *(Linked due to size. Links to be activated once reports are finalized.)*

- A.** [Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, Financial and Compliance Reports, Year Ended June 30, 2025](#)
- B.** [Results of the Audit, Year Ended June 30, 2025](#)
- C.** [NVTa FY2025 Financial Statements and MDA Highlights Presentation](#)

**NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY****MEMORANDUM**

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Amanda Sink, Project Delivery/Grants Manager

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Adoption of the 2025 Five-Year Strategic Plan

---

1. **Purpose:** To seek the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) adoption of the 2025 Five-Year Strategic Plan.
2. **Suggested Motion:** *I move Authority adoption of the 2025 Five-Year Strategic Plan.*
3. **Background:** The Five-Year Strategic Plan (Plan) provides a framework to guide NVTa's work over the next five years. The Plan focuses on maintaining and enhancing performance across NVTa's primary responsibilities, while positioning NVTa to proactively address emerging and unmet regional transportation needs. On May 8, 2025, the Authority formally adopted the Vision statement, Mission statement, Core Values and four strategic Goals to accomplish over the next five years. On October 9, 2025, members were presented draft Strategies. All elements of the Plan were presented to the Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC) for consideration without comment or requested changes, and are fully aligned with NVTa's legislative mandates.
4. **Discussion:** The full Plan is attached for adoption.
5. **Next Steps:** Following adoption of the Plan, NVTa staff will provide annual updates on the progress of implementing the Plan, which will include Metrics.

**Attachment:** 2025 Five-Year Strategic Plan





# 2025 Five-Year Strategic Plan

*We're not just planning for our future,  
we're making it happen.*

# **About the Five-Year Strategic Plan**

The Five-Year Strategic Plan (Plan) was developed through a process that involved continual coordination and engagement with NVTa's Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC). The Vision, Mission, Core Values, and Strategic Goals were adopted on May 8, 2025, and the full Plan was adopted on November 13, 2025.

## **Authority Members**

**Chair:** Hon. Phyllis Randall – Chair, Loudoun County

**Vice Chair:** Hon. David Snyder – Council Member, City of Falls Church

Hon. Jennifer Boysko – Virginia Senate Appointee

Hon. Linda Colbert – Mayor, Town of Vienna

Bill Cuttler, P.E. – Northern Virginia District Engineer, Virginia  
Department of Transportation

Hon. Michelle Davis-Younger – Mayor, City of Manassas

Hon. Karrie Delaney – Virginia Speaker of the House Appointee

Hon. Matt de Ferranti – Vice Chair, Arlington County

Hon. Alyia Gaskins – Mayor, City of Alexandria

DJ Gribbin - Governor's Appointee, Commonwealth Transportation  
Board Member

Hon. Deshundra Jefferson – Chair, Prince William County

Hon. Jeffrey C. McKay – Chair, Fairfax County

Hon. Alanna Mensing – Mayor, City of Manassas Park

Hon. Catherine S. Read – Mayor, City of Fairfax

Tiffany Robinson – Director, Department of Rail and Public  
Transportation

Hon. Briana D. Sewell – Virginia Speaker of the House Appointee

## **Outline of the Plan**

The Plan provides a framework to guide NVTa's work over the next five years (2025-2030). It focuses on maintaining and enhancing performance across NVTa's primary responsibilities, while positioning NVTa to proactively address emerging and unmet regional transportation needs. All elements of the plan align with NVTa's legislative mandates (Appendix A), reinforcing NVTa's commitment toward reducing congestion and investing in an integrated multimodal transportation system.

The Plan is grounded by NVTa's Vision, Mission and Core Values, which serves as guiding principles throughout. The Plan defines strategic Goals that outline how NVTa will work towards achieving its Vision. Each Goal is supported by Strategies that will guide NVTa's initiatives. Achieving the outlined Goals will require strong coordination with external partners as well as a continued focus on NVTa's internal capabilities. This includes fostering a high-performing, innovative organization equipped to successfully carry out the Plan.

Progress toward each Goal will be measured through Metrics, which will be reported through annual updates to the Plan. Metrics will quantify NVTa's work, evaluate how each Strategy is implemented, and assess overall advancement of each Goal. Annual Strategic Plan Updates and Metric Reports will be available at <https://thenovaauthority.org/about-nvta/vision/strategic-plan>



## **NVTA Vision**

**NVTA will plan for, and invest in, a safe, equitable, sustainable, and integrated multimodal transportation system that enhances quality of life, strengthens the economy, and builds resilience.**

## **NVTA Mission**

**Our mission is to reduce congestion in Northern Virginia by planning, funding, and advancing multimodal transportation solutions that reflect our Core Values of Safety, Equity and Sustainability.**

## **NVTA Core Values**

**Equity  
Safety  
Sustainability**



# Goals



## **1. Lead the region's transportation initiatives**

In collaboration with jurisdictions and agencies, NVTA will demonstrate regional leadership to develop and advance multimodal transportation solutions



## **2. Maximize public benefit through project selection and delivery**

NVTA is a steward of the public's trust through continued transparent project selection and increased project sponsor accountability for timely delivery.



## **3. Enhance regional planning through technical assistance and data-driven information**

NVTA provides regional insights through advanced data analytics to support informed decisions



## **4. Safeguard and diversify NVTA revenue sources**

NVTA protects and expands its revenue to bolster the region's capital funding needs

# **Strategies**



**Goal 1. Lead the region's transportation initiatives**

## **Strategies**

**1.1** Advance TransAction and regional planning initiatives that incorporate evolving transportation trends and strengthen long-term decision-making

**1.2** Lead efforts to identify regional needs and develop actionable approaches for a coordinated regional response

**1.3** Remain at the forefront of evolving technology and practices by applying and supporting innovative approaches that benefit the region

**1.4** Amplify NVTAs presence and influence as the region's advocate in state and federal transportation discussions



## Goal 2. Maximize public benefit through project selection and delivery

### **Strategies**

**2.1** Maintain and evolve funding processes for projects that support long-term regional impacts

**2.2** Strengthen ongoing oversight and engagement with project sponsors to proactively identify and address factors impacting project delivery

**2.3** Enhance public awareness of NVTAs' investments and project impacts



## Goal 3. Enhance regional planning through technical assistance and data-driven information

### **Strategies**

**3.1** Increase NVTa's data analytic capabilities to lead the use of evolving tools, methods, and technologies

**3.2** Deliver Northern Virginia-specific data and analytics support to assist regional partners

**3.3** Enhance public and partner access to NVTa data and continue delivering clear, data-informed messaging





## Goal 4. Safeguard and diversify NVTAs revenue sources

### **Strategies**

**4.1** Protect and strengthen NVTAs long-term funding capacity through disciplined financial stewardship and reliable, future-focused planning

**4.2** Evaluate NVTAs investments and economic benefits to the region and the Commonwealth

**4.3** Pursue competitive funding opportunities that leverage a regional approach and enhance NVTAs capacity to serve as a grant applicant and recipient

# Appendix A

This appendix provides a list of key legislative mandates that informed this Plan. While not exhaustive, these mandates reflect core responsibilities outlined in the Code of Virginia as of November 13, 2025.

- § 33.2-2500(1) The Authority shall prepare a regional transportation plan for Planning District 8 that includes transportation improvements of regional significance and those improvements necessary or incidental thereto and shall revise and amend the plan.
- § 33.2-2500(2) The Authority shall evaluate all significant transportation projects, including highway, mass transit, and technology projects, in and near Planning District 8, to the extent that funds are available for such purpose. The evaluation shall provide an objective, quantitative rating for each project according to the degree to which the project is expected to reduce congestion and, to the extent feasible, the degree to which the project is expected to improve regional mobility in the event of a homeland security emergency. Such evaluation shall rely on analytical techniques and transportation modeling, including those that employ computer simulations currently and customarily employed in transportation planning. The Authority may rely on the results of transportation modeling performed by other entities, including the Department of Transportation and private entities contracted for this purpose, provided that such modeling is in accordance with this section.
- § 33.2-2500(6)(c) Prepare a plan for mass transportation services with persons, counties, cities, agencies, authorities, or transportation commissions and may further contract with any such person or entity to provide necessary facilities, equipment, operations and maintenance, access, and insurance pursuant to such plan.
- § 33.2-2508 In fulfilling the requirements of subdivision 1 of § 33.2-2500, the Authority shall be responsible for long-range transportation planning for regional transportation projects in Northern Virginia. In carrying out this responsibility, the Authority shall, on the basis of a regional consensus whenever possible, set regional transportation policies and priorities for regional transportation projects and, at least once every five years, shall

consider for revision and revise as necessary the regional transportation plan. The policies and priorities shall have reducing congestion in Planning District 8 as their primary objective to the greatest extent practicable and shall be guided by performance-based criteria such as the ability to improve travel times, reduce delays, connect regional activity centers, improve safety, improve air quality, and move the most people in the most cost-effective manner. Any obstacles to achieving this objective shall be specified in writing, including any reason relating to the need for cooperation by any locality embraced by (i) the Authority, (ii) the District of Columbia, (iii) the State of Maryland, or (iv) any other regional entity in the metropolitan Washington area.

- § 33.2-2512 (1) Providing general oversight of regional programs involving mass transit or congestion mitigation, including carpooling, vanpooling, and ridesharing
- § 33.2-2512 (2) Providing long-range regional planning, both financially constrained and unconstrained
- § 33.2-2512 (3) Recommending to federal, state, and regional agencies regional transportation priorities, including public-private transportation projects and funding allocations
- § 33.2-2512 (4) Developing, in coordination with affected counties and cities, regional priorities and policies to improve air quality
- § 33.2-2512 (5) Allocating to priority regional transportation projects funds made available to the Authority and, at the discretion of the Authority, directly overseeing such projects
- § 33.2-2512 (6) Recommending to the Commonwealth Transportation Board priority regional transportation projects for receipt of federal and state funds
- § 33.2-2512 (8) Providing general oversight of regional transportation issues of a multijurisdictional nature, including intelligent transportation systems, signalization, and preparation for and response to emergencies
- § 33.2-2512 (9) Serving as an advocate for the transportation needs of Northern Virginia before the state and federal governments

**NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Starla Couso, AICP, Transportation Planning & Programming Manager

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report

---

1. **Purpose:** To seek the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) approval of the Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report to the House and Senate Transportation Committee Chairs.
2. **Suggested Motion:** *I move Authority approve transmittal of the Report to the House and Senate Transportation Committee Chairs.*
3. **Background:**
  - A. The Authority Chair received a letter signed by Senator Bagby (Chair, Senate Transportation Committee) and Delegate Delaney (Chair, House Transportation Committee) dated March 17, 2025. The Chairs requested NVTa review the findings of the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) December 2024 Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study and make recommendations regarding regional methods to fund the infrastructure identified in the Study. The letter further requested NVTa to coordinate with VDOT, NVTa's member jurisdictions, advocate groups, and other stakeholders.
  - B. The Authority approved a response letter to the House and Senate Transportation Committee Chairs on May 8, 2025. Following the approval, NVTa obtained consultant services of Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to assist with the initiative.
4. **Discussion:**
  - A. The project kickoff meeting occurred on June 16, 2025. Following the kickoff meeting, NVTa staff began reviewing the findings of VDOT's Study and established a regional coordination stakeholder group made up of staff from VDOT and NVTa's member jurisdictions, regional transportation agencies, as well as regional advocacy and stakeholder groups. NVTa staff held two regional coordination meetings. The first meeting was held in-person at NVTa's office on July 31, 2025, to discuss existing bicycle and pedestrian funding sources. The second meeting was held virtually on Microsoft Teams on August 27, 2025, to review the funding strategy approach and to review the preliminary results of the qualitative evaluation of forty-five (45) funding



strategies. Based on the qualitative evaluation and input from regional coordination stakeholders, fourteen (14) funding strategies were recommended for further study.

- B.** On October 8, 2025, NVTa staff shared the draft Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report with the regional coordination stakeholders. Stakeholders had until October 22, 2025, to submit comments on the draft report. NVTa staff collected and prepared responses to all comments received. For comments related to the 2024 VDOT Study, NVTa staff coordinated with VDOT staff on responses. The comments were incorporated into the report as appropriate.

**5. Committee Endorsements:**

- A. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):** The TAC met on Wednesday, October 15, 2025, and unanimously endorsed the Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report.
- B. Planning Coordination and Advisory Committee (PCAC):** The PCAC met on Wednesday, October 29, 2025, and unanimously endorsed the Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report.

- 6. Next Steps:** Following approval by the Authority, NVTa staff will finalize the Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report and transmit it to the House and Senate Transportation Committee Chairs.

**Attachment:**

- 1. Draft Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report
- 2. Comments and Responses Document

# Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure

November 2025



*DRAFT*



# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Initiative Intent .....	1
Initiative Overview .....	1
Initiative Timeline .....	2
<b>Previous and Ongoing Efforts .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study .....	2
Virginia Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 (SJ 28) – Ongoing.....	4
DMV Moves – Ongoing .....	4
<b>Regional Coordination.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Regional Stakeholders.....	6
Engaging Regional Stakeholders .....	7
<b>Existing Funding Sources .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Research Process and Methodology.....	8
Funding Sources Reviewed .....	9
Existing Sources: Regional Stakeholder Key Takeaways.....	12
Existing Funding Sources: Additional Considerations .....	16
<b>Future Funding Strategies .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Research Process and Methodology.....	17
Future Funding Strategies Results.....	19
Future Strategies: Regional Stakeholder Key Takeaways.....	20
Overall Future Funding Strategy Results.....	21
Funding Strategy Results by Tax/Fee Category.....	23
Future Funding Strategies: Additional Considerations .....	26
Funding Strategies Recommended for Further Study.....	27
<b>Future Opportunities .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix A – Regional Coordination Stakeholder List</b>	
<b>Appendix B – Regional Coordination Meetings Summaries</b>	
<b>Appendix C – Regional Stakeholder Survey Results</b>	
<b>Appendix D – Funding Strategy Detail Sheets</b>	



# Introduction

## Initiative Intent

In March of 2025, the chair of the Virginia House of Delegates Transportation Committee, Delegate Karrie K. Delaney, and the chair of the Virginia Senate Transportation Committee, Senator Lamont Bagby, requested that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) perform the following actions related to the 2024 Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study (Study) completed by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT):


1. Review the findings and recommendations of the Study
2. Recommend regional methods to fund the bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure identified in the Study
3. Coordinate with VDOT, NVTA's member jurisdictions, advocates, and stakeholders

This collective initiative is referred to as the ***Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure***.

## Initiative Overview

The goal of this initiative is to identify regional methods to fund Northern Virginia's 4,000+ miles of planned bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, as identified in the 2024 Study. NVTA acknowledges that identifying and developing a combination of funding mechanisms is likely to provide the greatest flexibility and resilience for agencies as they pursue funding for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the future. NVTA identified and evaluated two categories of funding mechanisms: (1) existing funding sources and (2) future funding strategies, shown in **Figure 1**. As part of this initiative, NVTA coordinated efforts with VDOT; member jurisdictions of NVTA; advocacy representatives on topics including bicycle, pedestrian, transit, smart growth, and multimodal transportation; and other necessary stakeholders.

**Figure 1: Funding Sources and Strategies**








Notably, this initiative is a qualitative assessment of existing revenue sources, and potential future revenue strategies that could be used to fund Northern Virginia’s Planned Bicycle and Pedestrian Network buildout. This initiative is neither a quantitative cost-analysis nor a feasibility study of sources and strategies, nor does it attempt to identify or prioritize bicycle and pedestrian projects.

## Initiative Timeline

This initiative took place from June to November 2025, with key milestones outlined in **Figure 2**. As noted in the Authority’s May 8, 2025, letter to Senator Bagby and Delegate Delaney, this effort will rely heavily on the concurrent work requested by the General Assembly in Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 or SJ28 (2025). The process integrated stakeholder feedback throughout, with NVTA’s understanding of existing funding sources expanding after the Regional Coordination Meeting 1 and future funding strategies modified following the Regional Coordination Meeting 2. Stakeholders were given a draft of the report on October 8, 2025, and asked to provide comments by October 22, 2025. NVTA prepared responses to all comments received and updated the report accordingly.

**Figure 2: Initiative Timeline**



## Previous and Ongoing Efforts

This initiative drew on three previous and ongoing efforts that provide background context on the region and valuable information regarding funding sources and potential future funding strategies. This initiative is also inspired by how these sources and strategies have been holistically assessed through previous studies in the region. This initiative advances the 2024 Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study and builds upon the ongoing Virginia SJ 28 and DMV Moves initiatives.

## Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study

In 2022, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) initiated the Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study, which was spearheaded by then-Chairman of the Virginia Senate Transportation Committee, David Marsden, and Virginia Senator Scott Surovell. This Study assessed bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure needs in VDOT’s Northern Virginia District by compiling available locality adopted bicycle and pedestrian network plans and GIS data. This Study delivered a combined regional planned bicycle and pedestrian network and assessed how the network could provide access to



key destinations, such as transit stations and activity centers, throughout the region. Additionally, this Study identified planning-level cost estimate ranges for constructing the bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout Northern Virginia, using recently completed project costs. Many of these projects included other related roadway improvements, as is typical and usually necessary, but project examples selected for cost estimating were bicycle/pedestrian-focused projects. Including bicycle and pedestrian facilities in larger roadway projects can potentially be more cost efficient than building standalone bicycle and pedestrian facilities, given the opportunity for shared design and construction activities.

The result of this effort was a snapshot of the planned bicycle and pedestrian network, over 4,000 miles across the NOVA District, and planning-level cost estimate ranges of a full buildout of the network that ranged from \$14 billion to \$30 billion in 2034 dollars, as shown in **Table 1. *The Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study serves as the precursor to this current initiative, identifying the high-level potential amount needed to complete the planned bicycle and pedestrian network.***<sup>1</sup>

**Table 1: Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study Planning-level Cost Estimate Ranges**

Facility Type	Total Lane Mileage	2022 Low Estimate Total	2022 High Estimate Total	2034 Low Estimate Total	2034 High Estimate Total
Shared-Use Path	1,863	\$8,169,700,000	\$16,972,800,000	\$13,078,900,000	\$27,164,000,000
Sidewalk	330	\$772,500,000	\$1,604,300,000	\$1,239,400,000	\$2,568,200,000
Bike Lane	834	\$258,600,000	\$538,000,000	\$417,100,000	\$863,400,000
Natural Surface Trail	236	\$48,300,000	\$99,000,000	\$77,800,000	\$159,000,000
Shared Lanes	877	\$26,300,000	\$48,200,000	\$43,800,000	\$78,900,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,140</b>	<b>\$9,275,300,000</b>	<b>\$19,262,400,000</b>	<b>\$14,857,000,000</b>	<b>\$30,833,500,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Note: the total amounts include significant contingency given the high-level nature of estimates and were based on recently constructed projects that often included other improvements/costs adjacent to the bicycle/pedestrian facility, as is typical of most projects.

## Virginia Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 (SJ 28) – Ongoing

SJ 28 was initiated in 2025 at the request of the Virginia House of Delegates to assess long-term, sustainable, and dedicated funding for operating and capital expenses of the region's transit agencies. As part of this process, the SJ 28 team conducted a quantitative analysis of 10 revenue methods identified in the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) Metro Operation Funding and Reform Working Group as well as five additional revenue sources, both existing and not yet utilized in the region. The purpose of this study is to assess each source's revenue potential and suitability for sustainably funding transit capital and operating needs in Northern Virginia.


## DMV Moves – Ongoing

DMV Moves is a joint initiative established by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) and the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) in 2024 to develop a funding solution to modernize and improve WMATA's rail and bus transportation systems. To achieve this, the initiative sought to establish a region-wide transportation fund that would contain predictable, flexible revenue sources, capital funds indexed to 3% annual growth to keep pace with average inflation, and funding that supports secure bond issuance, free of restrictions or encumbrances.

As of October 2025, DMV put forward recommendations of \$460 million in new capital funding for Metro starting in 2028, and also to move the 3% cap on operating subsidy to Metro from a maximum on the gross subsidy itself to a 3% cap on per-unit cost of service, allowing service to grow unconstrained if necessary. The task force also recommends adopting a regional bus priority action plan to help coordinate consistent service standards across D.C, Maryland, and Virginia transit operators, identify transit corridors in efforts to reduce operational cost, improve efficiency, and enhance the rider experience.

The funding methods assessed in each of these efforts can be seen in **Figure 3**.

Figure 3: Funding Methods Studied in SJ 28 and DMV Moves



These two studies of potential revenue methods provided a strategic background for this regional bike and pedestrian funding initiative, particularly in offering context for which funding sources and strategies could generate the highest revenue and affirm that there is a region-wide need to implement sustained funding for multimodal infrastructure projects and ongoing operations. Finally, the SJ 28 and DMV Moves studies identify upcoming decision points and next steps also present in this initiative, such as further planning on how new revenues should be structured as well as identification of who should collect and administer future transportation funding.





# Regional Coordination

Coordinating with regional stakeholders was essential given the regional nature of the wider network buildout study and the importance of local knowledge. *NVTA invited a variety of stakeholders to provide feedback on the following topics throughout the initiative, aiming to establish an understanding of the current funding landscape and identify opportunities to expand bicycle and pedestrian funding options moving forward.*

## Regional Stakeholders

Stakeholders include counties, cities, towns, regional entities, VDOT, and advocacy groups in Northern Virginia. **Table 2** details the organizations invited to participate in this initiative. **Appendix A – Regional Coordination Partner List** includes the points of contact for each of the invited stakeholders.

**Table 2: Regional Coordination Stakeholders**

 <p>Counties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arlington County</li> <li>• Fairfax County</li> <li>• Loudoun County</li> <li>• Prince William County</li> </ul>	 <p>Regional/ State Agencies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VDOT</li> <li>• National Park Service (NPS)</li> <li>• MWCOG Transportation Planning Board</li> <li>• Fairfax County Park Authority</li> <li>• NOVA Parks</li> <li>• Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC)</li> <li>• Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC)</li> <li>• Virginia Passenger Rail Authority (VPRA)</li> <li>• Virginia Railway Express (VRE)</li> <li>• Potomac Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC)</li> <li>• WMATA</li> </ul>
 <p>Towns and Cities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Alexandria</li> <li>• City of Fairfax</li> <li>• City of Falls Church</li> <li>• City of Manassas</li> <li>• City of Manassas Park</li> <li>• Town of Clifton</li> <li>• Town of Dumfries</li> <li>• Town of Hamilton</li> <li>• Town of Haymarket</li> <li>• Town of Herndon</li> <li>• Town of Hillsboro</li> <li>• Town of Leesburg</li> <li>• Town of Lovettsville</li> <li>• Town of Middleburg</li> <li>• Town of Occoquan</li> <li>• Town of Purcellville</li> <li>• Town of Round Hill</li> <li>• Town of Vienna</li> </ul>	 <p>Advocacy Groups/ Associations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fairfax Alliance for Better Bicycling</li> <li>• Bike Loudoun</li> <li>• Bike Falls Church</li> <li>• Sustainable Mobility for Arlington County</li> <li>• Coalition for Smarter Growth</li> <li>• Prince William County Trails and Blueways Council</li> <li>• Active Prince William</li> <li>• Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance</li> <li>• Tysons Community Alliance</li> <li>• Washington Area Bicyclist Association</li> <li>• Virginia Bicycling Federation</li> <li>• Alexandria Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</li> <li>• Potomac Pedalers</li> <li>• Transportation Association of Greater Springfield</li> <li>• Dulles Area Transportation Association</li> </ul>






## Engaging Regional Stakeholders

NVTA engaged regional stakeholders through various methods, including a survey and two coordination meetings. A summary of the engagements and purposes of each is as follows:

- **Agency Online Survey** | Developed a detailed understanding of the agency’s existing funding mechanisms to construct and maintain bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, to recognize the challenges and successes.
- **Regional Coordination Meeting #1** | Encouraged information sharing and discussion about the challenges and opportunities regarding different existing funding sources. The meeting included four breakout groups, organized by organization type, to appreciate the nuances that each organization may experience.
- **Regional Coordination Meeting #2** | Presented distilled themes and knowledge gained from the first meeting and survey, along with presenting the results of the funding strategy research for reaction and discussion.

The engagements provided opportunities for regional stakeholders to provide feedback and shape the findings and recommendations of this initiative. **Table 3** details the number of participants in each of the engagements throughout Summer 2025. The complete summaries for both regional coordination meetings and the survey can be found in **Appendix B – Regional Coordination Meetings Summaries** and **Appendix C – Regional Stakeholder Survey Results**, respectively.

**Table 3: Engagement Summary**

 <b>Agency Online Survey</b> 7/24/2025 – 8/18/2025	 <b>Regional Coordination Meeting #1</b> 7/31/2025 (in-person)	 <b>Regional Coordination Meeting #2</b> 8/27/2025 (virtual)
<b>12</b> jurisdiction responses	<b>21</b> jurisdictional participants <b>6</b> advocate participants	<b>27</b> jurisdictional participants <b>5</b> advocate participants

The following sections provide a more detailed discussion of key takeaways from the regional stakeholders. Feedback received from regional stakeholders helped NVTA establish an understanding of the current state of funding and implementing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, as well as potential future funding solutions.

**Figure 4: Regional Coordination Meeting #1**



# Existing Funding Sources

The purpose of reviewing the existing funding sources is to understand the current landscape of funding available for constructing and maintaining bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the Northern Virginia region. Through the review, NVTA identified and assessed existing funding sources across a range of administrative levels, including local, regional, state, and federal. Some of these funding sources may already be used to support bicycle and pedestrian projects.

## Research Process and Methodology

NVTA followed the process shown in **Figure 5** to better understand the applicability of each funding source for bicycle and pedestrian construction and maintenance projects. NVTA identified 26 existing sources, ranging from local to regional, state, and federal levels. NVTA integrated feedback from regional stakeholders on the sources they currently use, and identified where opportunities exist to further explore and secure funding.

**Figure 5: Methodology to Determine Existing Funding Sources**



## Funding Sources Reviewed

To develop a list of existing funding sources for evaluation, NVTA identified sources that could, in some way, fund bicycle and pedestrian projects. This helped develop the list of funding sources shown in **Figure 6**. Next, these sources were assessed using metrics that aimed to better understand the overall applicability of the source, including what parts of bicycle and pedestrian implementation they can fund. The results of this evaluation are shown in the funding source matrix shown in **Table 4**. Of the 26 sources evaluated, 25 sources can support capital projects and 17 sources can support maintenance projects. Each of the sources vary in administration, with some operating annually and some biannually, varying application materials, and evaluation metrics.

Figure 6: Existing Funding Source List

### Local

- Local allocation
- Developer contributions/proffers

### Regional

- NVTA 70% Regional Revenues
- NVTA 30% Local Projects
- NVTC Commuter Choice
- TPB Regional Roadway Safety Program (RRSP)
- TPB Transportation Land-Use Connections Program (TLC)
- TPB Transit Within Reach Program (TWR)

### State

- High-Priority Projects Program (SMART SCALE)
- District Grant Program (SMART SCALE)
- Trail Access Grants Program
- Land and Water Conservation Fund
- VDOT Revenue Sharing Program
- VDOT Urban Program Maintenance Payments
- VDOT State of Good Repair (SGR) Program - Pavements

### Federal

- Transportation Alternatives (TA) program, including Safe Routes to School
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program
- Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program
- Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program (ATIIP)
- Bridge Investment Program
- Recreational Trails Program
- Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) Program (Previously RAISE)
- Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program
- Brownfields Program
- Carbon Reduction Program
- National Scenic Byways Program
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
- National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)
- Railway Highway Crossing Program (RHCP)
- Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
- Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program
- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program



Table 4: Existing Funding Sources Matrix

Funding Source	Grantor	Eligible Jurisdictions ■ = eligible ● = eligibility varies					Eligible Project Types ✓ = eligible	
		Municipality	County	State	MPO	Other Agencies	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Capital	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Operations/ Maintenance
							*Only specific types may be eligible	
Local								
Local allocation	Varies	●	●				✓	✓
Developer contributions/proffers	Varies	●	●				✓	✓
Regional								
NVTA 70% Regional Revenues	NVTA	●	●				✓	
NVTA 30% Local Projects	NVTA	●	●				✓	✓
Commuter Choice	NVTC	●	●			●	✓	
State								
High-Priority Projects Program (SMART SCALE)	Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI)/ VDOT	●	●		●	●	✓	
District Grant Program (SMART SCALE)	Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI)/ VDOT	●	●			●	✓	
Trail Access Grants Program	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VDCR)	●	●			●	✓	
Land and Water Conservation Fund	Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)	●	●	●		●	✓	✓*
VDOT Revenue Sharing Program	VDOT	●	●				✓	✓
VDOT Repaving Program	VDOT	●	●	●		●	✓	✓



Funding Source	Grantor	Eligible Jurisdictions ● = eligible ● = eligibility varies					Eligible Project Types ✓ = eligible	
		Municipality	County	State	MPO	Other Agencies	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Capital	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Operations/ Maintenance
							*Only specific types may be eligible	
VDOT Urban Program Maintenance Payments	VDOT	●	●					✓*
VDOT State of Good Repair (SGR) Program - Pavements	VDOT	●	●					✓*
<b>Federal</b>								
Transportation Alternatives Program (TA)	VDOT/ Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	●	●	●	●	●	✓	✓
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program	FHWA / NVTA/ Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB)	●	●	●	●	●	✓	✓
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program	FHWA/ NVTA/ Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB)	●	●		●	●	✓	✓
Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program	FHWA	●	●	●	●		✓	
Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program (ATIIP)	U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT)	●	●	●	●		✓	
Bridge Investment Program	FHWA	●	●	●	●	●	✓	✓
Recreational Trails Program	VDCR	●	●	●	●	●	✓*	✓
Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) Program (Previously RAISE)	USDOT	●	●	●	●	●	✓	
Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program	USDOT	●	●		●	●	✓	
Brownfields Program	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	●	●	●	●	●	✓	✓*

Funding Source	Grantor	Eligible Jurisdictions ● = eligible ● = eligibility varies					Eligible Project Types ✓ = eligible	
		Municipality	County	State	MPO	Other Agencies	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Capital	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Operations/ Maintenance
							*Only specific types may be eligible	
Carbon Reduction Program <sup>2</sup>	FHWA	●	●	●	●	●	✓	✓*
Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program (Part of TAP)	VDOT/ FHWA	●	●	●	●	●	✓	✓
National Scenic Byways Program	USDOT			●			✓*	✓*
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	USDOT/ VDOT	●	●	●	●	●	✓	
National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)	USDOT	●	●	●	●	●	✓	
Railway Highway Crossing Program (RHCP)	USDOT	●	●		●	●	✓	
Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	●	●				✓	✓
Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program	MWCOG/ FTA	●	●			●	✓	✓

## Existing Funding Sources: What We Heard from Stakeholders

During NVTA's first regional stakeholder meeting, NVTA received verbal feedback from Northern Virginia jurisdictions and advocates in attendance. Prior to the meeting, an online survey was distributed to the counties and cities that make up NVTA's membership, and 12 responses were received during the three weeks the survey was open. The following sections summarize the feedback collected. While valuable, the limited number of responses should not be interpreted as representing a comprehensive regional perspective.


When agencies were asked what types of projects are the most difficult to identify funding for, the most difficult category perceived was maintenance and operations. **Figure 7** displays the responses received

<sup>2</sup> Carbon Reduction Program funds have only been authorized for a select number of years, and VDOT NOVA District funds have been largely programmed, decreasing the program's potential as a viable future funding source.



from this question. Many of the existing funding sources cannot be used for maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The least difficult ranked stage of funding identification was construction.


**Figure 7: How Difficult is it to Identify Funding in the Following Three Categories?**



*Source: Agency Online Survey*

When agencies were asked what types of projects are most difficult to secure funding for, maintenance and operations, and construction were both perceived as being equally difficult, but planning and design stood out as being perceived least difficult to secure funding for (as displayed in **Figure 8**).

**Figure 8: How Difficult is it to Secure Funding in the Following Three Categories?**



*Source: Agency Online Survey*

In addition to questions that sought to gauge the difficulty of the stages of implementation, other survey questions sought to assess the extent of funding that was being sourced from federal, state, regional and/or local funds for bicycle and pedestrian construction and maintenance projects. **Table 5** details the funding nuances described by agencies.





**Table 5: What Percentage of Your Funding Comes from Federal, State, Regional, Local, or Other Sources?**

	Construction Funding	Maintenance Funding
Towns and Cities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most often, state funding provides over half of the funds for construction projects.</li> <li>Regional funding most often provides 20% to 50% of funding.</li> <li>A combination of local and federal funds often completes the funding picture.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Towns and cities rely heavily on local funding.</li> <li>Some receive support from state and regional funding sources.</li> </ul>
Counties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One type of funding source does not dominate the funding picture.</li> <li>Local funds often provide 20% to 50% of funding.</li> <li>A combination of federal, state, and regional funds completes the funding picture.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Counties use mixed sources of funding with a heavy emphasis on state and local funding sources.</li> </ul>

*Source: Regional Coordination Meeting #1*

When asked to name specific funding programs that have been successfully used for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure construction, respondents identified several specific sources as programs that have been awarded funding. The funding sources most frequently mentioned are discussed below.

#### **NVTA Regional Revenue**

The regional revenues (70%) support regionally significant projects that benefit the entire region. NVTA evaluates and subsequently funds projects based on applications submitted by localities and agencies in NVTA's Six Year Program. The projects funded through this program include bicycle and pedestrian projects as well as other modal and intersection projects that include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. To date, this program has funded 14 projects, with the primary mode of transportation being bicycle and/or pedestrian, totaling \$132 million. Most of the projects with primary mode as roadway or intersection/interchange also add bike and pedestrian facilities.<sup>3</sup>

#### **NVTA Local Distribution**

Local distribution (30%) funds are distributed to member localities within Northern Virginia to support transportation improvements. To date, this program has funded 78 projects that primarily serve bicyclists and/or pedestrians, totaling \$59 million. Many local distribution fund projects add bike and pedestrian facilities, but funds may also be used for maintenance, despite limited examples.<sup>4</sup>

#### **VDOT Funding Programs**

Stakeholders frequently mentioned the following four programs administered by the state: the Revenue Sharing Program, SMART SCALE, transportation alternatives, and the maintenance/repaving program. The Revenue Sharing Program matches locality funds for eligible projects and has allocated approximately \$6 million dollars in FY2027 and FY2028 for bikeways/trails and sidewalk projects led by localities.<sup>5</sup> The SMART SCALE program funds a variety of project types, with bicycle and pedestrian

<sup>3</sup> <https://novagateway.org/>

<sup>4</sup> Unlike other sources, NVTA does not impose a matching requirement for both the 70% and 30% funds, nor do its funds typically carry a sunset provision. NVTA funds are also eligible as matching contributions for state and federal programs, making them very flexible compared to other funding mechanisms.


<sup>5</sup> *Fiscal Year 2027 and Fiscal Year 2028 Revenue Sharing Allocations*



infrastructure oftentimes included as part of broader transportation projects.<sup>6</sup> Between FY2017 and FY2025, approximately \$185 million was allocated to such improvements. Similarly, the Transportation Alternatives Program (TA), established by the federal government and administered by the state, provides funding for a variety of project types, including Safe Routes to School and other bicycle and pedestrian projects. In FY2025, approximately \$30 million of funding was requested for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects in Northern Virginia through this program.<sup>7</sup> Lastly, the VDOT pavement maintenance funding sources, through the Urban Program and SGR, provide select localities that maintain their roads the ability to resurface some of those roads while simultaneously improving some pedestrian and bicycle features. VDOT NOVA District works annually with other localities to consider the implementation of bike lanes and other marking enhancements on VDOT-maintained roads during their annual repaving process.

Using a live polling tool, participants from the second regional coordination meeting rated how well they found the summary of the funding source discussion to cover their experience in their respective jurisdictions. On a scale of one to five, respondents were able to rate the accuracy of the funding source summary from “Not accurate at all” (1) to “Very accurate” (5), and results averaged to approximately 3.7/5. Of the 32 regional stakeholders that attended the second regional coordination meeting, 22 responded to this polling question. The results of this poll can be seen in **Figure 9**.

**Figure 9: Regional Stakeholder Validation of NVTA’s Summary of Existing Funding Landscape**



Source: Regional Coordination Meeting #2. \*Regional agencies also responded to the poll, capturing how well the summary aligns with their perception of local agencies funding mechanisms.

<sup>6</sup>Not all bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure funding amounts can be separately calculated due to their inclusion in broader transportation projects.

<sup>7</sup> <https://smartportal.virginiahb2.org/#/public/apps>



## Existing Funding Sources: Additional Considerations

This initiative confirmed while regional stakeholders may have access to existing revenue streams and grants, challenges prevent funding sources from being fully utilized for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure construction and maintenance. During the first regional stakeholder meeting, jurisdictions and advocates noted while funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure are available, they perceived several barriers to securing funding including project criteria, staff capacity, political landscape, inflation, and local priorities.

Since these challenges are likely to continue, jurisdictions are encouraged to maintain and enhance current practices, focusing on continued optimization of existing funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Jurisdictions can continue to dedicate local dollars to advancing the development of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, while also remaining creative in their funding mechanisms. Ultimately, some implementation strategies may be more applicable at the local and state level, such as incorporating bicycle and pedestrian additions and improvements into roadway projects where integrating bicycle/pedestrian facility construction and improvements can have cost efficiencies. For example, since 2004, VDOT has had a policy that assumes roadway projects will accommodate bicycle and pedestrians via various strategies, including building sidewalks, shared use paths, and crosswalks. For projects that cross jurisdictional boundaries, collaboration in funding among stakeholders can enhance competitiveness for funding, increase the potential for higher match amounts, and improve the ability to secure and coordinate large-scale resources.




# Future Funding Strategies

The future funding strategy review aimed to identify new funding strategies that could generate revenue but are not currently implemented in Northern Virginia or elsewhere to support dedicated bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. These future funding strategies can be leveraged in conjunction with existing funding sources to support the expansion of the Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Network. NVTA evaluated the strategies in this section using seven metrics, to qualitatively assess each strategy's suitability and impact on achieving the project's goal of funding bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

## Research Process and Methodology

Similar to the existing funding sources, NVTA identified funding strategies from various avenues, including an assessment of ongoing efforts, stakeholder recommendations, and industry knowledge. Then, NVTA qualitatively assessed each strategy across seven metrics that evaluated its ability to support funding the bicycle and pedestrian network buildout. The entire methodology process is shown in **Figure 10**.

**Figure 10: Methodology to Determine Future Funding Strategies**



The metrics served as a holistic set of benchmarks that could assess a strategy's potential to generate revenue, while also mitigating adverse effects. A description of each metric used in this qualitative research initiative is presented below.



### ***Revenue Magnitude***

Gauges the magnitude of a new funding strategy, with municipal budgets serving as a baseline metric. Emphasizes larger revenue magnitude potential.

**Categories:** | High revenue | Medium revenue | Low revenue



### ***Revenue Growth Potential***

Gauges the relative potential growth of a new funding strategy, in particular the potential growth of the tax base. Emphasizes strategies with potential to increase revenue through a growth in tax base.

**Categories:** | Likely to grow | Some growth expected | Unlikely to grow



### ***Stability***

Gauges the longevity and stability of the future funding strategy. Emphasizes strategies that have longer horizons and less volatility.

**Categories:** | Longer horizon and stable | Moderate horizon and fairly stable | Shorter horizon and unstable



### ***Pathway to Implementation***

Gauges the logistical challenges of implementation at a regional level. Emphasizes strategies that have been implemented or can be modified to be implemented at a regional level.

**Categories:** | Pathway exists regionally | Pathway exists statewide or locally | No current pathway in Virginia



### ***Tax/Fee Payer Benefits***

Gauges how directly tax/fee payers may benefit from paying to fund the construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Emphasizes direct benefit to payers.

**Categories:** | Payers may directly benefit | Payers indirectly benefit | Payers do not benefit



### ***Socioeconomic Burden***

Gauges how financial burden of the funding strategy is distributed. Emphasizes a proportionately distributed structure.

**Categories:** | Proportionately distributed | Unclear or moderate | Impacts a population disproportionately



### ***Impact on Business***

Gauges the impact a new tax or fee may incur on business in the region. Emphasizes business and employee attraction.

**Categories:** | Shifts workers and businesses in | Maintains workers and businesses | Shifts workers and businesses out










## Future Funding Strategies Results

Through research, referencing ongoing projects, and staff coordination and review, NVTA qualitatively assessed the following 45 strategies in each of the seven metrics, as shown in **Figure 11**. Some of these strategies may currently be applied to the jurisdictional level, so examples of local-level implementation may exist while examples of regional-level implementation do not.

**Figure 11: Future Funding Strategies List**

Funding Strategy Category	Strategy Category Definition	Funding Strategies
 <p><b>General Revenue Taxes</b></p>	Broad-based taxes that contribute to a jurisdiction's overall budget are often used to fund several public services without being tied to specific infrastructure or programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corporate Income Tax</li> <li>Income Tax Increase</li> <li>Corporate Franchise Tax</li> <li>Business, Professional and Occupational License (BPOL) Tax</li> <li>Services Tax</li> </ul>
 <p><b>Property-Based Taxes and Fees</b></p>	Levied based on the ownership, transfer, or development of land and property, often reflecting the value or use of real estate assets within a community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personal Property Tax</li> <li>Real Estate Tax</li> <li>Tax Increment Financing (TIF)</li> <li>Land Value Tax</li> <li>Development Agreements</li> <li>Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreements</li> <li>Grantor's Tax</li> <li>Utility Right-of-Way (ROW) Agreements</li> </ul>
 <p><b>Sales and Consumption Taxes</b></p>	Collected from the purchase or use of goods and services, these taxes are influenced by consumer behavior and economic activity across sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sales Tax Increase</li> <li>Restaurant, Food, or Beverage Tax</li> <li>Motor Vehicle Sales Tax</li> <li>Transient Occupancy Tax (Lodging or Hotel)</li> <li>Utility/Communications Sales Tax</li> <li>Beverage/Alcohol Tax</li> <li>Streaming Services Sales Tax</li> <li>Auto Repair Labor Tax</li> <li>Parking Sales Tax</li> <li>Transportation Networking Company (Uber, Lyft) Fee/Sales Tax</li> <li>E-Commerce Delivery Fee</li> <li>Recreational Tax</li> </ul>
 <p><b>Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees</b></p>	Imposed in connection with travel, vehicle ownership, or infrastructure use, these charges help fund mobility systems and manage demand on transportation networks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motor Vehicle Rental Tax</li> <li>Vehicle Tolling</li> <li>Mileage-Based Usage Fee/Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee</li> <li>Congestion Pricing</li> <li>Vehicle Registration Fee</li> <li>Parking Fees</li> <li>Driver's License Fees</li> <li>Transportation Utility Fee</li> <li>Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility User Fees</li> </ul>




 <p><b>Alternative Taxes and Fees</b></p>	<p>Innovative or voluntary funding mechanisms that supplement traditional revenue sources, often involving partnerships, donations, or market-based strategies.</p>	Development/Transportation Impact Fee
		Speed Camera Fines
		Sponsorships/Advertisements
		Naming Rights
		Carbon/Emissions Tax
		Crowdfunding Campaigns
		Adopt-a-Trail Programs
		Merchandise Sales Fundraising
		Fundraising Events
		Public-Private Partnerships
		Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)

## Future Strategies: Regional Stakeholder Key Takeaways

During the second regional coordination meeting, NVTA asked participants to rank the relative importance of each metric to gather insights to help assess funding strategies, the results of which are shown in **Figure 12**. Revenue magnitude and pathway to implementation were most frequently ranked in the top three. Stability and socioeconomic burden were also identified as important metrics to consider.

**Figure 10: Regional Stakeholder Ranking of Funding Strategy Evaluation Metrics**

*Rank the following metrics in order of importance based on your experiences.*




*Source: Regional Coordination Meeting #2*

The final discussion topic of Regional Coordination Meeting #2 focused on the results of the funding strategy research. Participants were shown ranked funding strategies grouped by the number of high ratings they received. NVTA facilitated a question-and-answer discussion to understand stakeholders' thoughts on the relative rankings of strategies, as well as identify any nuances or potential challenges that may arise when advancing any of the strategies. Using a scale of one to five—with one being "Not at all" and five being "Very Well,"—respondents were asked to rate how well the funding source summary aligned with their thoughts and experiences. Results averaged approximately 3.3/5, as shown in **Figure 13**.



Figure 13: Regional Stakeholder Validation of Emerging Strategies




Source: Regional Coordination Meeting #2

## Overall Future Funding Strategy Results

Through the qualitative assessment, each funding strategy was assigned a high, medium, or low rating for each of the metrics outlined in **Appendix D – Funding Strategy Detail Sheets**. High-medium-low assessments were determined based on how well each strategy met the criteria and was suitable for regional bicycle and pedestrian funding, relative to other strategies in their category. For example, a strategy may have received a high assessment in the stability category because it provides a relatively long-term and predictable funding base.

**Figure 14** illustrates the results of the strategy assessment, and orders strategies by the number of high ratings they received in each metric category. This initiative focused on strategies based on the count of high assessments, rather than the average assessment to filter for the strategies that have the highest quality and most suitability for bicycle and pedestrian funding, rather than those that received medium assessments with fewer applicable attributes. The greatest number of high assessments received by strategies was four out of seven.

**Figure 11: Evaluation Results of All Strategies**




## Funding Strategy Results by Tax/Fee Category

To assess the relative quality of strategies within similar categories, NVTA grouped strategies by their strategy type and ordered them by the number of high ratings each respective metric received. NVTA noted if strategies received a high rating in the revenue magnitude or pathway to implementation categories, since these metrics were perceived by regional stakeholders as two of the most significant metrics for this initiative.<sup>8</sup>

### GENERAL REVENUE TAXES

As shown in **Figure 15**, NVTA assigned taxes in the general revenue moderate assessments, with no standout strategies and little variance between the highest and lowest assessed strategies. Across the board, general revenue taxes were assessed highly in the revenue potential (magnitude) and stability metrics, but were assessed lowest in the pathway to implementation and impact on businesses metrics.

**Figure 15: General Revenue Taxes Metric Alignment**



### PROPERTY TAXES AND FEES


**Figure 16** illustrates the results of the property taxes and fees category, which saw greater variance between strategy assessments. The metric with the greatest variance in this category was the revenue potential (growth) metric, due to the inclusion of both state-based strategies and locality-based strategies, which both have different levels of potential revenue capture. Property taxes and fees saw the least variance in the tax/fee payer benefit category, due to a clearer nexus of benefit between tax/fee payers and the benefit in property values they would realize from a bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure buildout.

<sup>8</sup> Revenue magnitude assesses the level of revenue that can be generated by a strategy, and pathway to implementation gauges if a strategy exists or could exist at not just a state or local level, but regionally, despite examples of local implementation.






Figure 12: Property Taxes and Fees Taxes Metric Alignment



## SALES AND CONSUMPTION TAXES

Sales and consumption taxes, as shown in **Figure 17**, exhibited some commonalities in scoring across the seven metrics, with most of the variance observed in the pathway to implementation metric. This is likely due to the breadth of different strategies assessed in this category, which captures not only taxes currently implemented in the state, but also taxes that have not yet been implemented in Virginia and would require state approval. Most strategies in this category were assessed as moderate to high in terms of revenue potential (magnitude), revenue potential (growth), and stability, which is indicative of the wide revenue bases of the taxes in this category and their strong ties to consumer spending and the broader economy.


Figure 13: Sales and Consumption Taxes Metric Alignment



## TRANSPORTATION-RELATED TAXES AND FEES

In transportation-related taxes and fees, there was a similar distinction between strategies assessed at the highest and lowest ends of the spectrum, as shown in **Figure 18**. In this category, taxes and fees saw shared low assessments in the pathway to implementation metric, due to the inclusion of many taxes and fees not currently established within the state, as well as existing ones whose revenues are already allocated to state or local channels. Similarly to property taxes and fees, strategies in this category saw high assessments in the tax/fee payer benefit metric, due to the assumption that all users of the transportation network, regardless of mode, would benefit in some way from the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.


Figure 14: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees Taxes Metric Alignment



## ALTERNATIVE TAXES AND FEES

Alternative taxes and fees saw the most variance between strategies and their assessments, as illustrated in **Figure 19**. In this category, most strategies saw differences in assessments across all metrics, likely due to the variety of strategies included in this category.

Figure 19: Alternative Taxes and Fees Taxes Metric Alignment



## Future Funding Strategies: Additional Considerations

Examining future funding strategies revealed several factors must be considered before incorporating strategies into a potential bicycle and pedestrian network funding package.

Social considerations revolve around the effects of taxes, particularly regarding equity and stability, as many options are either regressive or sensitive to market fluctuations. Industry-specific taxes (such as those in restaurants, retail, and tourism) should consider their predicted opposition but also how opposition may be reduced by tying funding to tangible, multimodal improvements.

Other key considerations revolve around whether revenue would be collected statewide or regionally. A statewide collection would benefit from a larger revenue base, as well as being more administratively efficient. Still, it would face uncertainty about whether funds would flow back to bicycle and pedestrian projects in Northern Virginia. Regional collection, conversely, would ensure dedicated local investment but would require a region-specific taxing authority, increasing administrative difficulty. Thus, regional collection would require stronger political authorization, which is necessary due to Dillon's Rule<sup>9</sup>, and risks overlapping with existing taxes and fees.

Finally, strategies recommended for further study would need to be incorporated into a regional economic analysis to fully determine the potential funding contribution to a bicycle and pedestrian network dedicated fund.

<sup>9</sup> The Dillon Rule in Virginia is a legal doctrine stating that local governments only possess powers explicitly granted to them by the state legislature, with any doubt about a power's existence meaning the power is not held. Virginia follows this "strict construction" of local power, limiting the ability of cities and counties to pass local ordinances without prior state approval. This contrasts with "home rule" states, where local governments have broader, inherent powers.

## Funding Strategies Recommended for Further Study

Following the funding strategy assessment, several strategies consistently received high assessments across multiple metrics. When these results were combined with stakeholder input and additional regional insights, NVTA identified a refined list of 14 high-quality strategies. These strategies—particularly when considered alongside the expansion of existing funding sources—represent the most viable options for implementation and hold strong potential to meaningfully advance the construction and long-term maintenance of the Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network.<sup>10</sup>

Beverage/Alcohol Sales Tax	Parking Sales Taxes and Fees
Business, Professional, and Occupational License (BPOL) Tax	Personal Property Tax
E-Commerce Delivery Fee	Real Estate Tax
Income Tax	Sales Tax
Land Value Tax	Services Tax
	Streaming Services Sales Tax
	Transient Occupancy Tax
	Transportation Utility Fee

### BEVERAGE/ALCOHOL SALES TAX

The beverage and alcohol tax is applied to the sale of specific beverages, including alcoholic beverages and non-alcoholic drinks, and is typically collected in addition to any existing sales tax. Beverage and Alcohol Taxes are typically collected by business with those increases passed onto consumers.

In Virginia, a limited form of this tax is implemented statewide with additional region-specific rates. There is a 40-cent excise tax levied on wine, a 20% tax is applied to distilled spirits that can only be sold through ABC stores, and there is an excise tax of \$0.2565 per gallon applied to beer. Statewide, the wine and spirits tax contributed approximately \$81 million through Virginia ABC in FY2023, making it a significant revenue source.<sup>11</sup>

Within the Northern Virginia region, localities have the authority to levy taxes on food and beverages sold at restaurants up to 6% and recently, Fairfax County has enacted a 4% tax on food and beverages as a meals tax to begin in 2026.<sup>12</sup> There is a baseline 2.5% beverage tax in Northern Virginia as part of the Statewide Retail Sales and Use Tax and a 6% wine and spirits sales tax at the point of sale, regardless if it is at an ABC store or other vendor.<sup>13</sup> This overlapping jurisdictional rates and applicability of beverage and alcohol taxes to different retail settings does introduce some complexity into the implementation of what is otherwise a reliable source of revenue used for other existing funding purposes. Policy makers would need to discern what specific beverage and alcohol tax rates could be incrementally increased or how to direct revenue to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure without jeopardizing existing funding streams.

<sup>10</sup> Strategies are presented alphabetically and do not imply relative importance.

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.vaspiritsassn.org/news/virginia-abcs-fiscal-year-2023-revenue-increases>

<sup>12</sup> <https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacodefull/title58.1/chapter38/article7.1/>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.abc.virginia.gov/products/products-faqs/pricing-information>



## Strategy Applicability

Because beverage and alcohol taxes are already in use regionally, they represent a familiar and administratively feasible mechanism that could be extended or incrementally increased to generate revenue for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Even relatively modest rate increases could yield notable revenues given the consistent demand for beverage sales, particularly in commercial and entertainment districts.

There is a potential link between alcohol-related public health and safety and investments in safe walking and biking infrastructure. Funds from this tax could be framed as supporting healthier and safer communities, strengthening the policy rationale for dedicating a portion to bicycle and pedestrian projects.

## Implementation Considerations

Expanding or increasing beverage and alcohol taxes would require state-level authorization for regional dedication and could face significant political and industry opposition. The restaurant and hospitality industries often resist increases, arguing that higher taxes may discourage dining and nightlife spending.

Further, because these taxes are consumption-based, they can be regressive, disproportionately affecting lower-income households. Spending on beverages is also often discretionary, which leaves the revenue prone to economic shocks such as inflation or slowdown in consumer spending. Careful structuring, such as packaging dedicating revenues to community-serving infrastructure like sidewalks, trails, and crossings, may help build acceptance by directly linking the tax to visible public benefits.

## BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL, AND OCCUPATIONAL LICENSE (BPOL) TAX

A BPOL tax is a tax levied on businesses that assesses a business's yearly gross receipts, the total revenue generated. Virginia code § 58.1-3703 states that the "governing body of any county, city or town may charge a fee for issuing a license" depending on the population of the locality.<sup>14</sup> The maximum fee established in the code is \$100, for localities with a population greater than 50,000. The code also includes limitations on specific business types and/or activities.

All four counties in Northern Virginia have some form of a BPOL tax, and all NVTA towns and cities also implement their own BPOL taxes.<sup>15 16 17 18</sup> Each jurisdiction has a differing structure, but most include tiered rates and/or varying rates based on business type.

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title58.1/chapter37/section58.1-3703/#:~:text=License%20Taxes-,%C2%A7%2058.1%2D3703.,and%20fees;%20limitation%20of%20authority.>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.loudoun.gov/1552/Business-License-Tax#:~:text=All%20business%20owners%2C%20including%20those,for%20business%20personal%20property%20taxes.>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/taxes/business/understanding-bpol-tax#:~:text=When%20and%20How%20to%20Apply,for%20late%20filing%20will%20apply.>

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.arlingtonva.us/Government/Programs/Taxes/Business#:~:text=Licenses%20and%20assesses%20a%20business,one%20reporting%20year%20to%20another.>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.pwcva.gov/departments/tax-administration/business-license/>





## Strategy Applicability

Though BPOL taxpayers (businesses) are less directly connected to bicycle and pedestrian facilities than property owners or residents, there are indirect linkages. Investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure can improve the quality of life, attract residents and employees, and support local businesses by drawing visitors to commercial areas. In this way, dedicating a portion of BPOL revenues to multimodal infrastructure can be counted as a reinvestment in the regional economy that benefits the business community.

## Implementation Considerations

Establishing a regional BPOL tax would require significant coordination across jurisdictions. Each locality currently applies its own structure, so coordinating rates and determining who would lead administration and collection could be complex. In addition, depending on the value and design of a proposed regional BPOL, changes to the Virginia Code may be required to enable uniform application.

The implementation of a BPOL tax also depends heavily on rate design. Tiered or industry-specific rates can create uneven impacts across sectors, which may raise concerns among certain business groups. Any proposal to dedicate BPOL revenues to bicycle and pedestrian funding would need to consider these distributional effects and balance them against the broader community benefits of a more connected, pedestrian-friendly region versus a business-friendly environment.

## E-COMMERCE DELIVERY FEE

The e-commerce delivery fee is applied to retail deliveries to homes and businesses within the region. It is anticipated that e-commerce deliveries will continue to expand, an indicator of a growing tax base. Although this tax is not implemented in Virginia, states such as Colorado and Minnesota have implemented this fee and have generated approximately \$60–80 million annually.<sup>19</sup>

## Strategy Applicability

As e-commerce grows, a delivery fee could provide a dedicated funding stream for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure as e-commerce continues to outperform other retail settings.<sup>20 21</sup>

The rationale for taking revenue from e-commerce stems from the fact that increased deliveries contribute to roadway wear, congestion, and safety concerns, while bike and pedestrian investments can help offset some of these impacts by reducing reliance on single-occupancy vehicle trips and creating safer streets for all users. However, if structured improperly, an e-commerce fee could encourage more Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by individuals, increasing trips to physical retail locations and placing additional strain on the network and parking requirements.

## Implementation Considerations

Implementing an e-commerce delivery fee in Northern Virginia would require state authorization, since no such mechanism currently exists in Virginia. Collection would most likely occur through delivery service

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://csgmidwest.org/2025/02/27/question-have-states-implemented-or-considered-adoption-of-a-retail-delivery-fee/>

<sup>20</sup> At an increment of 10¢ per package: SJ 28 estimated \$5.1 million to \$13.5 million in regional revenue generated.

<sup>21</sup> Note: The jurisdictions included in the SJ 28 and DMV Moves analyses differ from the jurisdictions under NVTA's purview



providers or third-party platforms (such as Amazon, UPS, or FedEx), with the fee passed on directly to consumers, often as a line item at checkout. Colorado and Minnesota have also instituted exceptions that suspend the tax for small businesses of a certain size, nonprofits, as well as exemptions for essential goods. Further analysis needs to be conducted to determine the structure of the fee and how it would apply to different delivery scenarios to properly incentivize efficient use of the transportation system balanced with revenue.

## INCOME TAX

An income tax is a tax on an individual's earnings, typically collected by state and federal governments. In Virginia, the 2025 tax schedule is graduated between 2% to 5.75% of taxable income.<sup>22</sup> In Virginia, it is one of the largest single sources of state revenue, having contributed nearly \$20 billion to the state's general fund.<sup>23</sup>

### Strategy Applicability

The scale and applicability of the income tax base to all employees represent a significant potential revenue source that could provide a stable and equitable funding stream for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure if a portion were dedicated to this purpose.<sup>24</sup> A progressive tax structure also ties contributions to ability to pay, which could help mitigate equity concerns often associated with other potentially regressive funding mechanisms, such as sales or fuel taxes. Packaging transportation and bicycle/pedestrian funding as part of an income tax bracket change or increase could also generate more revenue from Northern Virginia, where the income level is generally higher than the rest of the state.

### Implementation Considerations

Despite its potential, an income tax faces some of the most significant challenges to implementation among the funding strategies considered:

- **Authorization:** Virginia localities currently lack the authority to levy local or regional income taxes, meaning new state-level legislation would be required.
- **Regional administration:** Establishing a regional collection and allocation framework would be highly complex and is unlikely to be feasible. More realistically, an income tax adjustment would increase revenues to the state's general fund, expanding the state's overall transportation funding capacity rather than creating a dedicated stream for bicycle and pedestrian investments in Northern Virginia. The pathway for how these funds would flow back into transportation, and specifically into bicycle and pedestrian projects, remains uncertain.
- **Distribution:** Alternatively, the state's current income tax processes which identifies the localities of taxpayers could be used to designate the application and collection of a new tax through existing processes and the amounts collected remitted to the region.

---

<sup>22</sup> <https://states.aarp.org/virginia/state-tax-guide>

<sup>23</sup> <https://dpb.virginia.gov/budget/buddoc24/parta/RevenueForecast.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> At a 0.1 percent increase: SJ 28 estimated \$31.8 million to \$153.4 million in regional revenue generated.



- **Political feasibility:** Because of its visibility and sensitivity, income tax changes are among the most politically difficult revenue measures to advance, even when tied to specific infrastructure needs.

Given these challenges—particularly the uncertainty around directing revenue back to bicycle and pedestrian projects—an income tax is unlikely to be a feasible near-term strategy for Northern Virginia to implement unilaterally. However, it remains one of the highest-revenue potential mechanisms in the long term, and any future discussion around changing income brackets or rates could include revenue allocation for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

## LAND VALUE TAX

A **Land Value Tax (LVT)** is levied on the value of land at a greater rate than the improvements (buildings) upon it. Unlike conventional real estate taxes, which typically tax improvements at an equal or higher rate than the land itself, an LVT captures revenue from developed, underdeveloped, and undeveloped parcels alike. This structure creates a financial incentive for more efficient land use, which can then be used to build complementary bicycle and pedestrian-friendly infrastructure.

### Strategy Applicability

In Northern Virginia, where urban, suburban, and rural areas coexist, the impacts of an LVT would vary significantly across landowners and jurisdictions. LVTs are typically best suited to established cities or growing communities where infill and mixed-use development are needed, but high taxes on improvements may otherwise discourage new construction. This aligns with the profile of many Northern Virginia localities and would expand the potential tax base beyond just those areas with higher property values.

From a multimodal planning perspective, the LVT aligns well with bicycle and pedestrian investment objectives because it directly links land use efficiency, value capture, and transportation infrastructure outcomes. As higher-density developments are incentivized and housing supply expands, an LVT ensures that a dedicated base of funds is available to provide safe, multimodal infrastructure for future users.

### Implementation Considerations

Despite its potential, the implementation of an LVT in Virginia faces significant legal and political barriers. Under Dillon's Rule, local jurisdictions must receive explicit state approval to levy a higher tax on land than on improvements. To date, only four jurisdictions in the state have sought this authority, and none have advanced. This lack of precedent suggests limited political support and underscores the challenges of establishing a regional LVT to fund bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

Another major consideration is the geographic and jurisdictional scope of application. It is unlikely that an LVT could replace property taxes region-wide, as this would conflict with existing local property tax revenues. A more feasible approach would involve targeted implementation within designated improvement districts, along future trail alignments, or within available rights-of-way, where the tax could function as a value-capture mechanism tied directly to bicycle and pedestrian investments. Further study would need to be conducted to identify areas around future transportation improvements that would be suitable for a land value tax.



In practice, phased or pilot applications would likely be initiated by individual jurisdictions rather than rolled out region wide. This raises an important question of revenue coordination: how proceeds from locally administered LVTs could be pooled into or shared with a regional taxing authority to ensure they support bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, rather than simply flowing back into local general funds.

Finally, a unique limitation of the LVT is its revenue growth profile. Unlike property taxes, which expand as new construction is added to the tax rolls, an LVT base grows only with changes in land value, which may increase more slowly with zoning and reassessments. These limitations should be studied closely to assess long-term revenue stability and ensure that proceeds can be distributed equitably and aligned with regional transportation priorities.

## PARKING SALES TAXES AND FEES\*

Parking sales taxes and fees are applied to the use of parking facilities, such as garages and lots. The District of Columbia generated \$80 million in FY 2023 from its 18% parking sales tax, and Arlington is estimated to generate over \$11 million in metered parking revenue in FY 2026.<sup>25</sup><sup>26</sup><sup>27</sup> Traditionally, parking fees are a flat charge applied to both publicly and privately owned parking properties, whereas a parking tax is applicable to the gross receipts of sale regardless of who owns and operates the lot.

### Strategy Applicability

Parking taxes and fees directly link revenue generation to automobile use, creating a logical funding mechanism for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Dedicating a portion of parking revenues to expand sidewalks, trails, and other multimodal facilities could help reduce congestion, promote mode shift, and create a more balanced transportation system. Additionally, higher parking rates can serve as a demand management tool, encouraging alternatives to driving and increasing the availability of parking for those who continue to drive.

### Implementation Considerations

Implementing parking-related revenues would require determining whether to pursue parking fees or parking sales taxes, as each has different implications.

Parking fees (such as meter charges or garage rates) are typically set and collected directly by jurisdictions or their partners, making them easier to dedicate to specific purposes like bicycle and pedestrian improvements. However, they are limited to facilities under public control unless agreements are made with private operators. Parking revenues from government garages and other parking facilities may also already be used for debt service or other revenue purposes and thus clash with regional parking fees.

Parking sales taxes, by contrast, are levied as a percentage of the parking transaction price and are usually collected by the state or local tax authority. While taxes can capture revenue from both public and private parking providers, they often are more complex to administer regionally and may require state authorization. Identification of appropriate rates, who has the authority to set the regional rates, and the

<sup>25</sup> [https://ora-cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ora-cfo/publication/attachments/DC%20Tax%20Facts%20Visual%20Guide%202024\\_final2.pdf](https://ora-cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ora-cfo/publication/attachments/DC%20Tax%20Facts%20Visual%20Guide%202024_final2.pdf)

<sup>26</sup> [https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/v/4/budget/documents/fy-2026/fy-2026-adopted/fy-2026-adopted-all-in-one\\_v2-web.pdf](https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/v/4/budget/documents/fy-2026/fy-2026-adopted/fy-2026-adopted-all-in-one_v2-web.pdf)

<sup>27</sup> At a one-percent parking sales tax increase: SJ 28 estimated \$8.1 million to \$23.4 million in regional revenue generated.

appropriate collection method would need to be studied further. To note, parking sales taxes would exclude free public commuter lots given that there are no sales associated with those lots.

Regardless of the approach, implementation would require coordination across jurisdictions, private parking operators, and third-party applications, in addition to developing a comprehensive parking inventory. Private providers and employers may oppose additional charges, citing potential impacts on business costs and competitiveness, and additional coordination would need to be performed on parking facilities that are currently owned or generating revenue for public entities or debt-service such as WMATA garages. Additionally, the variation in parking supply and demand across the region means that revenue potential and political feasibility would differ, with dense, transit and bicycle-pedestrian rich areas like Arlington or Alexandria more suitable for robust implementation than outer suburb jurisdictions.

### **\*Parking Facilities Tax**

A parking tax can also take the form of a facilities tax which is not based on the transaction but based on the existence of parking spaces, tied to certain land uses. The parking facilities tax would occur whether the parking space is being used or not. However, because the region does not have an accurate assessment of the total number of parking spaces under a facility tax, there are limitations on how to quantify the potential true impact of taxing parking spaces of a facility rather than the parking sales transaction or fee. There would most likely be effects and unintended consequences that cannot be fully captured without estimating the revenue and conducting further analysis of its implementation. A parking facility tax does not have precedent or peer case studies like parking sales and fees, which make high-level comparisons difficult. Obtaining an accurate assessment of parking spaces for the purposes of a parking facilities tax would require further study.

## **PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX**

Personal property tax is levied on tangible property owned by individuals and businesses, including vehicles, trailers, boats, and other movable assets. It is a significant source of revenue for local governments in Northern Virginia. It is one of the largest single tax revenue categories, especially for counties with large commercial or tech sectors, such as Loudoun County, who levy personal property tax on computer equipment within data centers.<sup>28</sup> By fiscal year 2026, Loudoun projects that it will generate roughly \$1.37 billion solely from the personal property tax it levies on computer equipment. Similar taxes on personal and tangible property could be dedicated to region-wide transportation and bicycle funding initiatives.

### **Strategy Applicability**

The largest component of personal property tax revenue in Northern Virginia is the tax on personal automobiles. The link between the taxes drivers pay and the benefits they receive from bicycle and pedestrian investments is less direct, but still meaningful: multimodal improvements can expand travel options, reduce roadway congestion, and enhance safety for all users. Framing the allocation of a portion of personal property tax revenues as a reinvestment in a more balanced and efficient transportation network underscores how these funds can ultimately benefit both vehicle owners and non-drivers alike.

---

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/216022/General-Fund-Revenue>





Simultaneously, the tax can be regressive, particularly for lower-income individuals who depend on vehicles and may have fewer alternatives. However, investments in multimodal infrastructure can help counter this by providing more affordable mobility choices, reducing reliance on costly vehicle ownership, albeit over multiple years for real travel behavior change to occur.

### Implementation Considerations

Despite its strong revenue potential, the personal property tax faces political and practical challenges. Public support across Virginia is generally low, with taxpayers often expressing frustration over vehicle-related assessments. Revenues are also vulnerable to short-term market fluctuations, as seen during the COVID-19 chip shortage, when rising vehicle valuations sharply increased tax bills, while the use of personal vehicles within the transportation network did not increase significantly. For bicycle and pedestrian funding, a dedicated allocation from personal property taxes would require state and local coordination to ensure revenues are earmarked, while also addressing equity and volatility concerns.

## REAL ESTATE TAX

A real estate tax is a conventional property tax that applies an equal or greater tax rate to property, land, and improvements, so tax burdens are determined mainly by the development on the land. Real estate taxes are already used by localities to fund general infrastructure improvements, education, and other public services and represent a significant share of revenue for local governments.

### Strategy Applicability

Real estate taxes provide a broad, stable, and predictable tax base that could be leveraged to fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Because of its wide tax base, even modest increases in the rate can generate significant revenue.<sup>29</sup> Additionally, revenue generated from real estate taxes has proven to be very bondable, allowing jurisdictions to build infrastructure to match future needs.

Since bicycle-pedestrian investments contribute to neighborhood desirability and enhance property values, dedicating a portion of real estate tax revenues creates a clear value link between the tax source and the infrastructure it supports. This connection can strengthen the policy rationale for using real estate taxes as a funding tool for multimodal projects.

### Implementation Considerations

While the tax is already uniformly administered within individual jurisdictions, using it as a regional funding source would require substantial coordination between jurisdictions. Differences in local tax rates could influence business location decisions, though broad and modest increases may help mitigate competitive disparities.

Another challenge is the reliance on rising property assessments. Even in cases where tax rates are reduced, higher assessments increase the effective burden on taxpayers. This dynamic has already created points of tension within the region and may complicate efforts to establish a cohesive, region-wide funding approach for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

---

<sup>29</sup> At an increment of 5¢ per \$100 in assessed value: DMV Moves estimated \$413 million in regional revenue generated.



Alternatively, real estate tax increases can also include specific rates for land use categories to capture special uses, such as data and logistic centers under commercial and industrial zoning. Real estate taxes can also be structured in such a way to encourage development that is complementary to multimodal transportation systems, including special rates for efficient use of mixed-use land and parking allocations.

## RESTAURANT, FOOD, OR BEVERAGE TAX

A restaurant, food, or beverage tax is applied to the sale of prepared foods and beverages by restaurants. The tax is typically collected at the point of sale and passed on to consumers, who are often residents and visitors. Because those paying the tax are also the beneficiaries of improved public infrastructure, the tool creates a direct link between revenue generation and community reinvestment.

### Strategy Applicability

Restaurant and food taxes are already administered by several Northern Virginia jurisdictions at varying rates, making this a familiar and established funding mechanism. Revenues could be dedicated to bicycle and pedestrian projects, which in turn would improve accessibility to dining districts, enhance neighborhood vibrancy, and support local businesses by encouraging more walkable and bikeable communities.

### Implementation Considerations

Despite its potential, expanding or increasing food and beverage taxes would face barriers to implementation. Concerns typically center around the tax's impact on restaurant competitiveness and consumer behavior, particularly if rates differ across neighboring jurisdictions. Restaurants and hospitality industry groups often oppose increases, citing risks of reduced sales or lost customers to lower-tax areas and vulnerability to consumer spending habits. To be effective, a regional approach would require interjurisdictional coordination to ensure consistency, alongside clear communication that dedicating revenues to visible bicycle pedestrian improvements will provide tangible benefits to both residents and businesses.

## SALES TAX

Sales taxes, collected at the point of purchase, are a consumption-based tax applied to the sale of goods. This tax often responds to wider consumer spending patterns. Currently, the general sales tax rate combines a 4.3% statewide sales tax with a 1% local sales tax.<sup>30</sup> Additionally, the state also has a 0.7% transportation sales tax in three regions, including Northern Virginia, bringing the total sales tax rate to 6%.

### Strategy Applicability

Sales taxes already serve as a significant funding source for transportation investments in Northern Virginia through the regional transportation sales tax. This makes them a familiar and administratively feasible mechanism to extend toward bicycle and pedestrian funding. Even small increases in the sales tax

---

<sup>30</sup> [https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/taxes/consumer-taxes#:~:text=\\$1%2C000%20per%20bill-,Sales%20and%20Use%20tax,:%20Fairfax%20County%20%2D%201%25](https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/taxes/consumer-taxes#:~:text=$1%2C000%20per%20bill-,Sales%20and%20Use%20tax,:%20Fairfax%20County%20%2D%201%25).



rate can generate substantial revenue, furthering the investments in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.<sup>31</sup>

Sales taxes also have a natural connection to economic accessibility and retail vitality. Improved bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure enhances access to retail destinations and other goods-based services, supporting the overall health of the regional economy. Over time, reinvesting sales tax revenues into walkable, bikeable communities can increase local business activity and consumer traffic, creating a positive feedback loop between tax collection and community investment, even if these benefits materialize over time. This must be balanced with higher sales tax rates influence on consumer behavior and business location decisions.

### Implementation Considerations

Socioeconomic effects must be considered when implementing a region-wide sales tax change. While sales tax applies to all consumers, it is often considered regressive, as it disproportionately affects lower-income individuals who spend a larger share of their income on taxable goods. Other revenue studies, such as SJ 28 and DMV Moves, have moved to exclude grocery and food sales from their revenue estimates to avoid an outsized burden on low-income households.

Decision makers must also plan to conduct a detailed financial analysis to determine the correct sizing of any potential sales tax increase and how it would fulfill the ongoing bicycle-pedestrian capital and maintenance needs. They must also address whether the mechanism for implementation is an incremental increase to the 0.7% regional transportation sales tax, which would increase the overall funding resources that NVTA can use to fund programs like bicycle and pedestrian projects or if a sales tax increase would flow through a separate source.

Depending on the final funding mechanism and the funding structure, determining whether bonding against new sales tax revenue would be appropriate for larger bicycle and pedestrian funding projects, or a revenue-sharing and systematic approach to financing is more desirable.

## SERVICES TAX

A services tax is applied to service-based transactions and is typically structured as an extension of a sales tax. Examples of services eligible under a service tax can vary from activities related to tangible property, such as cleaning, home repair, landscaping, car washing, to personal services such as laundry, catering, personal training to tanning. In some cases, other states have enforced service tax on digital and information services such as software, data processing, marketing, and website design. Services taxes have emerged in response to the growing share of the service economy, which continues to outpace goods-based consumption and is especially prevalent in Northern Virginia. Capturing tax revenue from services, therefore, offers access to a rapidly expanding revenue base.

### Strategy Applicability

Because services represent an increasing share of household spending, a services tax could provide a substantial and growing source of funding for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Even a modest rate

---

<sup>31</sup> At a one-percentage point increase: DMV Moves estimated \$341 million to \$392 million in regional revenue generated.



could generate significant revenues if applied across common service sectors.<sup>32</sup> In addition, dedicating a portion of service tax revenues to multimodal projects could help link economic activity to improvements in quality of life and accessibility, reinforcing the attractiveness of local service economies. Similar to providing multimodal access to retail locations where residents of Northern Virginia access goods, ensuring people have bicycle and pedestrian access to service locations could help justify service taxes.

### Implementation Considerations

Currently, the Virginia Code exempts most services from taxation, with only limited exceptions. Implementing a regional services tax would therefore require modification of state legislation to authorize both collection and use. In addition, because there is no statewide framework in place, any services tax would require the development of new collection and administration mechanisms—a complex undertaking, especially if pursued at a regional level.

Another key consideration is equity and business impacts. Services taxes are often viewed as regressive, as they can disproportionately affect lower-income households. At the same time, service-sector businesses may raise concerns about competitive disadvantages if tax rates differ across jurisdictions or perceived unfairness relative to businesses that focus on retail. Regional coordination and study for the potential costs and benefits between service tax and pedestrian investment would be essential for public and stakeholder acceptance.

## STREAMING SERVICES SALES TAX

Streaming services sales taxes are an extension of traditional sales taxes and are applied to services such as video, music, and gaming platforms. While Virginia does not currently impose a streaming services tax, other states and localities have explored or implemented them, noting significant revenue potential.

### Strategy Applicability

As households increasingly shift toward digital consumption, streaming services represent a growing revenue base that could be tapped to fund bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. A dedicated tax on streaming platforms would tie funding to a modern, expanding segment of the economy and could provide a predictable source of revenue. Even a modest surcharge could generate substantial funding given the widespread use of subscription-based services.

However, unlike goods and services-related taxes, streaming services rely on digital infrastructure, which do not place as direct a strain on transportation networks. Thus, the linkage between investment in bike and pedestrian infrastructure as an inherent need from taxes digital services is uncertain. Framing revenues from streaming services tax as an investment in local quality of life—for example, supporting the sidewalks, trails, and public spaces that complement lifestyle and leisure activities—could also help build public acceptance.

### Implementation Considerations

The tax is typically assessed as a percentage of the subscription or transaction cost and collected by the service provider on behalf of the jurisdiction. If a statewide implementation of a streaming services tax

---

<sup>32</sup> At a six-percentage point increase: DMV Moves estimated \$209 million in regional revenue generated.



were implemented, a streaming services tax could be collected by the Virginia Department of Taxation. Similar to other statewide taxes, a formalized pathway for the funds to flow into bicycle-pedestrian funding in Northern Virginia would be unclear unless formally stated.

A regional-level collection for Northern Virginia would require new state legislation to authorize a regional digital services tax. Administration could fall to an existing or a newly designated regional body. Platforms would collect the tax from subscribers residing in Northern Virginia, and direct benefits and control could be retained by a regional body and its member jurisdictions, with the drawback being administrative complexity to collect and monitor the taxes.

## TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX

A transient occupancy tax (TOT) is applied to temporary lodging, such as hotel stays and short-term rentals (e.g., Airbnb or VRBO). This tax allows localities to generate revenue from visitors rather than residents, which is particularly relevant in Northern Virginia and the greater DMV region where tourism, business travel, and short-term lodging demand are expected to remain constant.

### Strategy Applicability

The TOT offers a direct way to fund bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure by leveraging visitor spending. Tourists, business travelers, and short-term renters frequently rely on sidewalks, trails, and safe street crossings to access hotels, restaurants, shopping districts, and cultural destinations. Investing tax revenues into bicycle and pedestrian facilities not only enhances the visitor experience but also supports the regional tourism economy by making activity centers more accessible and attractive. In this way, dedicating transient occupancy tax revenues to bicycle pedestrian projects establishes a clear value link between those paying the tax (visitors) and the infrastructure improvements that benefit them during their stay, while also creating long-term transportation and recreational benefits for residents.

### Implementation Considerations

Transient occupancy taxes are already widely implemented across Virginia jurisdictions, including Northern Virginia. For example, in Fairfax County, a base 2% TOT is collected for general revenue, a 3% Transportation District TOT is collected regionally to support transportation, and an additional 2% tax supports tourism and nonprofit initiatives.<sup>33</sup> While these mechanisms demonstrate that the tax is both familiar and administratively feasible, they also highlight the limited flexibility for additional increases, as overall lodging tax rates already approach 11% in some jurisdictions.

Higher rates may face opposition from the hospitality and tourism industries, which argue that increased lodging costs could reduce competitiveness relative to nearby regions. Moreover, TOT revenues are sensitive to fluctuations in travel demand, making them less reliable during economic downturns or disruptions to the tourism market. Revenues from many local jurisdictions in Northern Virginia are still recovering to pre-pandemic levels as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

---

<sup>33</sup> At a one-percent increase: SJ 28 estimated \$2.4 million to \$9.8 million in regional revenue generated.





## TRANSPORTATION UTILITY FEE

A transportation utility fee (TUF) treats transportation infrastructure as a municipal service, similar to water and electricity, in which residents and businesses pay a fee to use the utility that is the transportation infrastructure. The fee is often calculated based on trip generation estimates that reflect how much a property contributes to transportation system maintenance and operation costs.

### Strategy Applicability

A TUF directly links funding to system usage, ensuring that those who generate more trips contribute more to the cost of maintaining and improving infrastructure. The magnitude of revenue depends on the fee structure, but examples from cities such as Portland and Bend, Oregon demonstrate that TUFs can generate between \$5 million and \$54 million annually for general transportation funding. Small monthly fees as little as \$5 to \$15 can generate millions of dollars in revenue and provide a stable, predictable source of revenue up to local discretion for use. A TUF also provides a source that can be more heavily allocated to maintenance of existing systems, so it could be earmarked for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure maintenance specifically.

To date, there are no examples of TUF revenues being reserved exclusively for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, but rather for general transportation. Because many TUFs are fees rather than taxes, when they are implemented, they often do not require approval through ballot measures; however, this means that they often have specific restrictions on their use. Most North American applications dedicate revenues to general roadway operations and maintenance; however, the flexibility of the tool allows for a portion to be earmarked for multimodal investments.

### Implementation Considerations

There are currently no regional applications of TUFs; however, there are many examples at the county or municipality level. Implementing a TUF at a regional scale in Northern Virginia would require state authorization as well as substantial interjurisdictional coordination, both of which present significant challenges. However, because of the current administrative pathways to collect utility and other fees from residents, a regional transportation fee could be feasible by adding it to existing bills and invoices.

Decision-makers would also need to determine an appropriate fee structure, such as:

- **Flat fee:** Every household or business pays the same amount
- **Variable fee by land use:** Fees are scaled according to trip generation, with higher rates applied to commercial properties that generate more vehicle trips
- **Discounts/credits:** Reduced fees could be offered for properties or households with lower roadway usage, improving fairness, and incentivizing multimodal travel

To gain the broadest support, TUF revenue for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure would most feasibly be implemented by packaging it with other transportation needs like repaving, safety, and transit. By treating sidewalks, trails, and crossings as integral components of the transportation utility, a TUF could become a viable mechanism to dedicate revenues toward bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, though it would require careful structuring, political support, and strong regional collaboration. Further transportation economic study would also be necessary to determine the revenue that Northern Virginia's parcels could



generate at different rates and whether a region-wide or district-specific implementation is most appropriate.

## HIGH RATING STRATEGIES NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FURTHER STUDY

Though many strategies emerged with repeat high ratings, conversations with NVTA staff and regional stakeholders suggested that not all would be equally viable in practice. **Table 6** illustrates the strategies that initially rated higher amongst others in the same category, but were removed from consideration for extraneous reasons.




**Table 6: Strategies Not Recommended for Further Study**


Strategies Not Recommended	Reasoning
<b>Naming Rights</b>	Naming Rights lack of viability in the context of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (as opposed to transit, which has greater naming right sale potential with station names).
<b>Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)</b>	BIDs are promising hyper-local revenue options but lack the larger potential to be a regional solution with a broad revenue base.
<b>Congestion Pricing</b>	Congestion pricing would require significant political will and technology for cordon zone creation that currently is not present. Revenues from tolling as a congestion pricing measure are being generated, however with existing toll revenue already allocated to projects, debt or concessionaires, revenue from congestion pricing on tolling would require coordination on new hours of tolling or facilities, as well as regional agreement to fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements with these new funds.
<b>Mileage-Based Usage Fee (MBUF)/Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee</b>	An MBUF would be complex to administer on a solely regional level.
<b>Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreements</b>	PUDs are ad-hoc strategies that would not be implementable on a regional scale.

## Future Opportunities

Realizing the full benefits of active transportation in Northern Virginia requires sustained collaboration among regional stakeholders. While increased investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is crucial, challenges remain in securing and managing funding. Given the region's diverse land use and transportation needs, a one-size-fits-all approach is not viable. Future strategies must account for local context and the complementary role of various transportation modes. As viable funding strategies are chosen, efforts should focus on revenue estimation, implementation planning, and funding program design to support balanced regional mobility.

# Appendix A – Regional Coordination Stakeholder List

	Organization Name	Participant Name
 Counties	Arlington County	Elwyn Gonzalez Brian Shelton
	Fairfax County	Noelle Dominguez Laura Ghosh Nicole Wynands
	Loudoun County	Rob Donaldson Lou Mosurak
	Prince William County	Bryce Barrett
 Local Governments	City of Alexandria	Bryan Hayes
	City of Fairfax	Chloe Ritter
	City of Falls Church	Kerri Oddenino
	City of Manassas	Chloe Delhomme
	City of Manassas Park	Steve Hall
	Town of Vienna	Andrew Jinks
	Town of Clifton	Mayor Tom Peterson
	Town of Dumfries	Reginald Tabor
	Town of Hamilton	Daniel Gorman
	Town of Haymarket	Thomas Britt
	Town of Herndon	Mark Duceman Jaleh Moslehi Bryce Perry
	Town of Lovettsville	Jason Cournoyer
	Town of Leesburg	Richard Klusek
	Town of Middleburg	Danny Davis
	Town of Purcellville	Jessica Keller Jordan Andrew
	Town of Hillsboro	David Mekarski
 Regional/State Agencies	Virginia Department of Transportation	Brian Leckie Heidi Mitter Maria Sinner Rahul Trivedi
	National Parks Service	Laurel Hammig
	MWCOG Transportation Planning Board	Janie Nham Michael Farrell Victoria Caudullo

	Organization Name	Participant Name
	Fairfax County Park Authority	Randall Farren
	NOVA Parks	Mike Depue
	Northern Virginia Regional Commission	Jill Kaneff Rebecca Murphy
	Northern Virginia Transportation Commission	Andrew D'huyvetter Daniel Knickelbein
	Virginia Passenger Rail Authority	Angel Reed Meredith Judy Naomi Klein
	Virginia Railway Express	Nick Ruiz
	Potomac Rappahannock Transportation Commission	Joe Stainsby
	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	Mark Phillips
 <b>Advocacy Groups/ Associations</b>	Fairfax Alliance for Better Bicycling	Joy Faunce
	Bike Loudoun	Lisa Campbell
	Bike Falls Church	Andrew Olesen
	Sustainable Mobility for Arlington County	Chris Slatt
	Coalition for Smarter Growth	Sonya Breehey Stewart Schwartz
	Prince William County Trails and Blueways Council	David Brickley
	Active Prince William	Allen Muchnick
	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance	Jason Stanford
	Tysons Community Alliance	Jason Zogg Sonali Soneji Tianyi Berinato
	Washington Area Bicyclist Association	Elizabeth Kiker
	Virginia Bicycling Federation	Jim Durham
	Alexandria Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee	Ken Notis
	Potomac Pedalers	Rudi Riet
	Transportation Association of Greater Springfield	Joan Clark
	Dulles Area Transportation Association	Luke Frazza



# Appendix B – Regional Coordination Meetings Summaries





## Meeting Details

**Meeting:** Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure – Regional Coordination Meeting #1

---

**Date:** Thursday, July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2025, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm at NVTA

**Staff:**

✓ Monica Backmon	✓ Harun Rashid
✓ Starla Couso	✓ Amanda Sink
✓ Keith Jasper	✓ Kristen Sarik
✓ Michael Longhi	✓ Alyssa Beyer
✓ Sree Nampoothiri	✓ Abigail Hillerich
✓ Griffin Frank	✓ Kate Widness (KH)
✓ Lauren Wilber	✓ Geoff Giffin (KH)
✓ Sharara Faisal	✓ Kyla D'Sa (KH)
✓ Matt Bewley	✓ Matt Cheng (KH)
	✓ Amit Kamma (KH)

**Attendees:**

✓ Allen Muchnick (Active Prince William)	✓ Laura Ghosh (FCDOT)
✓ Bryce Barrett (PWC DOT)	✓ Laurel Hammig (NPS)
✓ Chloe Delhomme (Manassas)	✓ Mike DePue (NOVA Parks)
✓ Chloe Ritter (City of Fairfax)	✓ Noelle Dominguez (FCDOT)
✓ Daniel Knickelbein (NVTC)	✓ Nick Ruiz (VRE)
✓ Elizabeth Kiker (WABA)	✓ Rahul Trivedi (VDOT)
✓ Elwyn Gonzalez (Arlington)	✓ Reginald Tabor (Dumfries)
✓ Janie Nham (MWCOG)	✓ Rich Klusek (Leesburg)
✓ Jason Widstrom (Arlington)	✓ Rob Donaldson (Loudoun DTCL)
✓ Jim Durham (VA Bike)	✓ Sarah Sade (Loudoun DTCL)
✓ Jordan Andrews (Purcellville)	✓ Steve Hall (Manassas Park)
✓ Joy Faunce (FABB)	✓ Tianyi Berinato (Tysons Community Alliance)
✓ Ken Notis (Alexandria BPAC)	✓ Tim Stevens (Bike Falls Church)
✓ Kevin Wyrauch (PWC DOT)	✓ Victoria Caudullo (MWCOG)

---

## Meeting Notes

### Introduction and Background

- Introductory remarks about intention and background of study were provided by Monica Blackmon, NVTA CEO.

- Kate Widness (Kimley-Horn or KH) and Starla Couso (NVTa Project Manager) presented a project overview, including review of 2024 VDOT study and role of Regional Coordination Partners.
- Review of funding sources researched by KH.
- Breakout into four groups to discuss experiences with various funding sources:
  - Group A, Towns and Cities
  - Group B, Counties
  - Group C, Regional Agencies
  - Group D, Advocates

## Public Agency (Groups A-C) Discussion Notes

*Question 1— What is your largest bicycle and pedestrian funding source (for both infrastructure construction and maintenance and operations)? Does your jurisdiction have its own dedicated source of bicycle/pedestrian funding?*

- Towns and cities emphasized general funds and federal funds and noted the Transportation Land=Use Connections (TLC) Program grant through Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG).
- Many towns and cities lack dedicated funds and personnel to seek funds for maintenance and construction.
  - A common strategy is to combine with repaving and/or other roadway improvements (often paid for by maintenance funds).
  - Localities also leverage developer agreements and proffers.
- Counties highlighted many of the funds (regional and statewide) already included in the source list. New sources/strategies currently used to fund bicycle/pedestrian facilities including: C + I tax, tax districts.
- Regional agencies mentioned federal grants and internal funds as primary funding sources.
  - New sources include Category 2 Title 23 funds, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Trail Access Grants Program, DCR Recreational Trails Program (RTP), P3 projects, repaving programs, and Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP).

*Question 2— What barriers do you experience when trying to secure funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects?*

- Towns and cities mentioned many barriers including politics, cost/inflation, timing/process, non-advantageous criteria, lack of staff, and cost of consultants and grant applications.
  - Clarify the distinction between federal and local program: Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Redistribution of Surface Transportation Block Grant (RSTBG).



- County barriers include high application costs, non-advantageous criteria, lack of flexibility on state requirements (Transportation Alternatives Program or TAP and VDOT's SMART Scale process) and significant strings attached to federal grants.
  - Additionally, counties noted the high costs of Northern Virginia (land, staff, etc.) leading to poor cost/benefit ratios, making competition more difficult with other regions of Virginia for state-level grants.
- Regional agencies mentioned politics, staff capacity, non-advantageous criteria/low priority of bicycle and pedestrian as modes of transportation, federal grant requirements/strings attached, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

*Question 3— Are there any grants that have been particularly challenging to successfully “win”/acquire funding from for bicycle and pedestrian projects?*

- Towns, cities, and counties mentioned SMART SCALE, other VDOT programs, and NVTAs as being highly focused on car traffic and difficult to secure bicycle and pedestrian funding from.
- Counties also noted that federal grants are often difficult to win, especially when an equity component is included because of Northern Virginia's high median income.

## Advocates' (Group D) Discussion Notes

*Question 1— What sources of funding, such as federal, state, regional, local, and grant, have your advocacy efforts been most successful in securing?*

- Advocacy efforts (statewide) helped establish Virginia's State Trails Office.
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects often get funded through roadway improvements, especially when a complete streets policy has been adopted, which advocacy can support.
- Vision Zero is a key level for complete streets and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Easier for advocates to help advance a project when they are already ready to go and just need implementation funding.
- Local grants and dedicated budgets (like Tysons Transportation Special District) can be helpful.

*Question 2— What barriers do you experience when advocating for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure?*

- New SMART SCALE criteria prioritizing vehicles more heavily is a significant barrier.
- Cost/benefit is challenging in Northern Virginia due to high costs.
- Legislative mandates are focused on vehicles, limiting bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Lack of transparency at locality level in transportation decision making.



- Secondary benefits of bike/ped like health and economy are often uncalculated or unknown.
- Timelines often drag, making advocacy more difficult.

*Question 3— Are you aware of other states/communities, where you have been an advocate previously, that have efficient bicycle and pedestrian funding streams?*

- Maryland Highway Administration has dedicated funds for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Maintenance funding is often a key lever.
- Revenue from parking fees can be used for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Advocates can serve as conduits for coordination between jurisdictions.

### Funding Strategies

- Matt Cheng (KH) provided a high-level overview of funding strategies research, including background on similar processes for SJ 28 and DMV Moves.
- Initial list of funding strategies and brief whole-group discussion about experiences and possibilities.

### Next Steps

Kate Widness provided an overview of the next steps:

- Finalize the funding sources based on information provided at today's meeting.
- Continue to conduct research on funding strategies.
- Develop a matrix of funding strategy options.
- Schedule and identify next Regional Coordination Meeting #2.



## Meeting Details

**Meeting:** Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure – Regional Coordination Meeting #2

---

**Date:** Wednesday, August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 10:00 am – 11:30 am - Virtual

**Staff:**

✓ Starla Couso	✓ Kate Widness (KH)
✓ Michael Longhi	✓ Matt Cheng (KH)
✓ Sree Nampoothiri	✓ Daniel Segura (KH)
✓ Griffin Frank	
✓ Harun Rashid	
✓ Alyssa Beyer	
✓ Kristen Sarik	

**Attendees:**

✓ Allen Muchnick (Active Prince William)	✓ Joan Schnitzer (Fairfax County)
✓ Andrew Jinks (Vienna)	✓ Jordan Andrews (Purcellville)
✓ Brian Leckie (VDOT)	✓ Joy Faunce (FABB)
✓ Bryce Barrett (PWC DOT)	✓ Laura Ghosh (FCDOT)
✓ Bryan Hayes (Alexandria)	✓ Laurel Hammig (NPS)
✓ Chloe Delhomme (Manassas)	✓ Michael Farrell (MWCOG)
✓ Chloe Ritter (City of Fairfax)	✓ Mike DePue (NOVA Parks)
✓ Curtis Eatman (Dumfries)	✓ Noelle Dominguez (FCDOT)
✓ Dan Malouff (Arlington County)	✓ Nick Ruiz (VRE)
✓ Daniel Knickelbein (NVTC)	✓ Rebecca Murphy (NVRC)
✓ Elizabeth Kiker (WABA)	✓ Rahul Trivedi (VDOT)
✓ Elwyn Gonzalez (Arlington County)	✓ Reginald Tabor (Dumfries)
✓ Heidi Mitter (VDOT)	✓ Rich Klusek (Leesburg)
✓ Janie Nham (MWCOG)	✓ Rob Donaldson (Loudoun DTCL)
✓ Jason Widstrom (Arlington)	✓ Sarah Allred (Fairfax County)
✓ Jim Durham (VA Bike)	✓ Sarah Sade (Loudoun DTCL)
✓ Joan Clark (TAGS)	✓ Steve Hall (Manassas Park)
✓ Ken Notis (Alexandria BPAC)	✓ Sonya Breehey
✓ Kevin O'Brien (WABA)	✓ Tianyi Berinato (Tysons Community Alliance)
✓ Kevin Wyrauch (PWC DOT)	

---



## Meeting Notes

Starla Couso, project manager, opened the meeting by welcoming and thanking everyone for their participation in this effort. A presentation was then provided that expanded upon the following items:

- Project overview and intent
- Project schedule
- Regional coordination meeting #1 summary
- Funding strategy development, including metrics
- Funding strategy results and draft recommendations

## Funding Strategy Metrics Discussion

The following section features questions from regional participants and answers from the project team as part of a discussion on the seven evaluation criteria

*Question 1— For the category of “some growth expected,” is that offset by inflation or changes to dollar purchasing power?*

*(All responses below are associated with Question 1.)*

- Our initiative did not look at inflation, which would be included as part of a financial model. Our effort focused on looking at the growth in the tax base. We are not scaling to future inflation dollars; different improvements would have different rates, and we are just looking at the revenue base.
- We understand there are a lot of different components to really understand things as it comes to revenue magnitude and growth.
- The \$30 billion cost estimate from the VDOT study does consider inflation. As we develop packages to fund a full buildout of the proposed bicycle and pedestrian network, we will take inflation into account.

*Question 2— Does disproportionately distributed mean any group, or just the most at-risk groups?*

- No, we just looked at the most vulnerable groups. Those that might be categorized under Title VI or other vulnerability metrics. One could argue that a disproportionate burden on the wealthy is also a disproportionate burden, but we have just looked at groups that might not have the resources.

*Question 3— It's not clear to me, in the tax/fee payer category, what the prioritized category is. There are situations where it might be advantageous for the payer not to be a direct beneficiary, thereby reducing the transfer of negative externalities to others (e.g., taxing congestion-causing modes to pay for congestion mitigation modes).*

- This would have to be considered as a follow-up to this initiative. That might be good to look at and unlink the payer and benefit.

*Question 3— Does “disproportionately distributed” pertains to regressive taxes? (i.e., progressive tax is counted as proportionately distributed?)*



- Not necessarily. Since the project team conducted the analysis qualitatively, we needed to categorize and score the results as high, medium, or low.
- For this, we need to look at each tax individually. For sales tax, you could argue that it is regressive since it taxes people who are buying everyday items at a flat rate. However, in the case of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, it could be considered a progressive tax. There's a fine line in how we're tying a progressive tax to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure funding. If a tax isn't going to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure funding now, we might have to revisit that as part of a future consideration outside of this initiative.

*Question 4— For tax/fee payer benefit, how are we defining the “benefit”? Does a vehicle driver down a roadway benefit from reduced congestion, and is that factored in?*

- This gets to a previous question of linkage: how a congestion tax would affect bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, gets to congestion benefits, not infrastructure benefits. For example, a property tax could be considered as a direct benefit, if a shared-use path is added. What the question is getting at is if there's a tax on congestion, or something that affects road users, would that impact behavior, and change behavior in the long-term. We're just examining the cost-benefit of the resources being used. Will the payers receive commensurate value based on the benefits of the infrastructure? We haven't gotten to that stage where we can see how a cordon would shift behavior and realize the benefit.
- These comments are great. We will integrate feedback on how the metrics need to be integrated.

*Question 5— Can we underscore the discussion around payer benefit, with priority towards payers that benefit? One aspect of this funding is a desire for a modal shift. I think that the modal shift shouldn't be penalized. If car payers pay, it could be a benefit.*

- We'll have considerations for strategies written.

*Question 6— For impact on business - perhaps it is ranked lower amongst other metrics because we rely on businesses to do a lot of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure already: provision of bike parking, shared facilities, commuter benefits.*

- Yes, but also consider the "impact on businesses" as a metric for regional and economic competitiveness. The project team is not currently at a stage where we can trace the downstream effects of a payer benefit on how it would benefit them through shifts in travel behavior. Transient Occupancy Tax, for example, would not receive a high score in our criteria for alignment, as it primarily benefits visitors who pay and residents who benefit. However, you could argue that this should score high because the benefit is actually captured with minimal burden on local taxpayers. Funding Strategy Discussion

The following section features questions from regional participants and answers from the project team as part of a discussion on specific revenue strategies.



*Question 7— For real estate tax, are you looking at it associated with real estate value or 'proportion of frontage'? (i.e. a 'fine' for not having the planned infrastructure built?)*

- A fine for not having infrastructure built would be more of a land value tax (LVT), real estate (RE) tax is a property tax of assessed value.
- RE is tax on land and buildings. LVT is the unimproved value of land, encouraging more efficient land use and unplanned infrastructure.

*Question 8— For land value/real estate tax, did you distinguish between business-owned housing, secondary housing, vs. primary housing?*

- No, we're this initiative is not at the stage of differentiating types of real estate taxes.

*Question 7— Examining the strategy results, with the exception of the utility fee, none of the other transportation options ranked at the top, which may raise eyebrows in the final report regarding the alignment of revenue with the beneficiary. Another comment, one of the fees not listed in the alternative fees, is the use of moving violation fines, assessed by police departments. I don't know if it's feasible, but could you link safety improvements and safety violators?*

- We looked at speeding violations to cover that safety nexus.

*Question 9— For clarification, the project team didn't look at traffic violation fees like wrong-way fines?*

- We don't have revenue estimates for Virginia police revenue, but hopefully in the future, unsure of revenue potential or growth, since hopefully it'd go down. First, it's the locality's responsibility, and second, it would need to find a pathway for implementation at a regional level, to get those funds turned over to a regional level. But yes, there's a substantial nexus with the safety argument.

*Question 10— Could you elaborate on the parking fees and provide any rationale for potentially not moving forward with further consideration?*

- At this stage, what we are presenting is not a final list of recommendations. These are preliminary strategies that we want partner feedback on.
- There's a difference between parking fees and parking sales tax. Parking sales tax would be interesting regionwide, could be implemented not just on county lots but on all transactions, be it ParkMobile or off-street parking. Parking fees might have to be limited to property that each locality owns, which may conflict with the money that goes into the general funds of localities. There are just logistical layers to unravel with parking revenue, what goes to the metro, debt service, etc.

*Question 11— Apologies if this was mentioned or not applicable outside of localities. Is the project team also looking into taxi/rideshare taxes?*



- No.
- SJ28 considers a transportation network company (TNC) tax, not as high as sales taxes; we're seeing a shift in behavior, transactions, and the number of trips. The project team could look into it more, but I'm not sure how it'd score in terms of growth and stability.

*Question 12— This initiative should examine the potential and feasibility of Senator Surovell's original proposal to allow localities to tax all private, off-street parking spaces except those on single-family residential properties.*

- Even if we did conduct detailed revenue modeling, we don't have an inventory of parking spaces, so we'd have to find the difference between residential lots and commercial lots. We would have to review all property information to obtain that number. Parking has come up a lot, to allow localities to tax off-street parking, could be put into the report of recommendations for next steps, but we need to go with what's feasible for any given tax. To implement a regionwide parking sales tax, a lot more work would need to be done to justify it.

*Question 13— You haven't done it yet, but will that deeper dive be done for this initiative.*

- This initiative will stay high-level. The recommendations will state, "What should be considered further," and detail some of the next steps and what they could entail. Do we move forward and start modeling, and get into specificities for these taxes and fees?
- Also, this is a report to the Senate and House Transportation Committee Chairs. It is ultimately up to them to determine how they want to proceed. For SJ28 and other studies, finance staff would need to look more closely to come up with magnitudes and scales of legislative packages. We're not yet at that stage in SJ 28, but we are putting forward options that could be packaged with other sources. Do we need to estimate the revenue for every single parking space to come up with recommendations, or is this sufficient to be included in a package?

## General Questions and Comments

The following section features questions from regional participants and answers from the project team as part of a general discussion

*Question 14— I was wondering if a time horizon was assumed. I would think that revenue generation or goal amount would be tied to a realistic time horizon for infrastructure implementation. \$30 billion can't be built in 10 years, so what was the time horizon?*

- We didn't look at the time horizon; that's why we looked at metrics of revenue growth. We know that money shouldn't only exist for a year; we need something that'll last and grow for years.

*Question 15— I think that revenue amount would be rightsized to need over the time horizon. We know some have potential for high or moderate amounts, if it's focused on just bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and maintenance, there may be a rightsizing.*

- That's what SJ 28 is doing; they did a revenue estimation, coming up with estimations of packages that'll get them to their transit number. We expect something similar will happen



for this. Take the viable strategies connected to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and right-size them to meet our needs ( e.g., retail delivery fee combined with a more stable sales tax increase). Rightsizing not just the number, but also the mix of funding strategies that will provide resiliency. For bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, there will need to be a set revenue amount.

*Question 16— Is this initiative primarily examining new revenue strategies that would be implemented uniformly across regions, or is it considering new revenue sources that could be implemented voluntarily by individual localities?*

- This initiative is looking regionally recommendations as noted in the original letter from the House and Senate Transportation Committee chairs. If a locality wanted to adopt another revenue strategy, we wanted to encourage it so that bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure actually gets built.
- Something to consider, beyond the realm of one business, may react in one way, but there is a larger concept called economic flight. If you implement a tax in one locality, you may have a difference in implementation across the region, which we want to avoid. Where one locality implements a sales tax, and another one doesn't, and there are competing rates across jurisdictions, which wouldn't help in the long run.
- That was alluding to how some of the alternative taxes were things that localities could pursue.

*Question 17— In my opinion, the development of active mobility infrastructure should be largely controlled locally, rather than regionally.*

- The intention is to have authority and development controlled by locality; this is more about finding a dedicated regional fund that we can pull from. Not usurping authority, just looking to create a common pot.
- That's why we looked at existing sources, so we know that localities have their own pots and are spending it on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects. This is to complete the whole network sooner, regionally.

*Question 18— Is this initiative also considering modifications to existing revenue sources? )*

- We are only identifying existing funding sources.

*Question 19— To the parking sales tax end, it may be beneficial to explore a sales tax on parking leased in residential developments, too, not just commercial/municipal lots. This would then need to be balanced by a fee levied on residents who currently have access to parking on their land and would not bear the financial burden as much as someone who is purchasing parking in a residential building, etc.*

- Thank you for your comment.

*Question 20— In my opinion, trying to identify funding for an NVTa active mobility program is not the most productive path forward. Instead, this initiative should identify ways that localities can increase revenue for standalone active mobility projects.*





- Thank you for your comment.





# Appendix C – Regional Stakeholder Survey Results



## Survey Details

**Survey:** Understanding How You Fund Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities


**Date:** Thursday, July 24<sup>th</sup> – Monday, August 18<sup>th</sup>

**Respondents:**


✓ Allen Muchnick (Active Prince William)	✓ Jordan Andrews (Purcellville)
✓ Andrew Jinks (Vienna)	✓ Laura Ghosh (Fairfax County)
✓ Chloe Delhomme (Manassas)	✓ Mark Duceman (Herndon)
✓ Chloe Ritter (City of Fairfax)	✓ Megan Landis (PWC DOT)
✓ Elizabeth Kiker (Washington Area Bicyclist Association)	✓ Michael DePue (NOVA Parks)
✓ Elwyn Gonzalez (Arlington)	✓ Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County)
✓ Jason Cournoyer (Lovettsville)	✓ Reginald Tabor (Dumfries)
	✓ Steven Hall (Manassas Park)

## Survey Responses


What types of projects are the most difficult to identify funding for?



### What types of projects are the most difficult to secure funding for?



### What percentage of the funding you apply to bicycle and pedestrian construction projects comes from each of the following sources?



What funding programs have you successfully utilized to fund the construction of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure?

Source	Survey Responses
Transportation Alternatives	9
VDOT Revenue Sharing	7
Smart Scale	6
NVTA Local Revenue	4
NVTA Regional Revenue	3


How much were you awarded in total grant funding in FY 2025, 2024 (and 2023, if available) for the construction of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure? If available, please relate the amount awarded

Amount	Survey Responses
Over \$10M	2
\$1M - \$10M	8
None	6





What percentage of the funding you apply to bicycle and pedestrian maintenance and operations comes from each of the following sources?



What funding programs have you successfully utilized to fund bicycle and pedestrian maintenance and operations?

Source	Survey Responses
Local Funds	6
None	4
VDOT Revenue Sharing	1
NVTA Regional Revenue	1
Recreational Trails Program (RTP)	1





# Appendix D – Funding Strategy Detail Sheets



# Corporate Income Tax

## Revenue Category: General Revenue Taxes

### What is a Corporate Income Tax?

A corporate income tax is a tax levied on the net profits of businesses, calculated after deductions and expenses.

#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- Notable single source of state general fund revenue

#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Contingent on business activity and market conditions

#### Stability



- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- Stable, but also may fluctuate with market conditions and corporate relocations

#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- The Commonwealth is permitted to levy corporate income taxes, but localities are not

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers indirectly benefit
- Corporations do not benefit directly, but would experience indirect quality of life benefits from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings to employees

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Proportionately distributed
- Corporate income taxes impact businesses rather than individuals and are typically structured progressively

#### Impact on Businesses










- Shift workers and businesses out
- May influence businesses to not locate within the region or shift businesses and workers outside of the region

# Income Tax

## Revenue Category: General Revenue Taxes

### What is an Income Tax?

An income tax taxes a percentage of personal earnings that individuals, typically used to fund public services or infrastructure.


	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High revenue</li> <li>• One of the largest single sources of revenue for the Commonwealth</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• Long-term growth is dependent upon population growth and personal incomes</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer horizon and stable</li> <li>• Stability is high due to support from a broad tax base</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists statewide or locally</li> <li>• While the Commonwealth can levy individual income taxes, localities are not permitted to do so</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>• Income tax payers would benefit directly from regional multimodal improvements if levied on a regional basis</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear or moderate</li> <li>• Socioeconomic burden is dependent upon the levying structure of the income tax</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• The level to which individuals may be compelled to move out of the region is dependent on the structuring of the income tax itself</li> </ul>

# Corporate Franchise Tax


## Revenue Category: General Revenue Taxes

### What is a Corporate Franchise Tax?


A corporate franchise tax is a tax levied on businesses for the privilege of operating within a particular jurisdiction, and is levied regardless of income.

- 


**Magnitude** Low Medium High

  - Medium revenue
  - States that have implemented this tax see moderate revenue returns
- 


**Growth Potential** Low Medium High

  - Some growth expected
  - Long-term growth is contingent upon the growth of businesses locating in the region
- 


**Stability** Low Medium High

  - Moderate horizon and fairly stable
  - Stable due to a wide tax base but revenue is tied to fluctuating business environment
- 


**Pathway to Implementation** Low Medium High

  - No current pathway exists
  - Corporate franchise taxes are not employed throughout the Commonwealth
- 

**Tax/fee Payer Benefit** Low Medium High

  - Payers indirectly benefit
  - Taxpayers would benefit from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings
- 

**Socioeconomic Burden** Low Medium High

  - Proportionately distributed
  - Corporations do not benefit directly, but would experience indirect quality of life benefits from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings to employees
- 

**Impact on Businesses** Low Medium High

  - Maintain workers and businesses
  - May shift some workers out, but other workers in



# Business, Professional and Occupational License (BPOL) Tax

## Revenue Category: General Revenue Taxes

### What is a Business, Professional and Occupational License (BPOL) Tax?

The BPOL tax is a local tax assessed on the gross receipts of businesses, professionals, and trades operating within a locality, regardless of profitability.



#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- Large source of revenue for many localities



#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Growth expected, but long-term growth contingent on regional business activity



#### Stability



- Longer horizon and stable
- Stable due to a wide tax base



#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- Many localities levy BPOL taxes, but a regional pathway is unclear



#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers may directly benefit
- The local levying nature of these taxes increases the likelihood that payers would see direct quality of life benefits for employees



#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate
- Depends on tax structuring, but may have a disproportionate impact on small businesses



#### Impact on Businesses










- May shift workers and businesses out
- May influence businesses to not locate within the region or shift businesses and workers outside of the region

# Services Tax

## Revenue Category: General Revenue Taxes

### What is a Services Tax?

A services tax is a tax that applies to transactions involving services, such as consulting, legal advice, or repairs, rather than physical goods.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High revenue</li> <li>• Revenue magnitude is dependent upon the structuring of the tax, but generally large due to the large share of services in consumption</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to grow</li> <li>• Services are likely to continue forming a greater share of economic consumption, representing a growing tax base</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>• Services already comprise a significant share of consumption, representing a broad tax base</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists statewide or locally</li> <li>• Localities do not have permission to enact a services tax</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may indirectly benefit</li> <li>• Service providers are likely to be employers in the region and would likely see quality of life benefits for employees</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportionately distributed</li> <li>• Services are present across many jurisdictions, areas, and demographic backgrounds, meaning proportionality is highly likely</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• Service tax implementation has seen some opposition from the business community, but full impact depends on the tax structure</li> </ul>

# Personal Property Tax

## Revenue Category: Property-Based Taxes and Fees

### What is a Personal Property Tax?

A personal property tax is a recurring tax on movable assets like vehicles, machinery, or equipment, typically assessed annually by local governments.



#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- Personal property taxes comprise a significant share of general fund revenue



#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Long-term growth is upon the region's capacity for expansion



#### Stability



- Longer horizon and stable
- Stability is attributed to the wide tax base



#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- Personal property tax collection exists across the region, but a regional approach would require additional coordination



#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers may directly benefit
- Property tax is comprised of moveable assets, and investments in multimodal infrastructure would contribute to decreased car reliance, providing direct benefits to taxpayers



#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Impacts a population disproportionately
- Personal property taxes may be regressive in their levying, but multimodal investments would also benefit the most vulnerable populations, who tend to be non-drivers



#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- Personal property taxes could cause some businesses to shift out, but outcomes may differ across localities with different industry makeups

# Real Estate Tax

## Revenue Category: Property-Based Taxes and Fees

### What is a Real Estate Tax?

A real estate tax is a tax that property owners must pay based on the assessed value of land and buildings they own, often used to fund schools and municipal services.



#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- Real estate taxes comprise a significant share of general fund revenue



#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Real estate tax revenue growth is contingent upon the region's capacity for development or increased demand raising assessments



#### Stability



- Longer horizon and stable
- Stable due to a wide tax base



#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- Assessment and levying are conducted at the local level, but interjurisdictional coordination would require additional coordination



#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers may directly benefit
- Taxpayers would benefit from the increased property value that multimodal infrastructure brings



#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Proportionately distributed
- Property taxes are progressively structured by nature, targeting property owners and not renters



#### Impact on Businesses




- Maintain workers and businesses
- Business impact depends upon the structuring of the tax, but would likely have negligible impacts on business retention

# Tax Increment Financing

## Revenue Category: Property-Based Taxes and Fees

### What is Tax Increment Financing?

Tax increment financing is a strategy where future increases in property tax revenues within a designated area are earmarked to pay for current infrastructure or development projects.




#### Magnitude

Low

Medium

High

- Low revenue
- Short-term magnitude is low due to TIF's local implementation but may vary slightly in scale




#### Growth Potential

Low

Medium

High

- Some growth expected
- TIF districts are established in areas with projected future growth but offer mixed results




#### Stability

Low

Medium

High

- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- TIF agreements are typically subject to moderate to long-term time horizons




#### Pathway to Implementation

Low

Medium

High

- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- TIF districts are implemented across the state, but interjurisdictional collection would require additional coordination




#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit

Low

Medium

High

- Payers may directly benefit
- TIFs are a value capture strategy, so payers would directly benefit from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings




#### Socioeconomic Burden

Low

Medium

High

- Proportionately distributed
- TIFs benefit the most burdened taxpayers inside due to property tax rates being "frozen"



#### Impact on Businesses

Low

Medium

High


- Maintain workers and businesses
- TIFs have mixed results on their impact on employment and business development

# Land Value Tax

## Revenue Category: Property Based Taxes and Fees

### What is a Land Value Tax?

A Land Value Tax (LVT) is a tax that is levied on the value of the land, and not the improvements (buildings) atop, like a traditional property tax.

- 

**Magnitude** Low Medium High

  - High revenue
  - Magnitude depends on the LVT's structure, but can provide revenue equal to or greater than a modern property tax
- 

**Growth Potential** Low Medium High

  - Some growth expected
  - Land values will rise over time, so tax revenues will increase
- 

**Stability** Low Medium High

  - Longer horizon and stable
  - Land value is less volatile than property value and provides more long-term stability than a property tax
- 

**Pathway to Implementation** Low Medium High

  - No current pathway exists
  - In Virginia, localities can't tax land at a higher rate than property, unless given legislative permission
- 

**Tax/fee Payer Benefit** Low Medium High

  - Payers may directly benefit
  - Taxpayers would benefit from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings
- 

**Socioeconomic Burden** Low Medium High

  - Proportionately distributed
  - A land value tax would be proportionately distributed, since all would see their land values increase if outside investment occurred
- 

**Impact on Businesses** Low Medium High

  - Maintain workers and businesses
  - May shift some workers out, but other workers in




# Development Agreements

## Revenue Category: Property-Based Taxes and Fees

### What are Development Agreements?

Development agreements are contracts between local governments and developers stipulating financial contributions to local governments during the development process.




#### Magnitude

Low

Medium

High

- Medium revenue
- Could generate above-moderate revenue but oftentimes doesn't due to its smaller scale implementation




#### Growth Potential

Low

Medium

High

- Some growth expected
- Possible in active development markets, and contingent on the region's capacity to continue development




#### Stability

Low

Medium

High

- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- Agreement terms vary by project, and is contingent on the stability of the local development process




#### Pathway to Implementation

Low

Medium

High

- No current pathway exists
- State legislation is required to utilize development agreements




#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit

Low

Medium

High

- Payers may directly benefit
- Developers are the only fee payers and would benefit from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings




#### Socioeconomic Burden

Low

Medium

High

- Proportionately distributed
- Developers are the only fee payers, so nearby residents are not impacted by costs involved



#### Impact on Businesses

Low

Medium

High

- Shifts workers and businesses in
- Businesses could shift in due to the greater flexibility in development permitted




# Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreements

## Revenue Category: Property-Based Taxes and Fees


### What are Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreements?

PUD agreements are zoning arrangements that allow developers flexibility in land use and design in exchange for providing public amenities or infrastructure improvements.

- 


**Magnitude**

Low Medium High

  - Low revenue
  - Revenue is low due to their limited applicability
- 


**Growth Potential**

Low Medium High

  - Some growth expected
  - Contingent on the region's capacity for development
- 


**Stability**

Low Medium High

  - Moderate horizon and fairly stable
  - Instability deters developers and lenders, so PUD stability is contingent on those two factors
- 


**Pathway to Implementation**

Low Medium High

  - Pathway exists statewide or locally
  - PUDs are an established local method of revenue generation but would require more collaboration as a regional strategy
- 


**Tax/fee Payer Benefit**

Low Medium High

  - Payers may directly benefit
  - PUDs are pursued by developers, who would see a direct benefit in property values due to multimodal investment
- 

**Socioeconomic Burden**

Low Medium High

  - Proportionately distributed
  - Developers are the only direct cost-bearers in PUD agreements
- 

**Impact on Businesses**

Low Medium High

  - Shifts workers and businesses in
  - Businesses could shift in due to the greater flexibility in development permitted

# Grantor's Tax

## Revenue Category: Property-Based Taxes and Fees

### What is a Grantor's Tax?

A grantor's tax is a fee paid by the seller of real estate at the time of sale, typically calculated as a percentage of the sale price.








	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High revenue</li> <li>• A grantor tax can provide moderate to substantial tax revenue to localities with active real estate markets, due to revenue generation stemming from real estate transactions</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• Growth of tax revenue from grantor taxes can come from an increase in activity, or an increase in the dollar amounts of payments subject to the tax</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer horizon and stable</li> <li>• Generally provides a longer horizon and stable funding, but is subject to market forces</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists regionally</li> <li>• The Regional Congestion Relief tax is a grantor tax levied upon Northern Virginia localities that already exists and is paid to NVTA, demonstrating a regional pathway</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>• Homebuyers would indirectly benefit from reduced traffic with a multimodal transportation investment, and potential property value increases depending on the infrastructure's proximity</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear or moderate distribution</li> <li>• Impacts of a grantor tax would be unclear, and could be slightly regressive, depending on its structure</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• A grantor tax would likely have little impact on business retention</li> </ul>

# Utility Right of Way (ROW) Agreements

## Revenue Category: Property-Based Taxes and Fees

### What are Utility Right of Way (ROW) Agreements?

Utility right-of-way agreements are arrangements where utility providers pay fees or negotiate access to public land or infrastructure corridors to install and maintain services.

	<b>Magnitude</b>	<div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low revenue</li> <li>Total revenue magnitude is low across the region</li> </ul>	
	<b>Growth Potential</b>	<div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some growth expected</li> <li>Utility expansion may continue with growth of utility needs across the region</li> </ul>	
	<b>Stability</b>	<div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>Revenue horizon is dependent upon the agreements themselves but can provide moderate to long-term revenue</li> </ul>	
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b>	<div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pathway exists statewide or locally</li> <li>NoVA Parks collects easement revenue along its trails but a new body would require additional coordination</li> </ul>	
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b>	<div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>Fee payers would benefit from increased regional access by co-locating with multimodal infrastructure</li> </ul>	
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b>	<div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear or moderate distribution</li> <li>Utilities would be the only direct cost-bearers in a right of way agreement, but negative externalities may impact outside parties.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b>	<div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>Utility ROW Agreements would likely have little impact on business retention</li> </ul>	

# Sales Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Sales Tax?

A sales tax is a percentage-based charge added to the cost of goods at retail, collected at the point of sale.








	<p><b>Magnitude</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High revenue</li> <li>• One of the largest single sources of revenue in the Commonwealth</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Growth Potential</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• Dependent upon growth of consumption, which is expected to grow in the short-term</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Stability</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer horizon and stable</li> <li>• Consumer spending may fluctuate during periods of economic instability but is stable in the long-term</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists regionally</li> <li>• Various jurisdictions in the region enact substantial sales taxes</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>• Payers of sales tax often live nearby the jurisdiction and benefit from its infrastructure improvements</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear or moderate distribution</li> <li>• While a sales tax applies to a broad population base, it is considered regressive because tax burden as a share of income is highest for low-income individuals</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Impact on Businesses</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• Business retention impacts are likely small, but dependent on tax structure</li> </ul>

# Restaurant, Food, or Beverage Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Restaurant, Food, or Beverage Tax?

A Restaurant, Food, or Beverage tax is applied to meals, snacks, and beverages sold by restaurants and food vendors, often used to support tourism or local services.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium revenue</li> <li>• More limited in scope than the broader sales tax, but can still provide a significant amount or revenue</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• The food industry has moderate anticipated growth, indicating a growing tax base</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer horizon and stable</li> <li>• Food service is a large a broadly stable industry</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists statewide or locally</li> <li>• Permission exists across the Commonwealth but regional collection would require additional coordination</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>• This tax is passed to consumers who most likely live in the jurisdiction and would benefit from infrastructure implementation</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear or moderate distribution</li> <li>• As a form of sales tax, this tax may be considered regressive but is dependent upon the structuring</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May shift some workers and businesses out</li> <li>• This tax has faced significant opposition from the restaurant industry and may have adverse impacts on the competitiveness of regional restaurants</li> </ul>




# Motor Vehicle Sales Tax


## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Motor Vehicle Sales Tax?


A motor vehicle sales tax is a tax imposed on the purchase price of new or used vehicles, typically collected at the time of registration or sale.

- 


**Magnitude** Low Medium High

  - Medium revenue
  - This tax provides a significant amount of revenue to the state transportation fund, but overall generates a moderate amount of revenue
- 


**Growth Potential** Low Medium High

  - Some growth expected
  - Revenue is derived from motor vehicle purchases which are projected to slow down, and is difficult to predict long-term
- 


**Stability** Low Medium High

  - Shorter horizon and unstable
  - Vehicle sales are volatile and determined by a variety of factors, lowering the stability of this tax strategy
- 


**Pathway to Implementation** Low Medium High

  - Pathway exists statewide or locally
  - State level collection currently exists, but localities are unable to levy their own, unless given legislative permission
- 

**Tax/fee Payer Benefit** Low Medium High

  - Payers may directly benefit
  - Payer burden falls on vehicle purchasers, likely within their jurisdiction of residence, who would directly benefit from decreased traffic with the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure
- 

**Socioeconomic Burden** Low Medium High

  - Unclear or moderate distribution
  - Considered regressive because its structure as a form of a sales tax
- 

**Impact on Businesses** Low Medium High

  - Maintain workers and businesses
  - Would likely have an insignificant impact on business retention, depending on the structure of the tax

# Transient Occupancy Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Transient Occupancy Tax?

A transient occupancy tax is a charge on temporary lodging such as hotels, motels, or short-term rentals, often used to fund tourism-related services.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium revenue</li> <li>• Contingent on the rate of taxation, but overall magnitude projections are low to medium</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to grow</li> <li>• Tourism to the region is projected to grow, and is the main driver of revenue for this strategy</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>• Transient visitor numbers are fairly stable but contingent on broader economic trends</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists regionally</li> <li>• All localities may currently levy a transient occupancy tax, and several already do</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers do not benefit</li> <li>• This tax is generally paid by visitors, who would not see significant benefits from infrastructure improvements</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportionately distributed</li> <li>• Generally paid by visitors, for whom travel is more likely to be a business or discretionary spend, rather than a necessary one. Thus, the tax burden is not likely to be inequitable</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• Impacts of a transient occupancy tax on businesses and individual travel patterns are mixed</li> </ul>

# Utility/Communications Sales Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Utility/Communications Sales Tax?

Utility/Communications Sales Taxes are taxes on utility services like electricity, water, and telecommunications, and are typically added to monthly bills.

- 

**Magnitude** Low Medium High

  - Medium revenue
  - Revenue is projected to be moderate, with examples in the region generating small to moderate amounts of revenue
- 

**Growth Potential** Low Medium High

  - Some growth expected
  - Generally not a high-growth sector, but region-specific tech industries make this strategy a candidate for growth
- 

**Stability** Low Medium High

  - Longer horizon and stable
  - The high level of necessity for utilities and communications signals stable Stability
- 

**Pathway to Implementation** Low Medium High

  - Pathway exists statewide or locally
  - This tax is currently levied on a statewide-level, and regional collection would require additional coordination
- 

**Tax/fee Payer Benefit** Low Medium High

  - Payers may indirectly benefit
  - This tax would likely be passed to consumers, who would likely benefit from multimodal infrastructure development
- 

**Socioeconomic Burden** Low Medium High

  - Unclear or moderate distribution
  - Generally, these taxes are levied on corporations and businesses, and the demographic differences in the ultimate burden for consumers are unclear
- 

**Impact on Businesses** Low Medium High

  - Maintain workers and businesses
  - This strategy has mixed results, and would likely shift some workers out, but other workers in

# Beverage/Alcohol Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Beverage/Alcohol Tax?

A Beverage/Alcohol Tax is an excise tax levied on the sale of alcoholic drinks.

#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- Current statewide alcohol taxes are a significant single source of revenue generated

#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Alcohol sales revenue has grown moderately over recent years in Virginia

#### Stability



- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- Historically a stable industry, alcohol sales are subject to consumer trends which may be indicating shifts against alcohol

#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists regionally
- Several region-specific additional alcohol taxes exist in the Commonwealth

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers may directly benefit
- Taxpayers are likely residents of the levying jurisdiction and would benefit from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate distribution
- Mixed academic evidence points to alcohol taxation being slightly regressive due to it being a form of sales tax

#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- While an alcohol tax would have an impact on the activity of the alcohol sector, overall business retention impacts are likely minimal

# Streaming Services Sales Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Streaming Services Sales Tax?

A Streaming Services Sales Tax is a digital consumption tax applied to subscriptions for streaming services such as Netflix or Spotify.



#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- States where this strategy has been implemented have seen significant revenue returns



#### Growth Potential



- Likely to grow
- Streaming services have grown significantly as an economic sector and growth is projected to continue



#### Stability



- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- Although growth is expected to continue, the digital economy is slightly unstable and Stability is not guaranteed



#### Pathway to Implementation



- No current pathway exists
- The previous attempt to enact this strategy in 2024 failed in the general assembly, indicating difficulties



#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers may directly benefit
- If the tax is passed to local residents, taxpayers would directly benefit from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings



#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate distribution
- A land value tax would be proportionately distributed, since all would see their land values increase if outside investment occurred



#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- This strategy may impact business and consumer behavior but the impact is likely negligible

# Auto Repair Labor Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is an Auto Repair Labor Tax?

An Auto Repair Labor Tax is levied on the labor portion of vehicle repair bills, excluding parts, and is typically collected by service shops.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low revenue</li> <li>Due to the smaller industry size, revenue projections are low for this tax</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some growth expected</li> <li>Short-term growth is expected, but long-term growth is unclear due to a potential drop in gas vehicle purchasing</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>Generally a stable industry, but lacking long-term certainty due to a changing vehicle landscape</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pathway exists statewide or locally</li> <li>Previous attempts to levy this tax regionally were unsuccessful, indicating mixed future potential</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payers indirectly benefit</li> <li>In this strategy, tax payers are drivers, who would indirectly benefit from the value that multimodal infrastructure brings</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear or moderate distribution</li> <li>Downstream impacts are unclear as although this is a business tax, small businesses and workers would be impacted</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on the structure could have a mixed to negative impact on the auto repair industry</li> <li>May shift some workers out, but other workers in</li> </ul>



# Parking Sales Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Parking Sales Tax?

A Parking Sales Tax is a charge on paid parking transactions, often used to fund transportation infrastructure.

#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- Parking sales taxes generate high amounts of revenue in jurisdictions close to the region

#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Construction for new parking lots has slowed but demand continues to be present

#### Stability



- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- While the large current presence of parking represents a broad base, decreasing rates or removal of parking could indicate long-term instability, even if not currently present

#### Pathway to Implementation



- No current pathway exists
- A parking tax does not currently exist in Virginia, and permission would need to be granted to local jurisdictions.

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers indirectly benefit
- Individuals utilizing parking and paying a parking tax would indirectly benefit from bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure through decreased traffic on roads

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Proportionately distributed
- While a form of sales tax, parking is generally a more inelastic good for higher-income individuals, where bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure would benefit a broader range of income classes

#### Impact on Businesses










- Maintain workers and businesses
- Would likely impact businesses reliant on parking, contingent on the scope of the tax

# Transportation Networking Company (TNC) Fee/Sales Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Transportation Networking Company (TNC) Sales Tax?

TNC Sales Taxes are applied to rideshare services, such as Uber or Lyft, either as a flat charge or percentage of fare.








	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium revenue</li> <li>• TNC's have raised moderate amounts of revenue in the jurisdictions they've been implemented in</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• Ridesharing is expected to see moderate growth, with the most rapid growth having already occurred</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>• Large industry but highly dependent on market conditions, which could indicate instability in times of economic downturn</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No current pathway exists</li> <li>• No localities are permitted to implement a tax on ridesharing</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>• Rideshare companies almost always explicitly pass this tax to riders, who are likely to live in the jurisdiction and benefit from bike/ped infrastructure as an alternative to ridesharing</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear or moderately distributed</li> <li>• A TNC tax would be slightly regressive but overall negligible</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• Limited impact on business due to the out-of-state locating of the TNCs themselves</li> </ul>

# E-Commerce Delivery Fee

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is an E-Commerce Delivery Fee?

An E-Commerce Delivery Fee is a charge added to online purchases to help fund transportation infrastructure impacted by increased delivery traffic.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High revenue</li> <li>• This strategy has generated significant revenue in states where it has been implemented</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to grow</li> <li>• E-Commerce consumption has grown significantly and is projected to continue growth, indicating a growing tax base</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer horizon and stable</li> <li>• Due to the popularity and growth of E-Commerce, this strategy likely presents a stable source of revenue</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No current pathway exists</li> <li>• E-Commerce fees are not currently implemented in the Commonwealth, and would require additional coordination if implemented on a regional level</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers indirectly benefit</li> <li>• Fees would likely be passed to consumers, who would indirectly benefit from the decrease in traffic that multimodal infrastructure investment brings</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts a population disproportionately</li> <li>• This strategy is a form of sales tax, and is thus regressive for consumers</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shifts workers and businesses out</li> <li>• An E-commerce delivery fee would likely have minimally negative impacts on the delivery sector</li> </ul>

# Recreational Tax

## Revenue Category: Sales and Consumption Taxes

### What is a Recreational Tax?

A Recreational Tax is a tax on leisure activities such as gym memberships, amusement parks, or sports events.

#### Magnitude



- High revenue
- The unrestrictive nature of this tax allows for a potentially high revenue if structured to include a variety of taxable sources

#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Growth is dependent upon the industries that are included under this strategy

#### Stability



- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- Growth is dependent upon the industries that are being taxed under this strategy

#### Pathway to Implementation



- No current pathway exists
- This tax is not currently implemented within the Commonwealth, and would require additional coordination if a regional strategy was pursued

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers may directly benefit
- Taxpayers would likely directly benefit from the implementation of multimodal infrastructure, but the degree of benefit would depend on the industries that are included in this tax

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate distribution
- As a form of sales tax, it would be slightly regressive, but depends on the industries that are included in this tax

#### Impact on Businesses




- Maintain workers and businesses
- Unclear impact on workers and businesses due to the strategy's flexibility in covering different sectors

# Motor Vehicle Rental Tax

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What is a Motor Vehicle Rental Tax?

A Motor Vehicle Rental Tax is a surcharge on car rentals, typically used to fund transportation infrastructure or tourism services.



# Vehicle Tolling

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What is Vehicle Tolling?

Vehicle tolling is a fee charged for using specific roads, bridges, or tunnels, often collected electronically or at toll booths.



#### Magnitude



- Medium revenue
- Toll revenue provides a noticeable amount of regional revenue



#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Interest in new tolling exists, but agreement stipulation and bonds limit revenue growth



#### Stability



- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- Tolls are moderately stable but influenced by politics and differing state-private goals



#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- Tolling is used across the region, but interjurisdictional collection would require additional coordination



#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers indirectly benefit
- Toll road users (payers) would indirectly benefit from more multimodal transportation options



#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Proportionately distributed
- Virginia toll roads are optional, so an increase would only impact drivers choosing to use the toll road



#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- Increased tolling pricing would likely have little impact on business retention




# Mileage-Based Usage Fee/Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees


### What is a Mileage-Based Usage Fee/Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee?

A mileage-based usage fee (MBUF) charges drivers based on the number of miles they travel, used to fund infrastructure maintenance and cover shortfalls from traditional fuel sales taxes as vehicle efficiencies increase.




**Magnitude** Low Medium High

- Medium revenue
- A revenue neutral MBUF/VMT fee would be just as able to recuperate tax revenue as a gasoline tax




**Growth Potential** Low Medium High

- Likely to grow
- As travel rises and fuel use falls, MBUF fees become increasingly attractive for funding transportation




**Stability** Low Medium High

- Longer horizon and stable
- An MBUF would shield highway revenues from fuel efficiency and oil price changes




**Pathway to Implementation** Low Medium High

- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- Pilot programs and tech assessments are underway in the U.S.




**Tax/fee Payer Benefit** Low Medium High

- Payers may directly benefit
- MBUF benefits drivers more than a fuel tax, charging by road use and rewarding those near multimodal improvements



**Socioeconomic Burden** Low Medium High

- Proportionately distributed
- A VMT tax would be slightly more regressive than the gasoline tax, but the difference is negligible



**Impact on Businesses** Low Medium High

- Maintain workers and businesses
- An MBUF would likely have little impact on business retention








# Congestion Pricing

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What is Congestion Pricing?

Congestion pricing is a dynamic fee charged for driving in high-traffic areas during peak hours, with the goal of reducing congestion and emissions.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High revenue</li> <li>Congestion zone pricing would be based on revenue goals and the tolerance of drivers, but could generate significant revenue</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some growth expected</li> <li>Vehicle travel continues to grow, boosting revenue under flat or dynamic pricing</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longer horizon and stable</li> <li>A congestion pricing zone would likely remain stable due to regional congestion levels</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No current pathway exists.</li> <li>Regional toll lanes use flat and dynamic pricing, but congestion pricing is not yet authorized</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>Drivers pay by travel and directly benefit from reduced congestion and multimodal improvements</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportionately distributed</li> <li>Congestion pricing may impact drivers without transit access, but multimodal investments can help offset this</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>Congestion pricing would likely dissuade some businesses and workers, but entice others, due to the reduced traffic</li> </ul>

# Vehicle Registration Fee

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What are Vehicle Registration Fees?

A vehicle registration fee is a mandatory charge paid to register a vehicle with the state, often with annual renewals.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium revenue</li> <li>• Motor vehicle license fees contribute a significant, though smaller, portion of Commonwealth Transportation Fund revenue</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• Growth of this tax depends on vehicle ownership trends, which have slightly declined</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>• Moderately dependable, but influenced by economic shifts and car demand, less so than usage-based fees</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists statewide or locally</li> <li>• Vehicle registration fees are currently implemented, but regional collection would require coordination</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers indirectly benefit</li> <li>• Higher vehicle registration fees indirectly benefit drivers through reduced traffic from multimodal investments</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts a population disproportionately</li> <li>• An increased fee would be regressive because the current tax is flat, but exemptions could be expanded to offset this impact</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• Vehicle registration fees would likely have little impact on business retention</li> </ul>

# Parking Fees

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What are Parking Fees?

Parking Fees are charges for using public or private parking spaces, typically based on duration or location.

#### Magnitude



- Medium revenue
- Metered parking comprises a smaller, but consistent portion of municipal revenue

#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Long-term parking revenue growth is uncertain and depends on local policies and management goals

#### Stability



- Longer horizon and stable
- Relatively stable, and will likely persist as urbanization continues in the region

#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- Commonly used parking revenue strategies include meters, permits, and stormwater fees; but regional collection requires additional coordination

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers may directly benefit
- Priced parking can give drivers direct benefits such as cheaper parking and less traffic, or indirect benefits through funding for municipal services

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate
- Underpriced parking shifts costs from low-use to high-use drivers, making parking fees progressive since wealthier households typically drive more

#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- Parking pricing would likely have little impact on business retention

# Drivers License Fees

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What are Drivers License Fees?

Drivers License Fees are fees paid to obtain, renew, or replace a driver's license.

#### Magnitude



- Medium revenue
- Driver's license fees make up a significant portion of DMV revenue

#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- License revenue growth depends on fee increases or population growth, so large gains are unlikely

#### Stability



- Longer horizon and stable
- Long-term revenue is likely dependable

#### Pathway to Implementation



- No current pathway exists
- Drivers license fee recuperation is common, but regional collection would require additional coordination

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers indirectly benefit
- Drivers paying drivers license fees would indirectly benefit from reduced traffic with a multimodal transportation investment

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate
- Higher fees are regressive, and the nexus of benefit is less clear than other driving focused fees

#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- Drivers license fees would likely have little impact on business retention

# Transportation Utility Fee

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What are Transportation Utility Fees?

A transportation utility fee is a charge assessed to properties based on their estimated use of transportation infrastructure, similar to utility billing.

	<p><b>Magnitude</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High revenue</li> <li>• Revenue typically comprises a significant portion of local funding where implemented</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Growth Potential</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• TUF revenue can grow in developing areas as more road users are added</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Stability</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>• Stability depends on structure and stakeholder support; fees have sometimes been rolled back after challenges</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No current pathway exists</li> <li>• TUFs are not levied in Virginia and would need additional coordination if collected regionally</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>• Taxpayers would directly benefit from the positive externalities of multimodal investment, as well as a potential reduction in vehicle trip generation estimates</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportionately distributed</li> <li>• Fees are proportionate due to being calculated by trip estimates</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Impact on Businesses</b> <span>Low Medium High</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• TUFs would likely have little impact on business retention</li> </ul>










# Bicycle/Pedestrian User Fees

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What are Bicycle/Pedestrian User Fees?

These are fees charged for access to bike paths, pedestrian trails, or shared-use facilities, often used to maintain and expand multimodal infrastructure.


	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low revenue</li> <li>Bike/pedestrian fees are feasible in few areas and may discourage use more than raising revenue</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some growth expected</li> <li>As multimodal infrastructure investment continues, opportunities for trail adoption will continue to exist and grow</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shorter horizon and unstable</li> <li>Revenue depends on infrastructure use and can be unstable, with fee revocations being common</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No current pathway exists</li> <li>Fairfax County Park Authority levies somewhat similar group walk/run trail use fees</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>Taxpayers would directly benefit from having funds be used for trail expansion or maintenance of existing trails</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportionately distributed</li> <li>Targeting cyclists and pedestrians makes the fee regressive, impacting lower-income users, especially if structured as a flat fee</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>Bicycle and pedestrian facility user fees would likely have little impact on business retention</li> </ul>

# Development/Transportation Impact Fee

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What are Development/Transportation Impact Fees?

These fees are charged to developers to offset the cost of public infrastructure needed to support new growth, such as roads or public transportation.

- 

#### Magnitude

Low

Medium

High

  - Medium revenue
  - Impact fees vary by project and calculation method, so total revenue differs by fee structure
- 

#### Growth Potential

Low

Medium

High


  - Some growth expected
  - Growth in impact fee revenue is limited and depends on development and case-by-case administration
- 

#### Stability

Low

Medium

High

  - Moderate horizon and fairly stable
  - Impact fees rely on active, stable development markets, so growth depends on regional capacity for development
- 

#### Pathway to Implementation

Low

Medium

High

  - Pathway exists statewide or locally
  - Impact fees are levied by local governments, but regionwide levying strategy would require additional coordination
- 

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit

Low

Medium

High


  - Payers may directly benefit
  - Taxpayers would see direct benefits by attaining greater property values from the multimodal improvements
- 

#### Socioeconomic Burden

Low

Medium

High

  - Proportionately distributed
  - Impact fees are paid by developers to offset development impacts on nearby residents
- 

#### Impact on Businesses

Low

Medium

High

  - Maintain workers and businesses
  - Impact fees would likely have little impact on business retention

# Speed Camera Fines

## Revenue Category: Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees

### What are Speed Camera Fines?

Speed Camera Fines are fines issued automatically when a vehicle exceeds the speed limit in monitored zones, used to reduce unsafe driving and generate revenue.



#### Magnitude



- Medium revenue
- Magnitude differs by rate and goal of fine implementation (i.e. revenue raising or behavior changing)



#### Growth Potential



- Some growth expected
- Long-term growth is dependent upon on implementation strategy and behavioral goals



#### Stability



- Shorter horizon and unstable
- Depends on implementation; behavior-focused programs may reduce long-term funding



#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- Speeding fees are set locally, but regional collection would require extra coordination



#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers indirectly benefit
- Taxpayers would indirectly benefit from a reduction in vehicle trip generation from multimodal infrastructure implementation



#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate
- If levied as a flat fee, speeding fees would be regressive



#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- Speed camera fines would likely have little impact on business retention

# Sponsorships/Advertisements

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What are Sponsorships/Advertisements?

Sponsorships and Advertisements are used to generate revenue by allowing companies to promote their brands on public infrastructure or events.




	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low revenue</li> <li>Some municipalities sell advertising on public property, but revenue is generally low and varies by strategy</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlikely to grow</li> <li>Advertising on public space is rare and mostly used by financially strained cities</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shorter horizon and unstable</li> <li>Public space is always available and visible, but advertising deals are usually short-term</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pathway exists statewide or locally</li> <li>Bus advertising has been utilized in the region, but permissions vary by jurisdictions</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>Taxpayers would directly benefit from having more public infrastructure available to advertise on</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportionately distributed</li> <li>Advertisers are the only direct fee payers</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>Public space advertisements are not likely to encourage or dissuade business retention</li> </ul>

# Naming Rights

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What are Naming Rights?

Naming Rights involve selling the right to name a public facility or public infrastructure, such as a transit station, in exchange for financial support.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low revenue</li> <li>Magnitude depends on the facility that is having its rights sold</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlikely to grow</li> <li>Growth is rare because this strategy is typically used by financially strained jurisdictions</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shorter horizon and unstable</li> <li>Naming rights revenue depends on term limits, agreement details, and demand</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pathway exists regionally</li> <li>Fee collection occurs regionally, but naming rights authorization varies by jurisdiction</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>Taxpayers would directly benefit from being granted naming rights to portions of any multimodal improvements</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportionately distributed</li> <li>Entities purchasing naming rights are the only parties paying a direct cost</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>Could be leveraged as an economic development tactic, but not likely to impact outside business retention</li> </ul>

# Carbon/Emissions Tax

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What is a Carbon/Emissions Tax?

A Carbon or Emissions Tax is a tax imposed on activities that generate greenhouse gases, designed to reduce negative externalities and generate revenue.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High revenue</li> <li>• Depends on structure and goals, balancing behavior change with funding for mitigation programs</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlikely to grow</li> <li>• Depends on structure and goals; behavior-focused policies may reduce revenue over time</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate horizon and fairly stable</li> <li>• Carbon tax longevity is influenced by structure and goals, with faster decarbonization shrinking the tax base</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No current pathway exists</li> <li>• No local carbon tax exists in the region, so a new path forward would need to be created</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers may directly benefit</li> <li>• Taxpayers would directly benefit from multimodal investments and potentially reduced vehicle trips</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear or moderate</li> <li>• Regressivity mitigation strategies may be employed to lessen the burden on low-income individuals</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shift workers and businesses out</li> <li>• Businesses generally prefer no carbon tax, but any tax would likely prompt strategic changes</li> </ul>





# Crowdfunding Campaigns

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What are Crowdfunding Campaigns?

Crowdfunding campaigns are voluntary fundraising efforts where individuals can contribute small amounts towards a public project or initiative.








	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium revenue</li> <li>• Crowdfunding can support small to medium sized projects depending on its structure</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlikely to grow.</li> <li>• Limited U.S. case studies make growth potential uncertain</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate horizon and fairly stable.</li> <li>• Crowdfunding is project-limited, so long-term growth is uncertain, though population growth may expand the potential base</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists regionally</li> <li>• Has occurred domestically and abroad; a regional effort is possible but would need coordination</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers indirectly benefit</li> <li>• Payers would indirectly benefit from the positive externalities of multimodal investment, as well as a potential reduction in vehicle trip generation estimates</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts a population disproportionately</li> <li>• Relies on voluntary payers, but free-riding may occur as non-payers still benefit</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• Use of crowdfunding is not likely to encourage or dissuade business retention</li> </ul>

# Adopt-A-Trail Programs

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What are Adopt-A-Trail-Programs?

These programs allow individuals or organizations to sponsor the maintenance of public trails, often in exchange for recognition signage.

	<b>Magnitude</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low revenue</li> <li>• Direct volunteering typically only supports maintenance costs</li> </ul>
	<b>Growth Potential</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growth expected</li> <li>• Growing multimodal investment will expand opportunities for trail adoption</li> </ul>
	<b>Stability</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shorter horizon and unstable.</li> <li>• Trails need ongoing maintenance, which grows with multimodal facilities, but adopt-a-trail agreements are short-term</li> </ul>
	<b>Pathway to Implementation</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway exists regionally</li> <li>• Adopt-a-trail programs are common, and regionwide expansion is possible with minimal coordination</li> </ul>
	<b>Tax/fee Payer Benefit</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payers indirectly benefit</li> <li>• Taxpayers would directly benefit from the positive externalities of multimodal investment, as well as a potential reduction in vehicle trip generation estimates</li> </ul>
	<b>Socioeconomic Burden</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts a population disproportionately</li> <li>• Trail adoption relies on voluntary participation, but free-riding is possible as non-participants still benefit</li> </ul>
	<b>Impact on Businesses</b> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain workers and businesses</li> <li>• The ability to adopt-a-trail for advertising purposes could potentially attract businesses but likely not significantly</li> </ul>

# Merchandise Sales Fundraising

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What is Merchandise Sales Fundraising?

This strategy involves selling branded merchandise to generate revenue.

#### Magnitude



- Low revenue
- Public agency merchandising is rare, mainly limited to transit agencies with third-party-managed online stores

#### Growth Potential



- Unlikely to grow
- Lack of public agency focused case studies and data in the United States means growth potential is unsure

#### Stability



- Shorter horizon and unstable
- Merchandise revenue is short-term and unstable, fluctuating with consumer preferences and spending

#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists statewide or locally
- WMATA is the only transit agency in the region that oversees merchandising for revenue

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers indirectly benefit
- Taxpayers would directly benefit from the positive externalities of multimodal investment

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Unclear or moderate
- Payers would be voluntary, and likely most enthusiastic about paying to support multimodal infrastructure

#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- Public agency merchandising is not likely to encourage or dissuade business retention significantly

# Fundraising Events

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What are Fundraising Events?

Fundraising events are organized activities like that aim to generate financial support for specific causes.

#### Magnitude



- Low revenue
- Magnitude depends on the organization, and is smaller than crowdfunding due to being donation-based

#### Growth Potential



- Unlikely to grow
- Limited U.S. case studies make fundraising growth potential uncertain

#### Stability



- Moderate horizon and fairly stable
- Fundraising, like crowdfunding, is short-term and unstable

#### Pathway to Implementation



- Pathway exists regionally
- The Virginia Capital Trail Foundation is a regional body managing a trail and its fundraising events

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit



- Payers indirectly benefit
- Taxpayers would indirectly benefit from the positive externalities of multimodal investment, as well as a potential reduction in vehicle trip generation estimates

#### Socioeconomic Burden



- Impacts a population disproportionately
- Participation is voluntary and motivated, but free-riding may occur as non-payers still benefit

#### Impact on Businesses



- Maintain workers and businesses
- Use of crowdfunding is not likely to encourage or dissuade business retention



# Public-Private Partnerships

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What are Public-Private Partnerships?

Public-private partnerships are agreements where private entities help finance, build, or operate public infrastructure in exchange for shared benefits.

- 

#### Magnitude

Low

Medium

High

  - Medium revenue
  - P3 potential revenue differs depending on the agreement structure and type of infrastructure being developed
- 

#### Growth Potential

Low

Medium

High

  - Some growth expected
  - Revenue base growth is dependent on jurisdiction capacity to pursue P3s, which differs across jurisdictions
- 

#### Stability

Low

Medium

High

  - Moderate horizon and fairly stable
  - P3 longevity is project specific and determined in early stages of P3 agreements
- 

#### Pathway to Implementation

Low

Medium

High

  - No current pathway exists
  - P3s are commonly pursued by jurisdictions but a regional strategy would require additional coordination
- 

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit

Low

Medium

High

  - Payers indirectly benefit.
  - Payer benefit is dependent on the type of infrastructure being developed but could indirectly benefit payers through decreased traffic from funding multimodal infrastructure development
- 

#### Socioeconomic Burden

Low

Medium

High

  - Unclear or moderate distribution
  - Proportional distribution is contingent on the infrastructure being developed and P3 agreement
- 

#### Impact on Businesses

Low

Medium

High


  - Shift workers and businesses in
  - P3s attract business and investment and could support job creation

# Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)

## Revenue Category: Alternative Taxes and Fees

### What are Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)?

BIDs are designated areas where businesses pay additional fees to fund local improvements, marketing, and services that benefit the district.


- 

#### Magnitude

Low

Medium

High


  - Lower revenue
  - Revenue depends on rate at which businesses are taxed and often used for lower funding level improvements such as quick-build and light maintenance
- 

#### Growth Potential

Low

Medium

High


  - Likely to grow
  - BIDs as a concept are growing in popularity
- 

#### Stability

Low

Medium

High


  - Longer horizon and stable
  - BIDs may require renewal, but often they are not dissolved
- 

#### Pathway to Implementation

Low

Medium

High


  - Pathway exists statewide or locally
  - BIDs exist throughout the Commonwealth but require additional coordination if implemented regionally
- 

#### Tax/fee Payer Benefit

Low

Medium

High


  - Payers may directly benefit
  - Taxpayers would benefit from improved multimodal infrastructure that may attract more employees and customers/visitors
- 

#### Socioeconomic Burden

Low

Medium

High

  - Impacts a population disproportionately
  - Improvements would likely need to be within the BID district, which may limit improvements that may have benefits to the broader community
- 

#### Impact on Businesses

Low

Medium

High

  - Shift workers and businesses in
  - Businesses may experience benefits from more accessible and activated spaces which may increase revenue



Comment #	Regional Coordination Stakeholder	Comment	Response
1	VDOT	Page 2, first paragraph, line 2: please add "planned", so it reads "Northern Virginia's planned bicycle and pedestrian network".	Revised text to reflect comment.
2	VDOT	Figure 2, October 2025: consider adding "stakeholder review" to the activities in the timeline.	Revised text to reflect comment.
3	VDOT	Page 2, final paragraph - re-wording: lines 4-6: suggest simplifying to "...by compiling available local bicycle and pedestrian network plans and GIS data." line 7: "...key destinations like transit stations and activity centers, throughout the region." line 8: "Additionally, this study identified planning-level cost estimate ranges for constructing the..."	Revised text to reflect comment.
4	VDOT	Page 3, first paragraph, lines 1-2: revise sentence to "Many of these projects included other roadway improvements, as is typical and usually necessary, but project examples selected for cost estimating were bicycle/pedestrian-focused projects."	Revised text to reflect comment.
5	VDOT	Page 3, paragraph 2: line 2: "... over 4,000 miles across the NOVA district, and planning level-cost estimate ranges of a full buildout..." line 4: "... Identifying the high-level potential amount needed..."	Revised text to reflect comment.
6	VDOT	Page 3, table 1: title should read "Northern Virginia bicycle and pedestrian network study planning-level cost estimate ranges"	Revised text to reflect comment.
7	VDOT	add note below table 1 which reads "Note: amounts include significant contingency given the high-level nature of estimates – and were based on recently constructed projects that often included other improvements/costs adjacent to the bicycle/pedestrian facility, as is typical of most projects."	Revised text to reflect comment.
8	VDOT	Page 5, table 2: the Dulles Area Transportation Association is a transportation management association, and perhaps more of a regional entity than an advocacy group. Consider making that category "advocacy groups/regional entities" or similar.	Revised text to reflect comment.
9	VDOT	Page 8, figure 6 (some comments also apply to Table 4) : for regional and state funding sources, consider adding the applicable agency to the title. For example, TPB regional roadway safety program, etc.. Title should likely read NVTC Commuter Choice (more generally) since the funds can support projects in the greater I-66 and I-95/395 corridors (not just I-66 ITB).	Revised text to reflect comment.
10	VDOT	please delete VDOT repaving program as a funding source.	Revised text to reflect comment.
11	VDOT	please add two funding sources instead: "VDOT Urban Program maintenance payments" and "VDOT State of Good Repair (SGR) Program – pavements"	Revised text to reflect comment.
12	VDOT	Suggest including Safe Routes to School program (SRTS) within Transportation Alternatives (TA) program. Suggest that the bullet say "Transportation Alternatives (TA) program, including Safe Routes to School"	Revised text to reflect comment.
13	VDOT	For the Carbon Reduction Program, it is debatable whether that should be included in this list/report since the funds have only been authorized for a select number of years (at this point), and VDOT NOVA programmed the funds already, according to certain priorities. It is not a fund that localities/others apply for at this time.	Added footnote to reflect comment.
14	VDOT	Table 4, page 10: For the newly added "VDOT Urban Program maintenance payments" and "VDOT State of Good Repair (SGR) program - pavements" sources, the grantor is VDOT and eligible jurisdictions are seemingly Municipality and County. These funds are for maintenance, not for adding new capital (so only the maintenance box should be checked). Please add the * next to the checkmark as well. For additional context, these funds are applicable to certain jurisdictions and certain roadways and are for replacing existing elements (plus ADA curb ramp upgrades, if applicable, as determined by project).	Revised text to reflect comment.
15	VDOT	As background information, the "VDOT repaving program" is removed because that is a general maintenance program that VDOT conducts for roads we maintain on an annual basis, with the general goal to resurface and re-stripe, therefore it is not a funding source. We collaborate with jurisdictions, when possible, to implement new on-road bike lanes and other marking enhancements if certain conditions are met, including engineering analysis, and VDOT and jurisdictional representatives' approvals.	Noted
16	VDOT	For the transportation alternatives (TA) program, TPB and the CTB make selections, although the funding flows through VDOT. Consider noting those two additional entities as well.	Noted. For simplicity, no change will be made. The table header, "Grantors" denotes who the funding is coming from, not necessarily who is selecting or screening projects and/or funding.
17	VDOT	Table 4, page 11: Again, consider whether to include Carbon Reduction Program at all, since it may not be a realistic option. Also suggest moving SRTS into the TA box.	Added footnote to reflect comment.
18	VDOT	For HSIP, please add "VDOT" as grantor (Localities can apply for certain strategies through the SMART portal)	Revised text to reflect comment.
19	VDOT	Page 13, last paragraph: please update Smart Scale generally estimated bike/ped allocation amounts to what was provided to Sree (NVTA staff) - closer to \$200 million – with the caveats that were provided (i.e. many projects provide bike/ped. Facilities but the funds cannot be separately calculated).	Added footnote to reflect comment.
20	VDOT	Page 14, first paragraph, last sentence: should read "Lastly, the VDOT pavement maintenance funding sources, through the Urban Program and SGR, provide select localities that maintain their roads the ability to resurface some of those roads while simultaneously improving some pedestrian and bicycle features. VDOT NOVA District works annually with other localities to consider the implementation of bike lanes and other marking enhancements on VDOT-maintained roads during their annual repaving process."	Revised text to reflect comment.
21	VDOT	Page 14, second paragraph, lines 4–5: The statement that "many of these programs generally seek to provide funding for improving vehicle throughput and operations over bicycle and pedestrian projects" is subjective/a perception. The Smart Scale process, for example, provides funding for exclusive bicycle/pedestrian projects as well as encourages other projects to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Revised text to reflect comment.
22	VDOT	Page 15: Line 7: "some implementation strategies may be more applicable at the local and state level..." Line 8 and 9: says "where project and maintenance costs are at a relatively smaller scale" - this is aiming to reference relative unit costs or economies of scale I believe - suggest revising to say "...into roadway projects, where integrating bicycle/pedestrian facility construction and improvements can have cost efficiencies..." or "...can be implemented more efficiently when incorporated into other/larger projects." Or similar. Also, changed maintenance cost to improvement since maintenance is not a part of construction projects.	Revised text to reflect comment.
23	VDOT	Line 9: consider adding "For example, since 2004 VDOT has had a policy that assumes roadway projects will accommodate bicycle and pedestrians via various strategies, including building sidewalks, shared use paths, and crosswalks."	Revised text to reflect comment.
24	VDOT	Line 10: consider deleting "however"	Revised text to reflect comment.
25	VDOT	Page 17: In revenue magnitude, which municipal budgets are being referred to? Categories under socioeconomic burden: these category labels have the same words as above categories for tax/fee payer benefits – unsure whether the labels also apply to the socioeconomic section.	1) The municipal budgets that are being referred to are the general fund budgets in Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs). The CIPs highlight revenue controlled through local means and are usually not inclusive of external funding sources.  2) The socioeconomic burden category has been updated accordingly.
26	VDOT	Page 26, regarding future funding strategies – additional considerations: Several social/feasibility considerations are mentioned throughout the report- please also consider/mention the factor of whether residents have a choice or not in paying the tax or fee i.e. the choice to purchase alcohol or streaming services versus using income from all via income tax. Please also consider the factor of geographic applicability/benefit (within Northern VA). For example, there are significant areas of northern Virginia, where no bicycle/pedestrian facilities (especially separated facilities) are planned but residents in those areas would potentially still be impacted. Please also consider proportionality/right-sizing of funds. While cumulative comp. plan needs for decades into the future produce a high total number, funding utilization and implementation would be relatively slow year to year. Match the amount of funding collected to reasonable ability for localities to expend them.	Outside this scope of work
27	VDOT	Page 27 – beverage/alcohol sales tax, third paragraph, second sentence: it states that there is a northern Virginia tax - but that it is also statewide. Please clarify.	Revised text to reflect comment.

Comment #	Regional Coordination Stakeholder	Comment	Response
28	VDOT	Page 31 – Land value tax: would this mean that rural (and suburban) property owners with more land would pay more tax despite having less access to bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure and having little bike/ped. infrastructure planned in those areas?	Potentially yes. The most likely way a land value tax would be implemented is to allow each jurisdiction to implement a rate up to a certain amount, so jurisdictions in more rural or suburban areas could structure the tax differently. This would require further study that is not included in the scope of this work.
29	VDOT	Page 32/33 – parking sales taxes and fees: please add that these strategies would exclude free public commuter lots given that there are no sales associated with those lots. Also, the concept that these revenues would stem largely from more dense areas with more paid parking has a good geographic nexus. Areas with denser bicycle and pedestrian networks (existing and planned) and transit (and more paid parking) would also be generating more revenue to build and maintain these networks.	Revised text to reflect comment.
30	VDOT	Page 34 – real estate tax, line 1: please clarify what "property" includes (land plus buildings)?	Revised text to reflect comment.
31	VDOT	Page 36/37 – services tax: please provide some examples of what services are referred to. Are services like lawn care, salons, and cleaners?	Revised text to reflect comment.
32	VDOT	Page 37 – streaming services tax: the first paragraph references a digital ad tax. This seems like a different category or strategy than a streaming tax. Consider clarifying.	Revised text to reflect comment.
33	VDOT	Page 38/39 - transportation utility fee: this references property and household roadway usage – how would a property or household's roadway usage (and fee amount) be determined?	This is outside the scope of work.
34	Active Prince William	<p>The current study originated from Sen. Surovell's SB1007 (2025), which in its original form proposed a new annual "Parking Facility Tax" in Northern Virginia on privately owned off-street parking spaces (excepting those on single-family parcels). This would be a tax on private property devoted to off street parking, based on the number of parking spaces, and is neither a Parking Fee nor a Parking Sales Tax. Although the proposed annual tax rate in SB1007 (\$0.50/parking space) was far too low, it could be a viable and feasible revenue source for active transportation projects if the rate were set 10 or 100 times higher.</p> <p>Sen. Surovell's "Parking Facility Tax" is not listed among the 45 potential future funding strategies in Table 11 (pp 18-19) or referenced anywhere in the draft report. It seems that the 45 future funding strategies examined are the same revenue sources that had already been evaluated for SJ28 and DMV Moves. In Table 11, Parking Sales Tax is listed under "Sales and Consumption Taxes", whereas Parking Fees is listed under "Transportation-Related Taxes and Fees". If a Parking Facility Tax were considered, it would be appropriately listed under "Property-Based Taxes and Fees", but there is no parking-related revenue listed for that category in Table 11.</p> <p>Since this study was instigated by SB 1007, it ought to examine the one new revenue source that Sen. Surovell had originally proposed in that bill.</p>	Revised text to reflect comment.
35	City of Manassas	It seems Appendix B and D are missing	No change needed
36	Coalition for Smarter Growth	Project Cost Estimates (pg.4) - The VDOT Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study Cost Estimates lack important context regarding their assumptions, which led to very inflated costs. VDOT's study, for planning purposes, assumed that all of the identified planned active transportation infrastructure would be built as standalone construction projects and none during either concurrent highway construction or by reconfiguring roadways during scheduled roadway resurfacing. It's important to include discussion of this issue in this funding study, and what might be more reasonable cost estimates to demonstrate that the active transportation facilities are feasible and likely to cost much less.	<p>VDOT's Study identified estimated planning-level cost ranges based on recently completed projects in Northern Virginia. Many of these projects included other related roadway improvements, as is typical and usually necessary, but project examples selected for cost estimating were bicycle/pedestrian-focused projects. Including bicycle and pedestrian facilities in larger roadway projects can potentially be more cost efficient than building standalone bicycle and pedestrian facilities, given the opportunity for shared design and construction activities. For further clarification, please contact VDOT directly.</p> <p>Revised text to reflect comment.</p>
37	Coalition for Smarter Growth	NVTA funded Bike/Ped Projects (pg.13-14) - For NVTA funding for active transportation projects, we recommend noting the percentage share of funding that has gone to stand alone active transportation projects, not just dollar amounts. This would better represent the share of funding going to stand alone bike/ped projects compared to other transportation investments. Additionally, we recommend including discussion of how localities and the state could spend more of these existing funds on active transportation projects, but instead they choose to prioritize other projects.	<p>NVTA can only fund projects based on applications jurisdictions submit. NVTA evaluates and subsequently fund projects based on applications submitted by localities and agencies. To date, we have funded more than \$190 million (in regional revenues and local distribution funds) on standalone bike and pedestrian projects. We also note that many projects with the primary mode of roadway, intersection/interchange, or transit also have bicycle and pedestrian facilities associated with them.</p> <p>Revised text to reflect comment.</p>
38	Coalition for Smarter Growth	Parking Tax (not in study) - The current study originated from Sen. Surovell's SB1007 legislative proposal in 2025 that would have created a new annual "Parking Facility Tax" in northern Virginia on private, off-street parking spaces with the exception of single-family properties. This Parking Facility Tax is not listed among the 45 potential future funding strategies or referenced anywhere in the draft report. This study should assess a Parking Facility Tax as a potential new revenue source.	<p>Parking Sales Taxes and Fees is listed under the funding strategies recommended for further study. The parking facility tax would fall under this funding strategy category, and we can note differences formally between a regular parking sales tax. However, because the region does not have an accurate assessment of the total number of parking spaces under a facility tax, we cannot quantify the potential true impact of taxing parking spaces of a facility rather than the parking sales transaction or fee. Obtaining an accurate assessment of parking spaces would require further study outside of the current scope of work.</p> <p>Revised text to reflect comment.</p>
39	Coalition for Smarter Growth	NVTA Funding Policies/Procedures (not in study)- The study should examine how NVTA's funding policies and procedures both help and create barriers to funding active mobility projects. These programs include NVTA 6-year program, CMAQ, and RSTP. This would be an easy lift for the study to include and provide valuable information to help support funding the Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network.	NVTA funds multimodal transportation projects. All project application submittals, regardless of mode, undergo the same evaluation process which includes a quantitative and qualitative analysis.
40	MWCOG/TPB	Pg. 3 – For the sentence under the DMVMoves section, we suggest using "solution" or "source" for the word "model"	Revised text to reflect comment.
41	MWCOG/TPB	Pg. 8 (and pg. 9 Table 4) - We're not sure if this impacts the list, but the TPB technical assistance programs (RRSP, TLC, and TWR) fund planning and preliminary engineering projects (up to 30% design) and not construction or maintenance	Removed the programs in Table 4 to reflect comment.
42	MWCOG/TPB	Pg. 8 – It's our understanding that the "Transportation Alternatives Program" and the "Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside" are one and the same program (TAP)	Combined both in Table 4 and Figure 6 to reflect comment.

Comment #	Regional Coordination Stakeholder	Comment	Response
43	NVTC	The document cites Commuter Choice for I-66 Inside the Beltway as a potential existing fund source for bike/pedestrian projects. The Commuter Choice program provides funding for projects on two corridors (I-66 and I-395/95), and bike/pedestrian projects (with certain restrictions) are eligible for funding on both. In the Report could you call the program NVTC Commuter Choice, rather than only calling out the I-66 corridor (or, if you'd like to cite the corridors please list both I-66 and I-395/95 as eligible).	Revised text to reflect comment.
44	Prince William County	Was there any consideration of a Commercial and Industrial (C&I) tax, or was that included in the land/real estate tax category. PWC has been considering this as a potential funding source for a few years, and I believe some other jurisdictions in Northern Virginia currently used it. Especially, with the huge growth in industrial industries such as data centers.	Revised text to reflect comment.
45	VRE	Page 8: Add I-395/95 NVTC funding as well.	Revised text to reflect comment.
46	VRE	Page 9: Add I-395/95 NVTC funding as well.	Revised text to reflect comment.
47	VRE	Page 15: This graph is hard to read. Consider adding labels on each point for the response versus the # of respondents.	Revised graph to reflect comment.
48	VRE	Page 20: Same comment as on page 15	Revised graph to reflect comment.
49	VRE	Page 23: Are there no examples of TIF projects in NOVA that have already been implemented?	Denoting that a "pathway exists regionally" demonstrates that the funding strategy is already being implemented at the regional level. While a TIF could currently be implemented at a local level, that does not necessarily mean a regional pathway does not exist.
50	VRE	Page 23: Several jurisdictions have meals taxes, so a pathway definitely exists regionally for this type of revenue.	Denoting that a "pathway exists regionally" demonstrates that the funding strategy is already being implemented at the regional level. While a TIF could currently be implemented at a local level, that does not necessarily mean a regional pathway does not exist.
51	VRE	Page 39: Wouldn't this be the other way around, where mixed-use developments would pay lower rates as their burden on the transportation infrastructure is lower on a per-resident" basis than single-family?	Revised text to reflect comment.
52	VRE	Page 40: This statement can not entirely be true, as facilities such as I-66 ITB already function as a partial congestion-tolled facility with all users paying the toll to travel east of the Beltway. Perhaps the discussion of a congestion pricing strategy for Northern VA should instead be described as the potential for a 24/7 roadway toll on select capacity constrained corridors, versus a full cordon zone as is implemented in London, etc.	Revised text to reflect comment.
53	Arlington County	Global comment: Fonts of several Figure titles appear muddled (for example, Figure 9).	Noted
54	Arlington County	Page 8: For general audiences who may view this document, will summaries of each revenue source that are mentioned be provided in Appendix D?	No change needed
55	Arlington County	Page 15: In the paragraph under "Existing Funding Sources: Additional Considerations," some of these "encouragement" statements seem out of place for this document and read as opinions. Consider revising or removing.	Revised text to reflect comment.
56	Arlington County	Page 21, Figure 14: It might be better to illustrate this graphically through the use of a matrix in order to outline individual metrics that are met or not met by each strategy.	Noted
57	Arlington County	Page 29: Within the E-Commerce Delivery Fee paragraph, including high-level impacts of such a fee as implemented by other states/jurisdictions is appreciated. Is it possible to include similar implementation case studies for the other Funding Strategies Recommended for Further Study?	Noted. Case studies were not available for every funding strategy.

# Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure

November 13, 2025








# Overview

**Goal:** Develop recommendations of **strategies and sources** to **fund** Northern Virginia's planned bicycle and pedestrian network as identified in 2024 VDOT study

## Methods:

- Reviewed and researched funding sources and strategies
- Consulted ongoing efforts
- Engaged with our regional coordination stakeholders





# Regional Coordination Stakeholders

---

- City of Alexandria
- City of Fairfax
- City of Falls Church
- City of Manassas
- City of Manassas Park
- Town of Vienna
- Town of Clifton
- Town of Dumfries
- Town of Hamilton
- Town of Haymarket
- Town of Herndon
- Town of Lovettsville
- Town of Leesburg
- Town of Middleburg
- Town of Purcellville
- Town of Hillsboro
- Town of Occoquan
- Town of Round Hill
- Arlington County
- Fairfax County
- Loudoun County
- Prince William County
- Fairfax County Park Authority
- VDOT
- NPS
- TPB/MWCOG
- NOVA Parks
- NVRC
- NVTC
- VPRA
- VRE
- PRTC
- WMATA
- Fairfax Alliance for Better Bicycling
- Bike Loudoun
- Bike Falls Church
- Sustainability Mobility for Arlington County
- Coalition for Smarter Growth
- Prince William County Trails and Blueways Council
- Active Prince William
- Tysons Community Alliance
- Washington Area Bicyclists Association
- Virginia Bicycling Federation
- Alexandria Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Potomac Pedalers
- Transportation Association of Greater Springfield
- Dulles Area Transportation Association

*Held 2 regional coordination meetings.*





# Approach to Funding





# Existing Funding Sources – Regional, State, Federal

## NVTA

- **Regional Revenue (70%)** – Funded 14 primarily bicyclist and/or pedestrian projects, totaling \$132 million from FY2014 – FY 2029
- **Local Distribution (30%)** – Funded 78 primarily bicyclist and/or pedestrian projects, totaling \$59 million from FY2014 – FY2024

## VDOT

- **Revenue Sharing** – approximately \$6 million in FY2027 and FY2028
- **SMART SCALE** – roughly \$185 million between FY2017 and FY2024
- **Transportation Alternatives Program** – FY2014 to FY2024, approximately \$68 million of funding was requested
- **VDOT Maintenance/Paving Program**

## Federal

- **CMAQ** – approximately \$52 million between FY2022 and FY2031
- **RSTP** – about \$84 million between FY2022 and FY2031

### Notes:

1 – This is a subset of existing funding sources. The existing funding sources listed in the report is not meant to be a comprehensive list.

2 – The funding amounts provided on this slide for all sources are approximate and for standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects.



# Funding Strategy Metric Development

All funding strategies were evaluated against these seven metrics using a **qualitative research approach**

- Available information where strategy was implemented elsewhere
- Current local efforts for reference
- General knowledge of strategies
- Multiple layers of QC on how strategies were assessed for each metric, adjustments were made based on discussions








	Impact on Business
	Pathway to Implementation
	Revenue Growth Potential
	Revenue Magnitude
	Socioeconomic Burden
	Stability
	Tax/fee Payer Benefit











# Recommendations

---

As viable funding strategies are chosen, efforts should focus on revenue estimation, implementation planning, and funding program design to support balanced regional mobility.

-  Beverage/Alcohol Tax
-  Business, Professional and Occupational License (BPOL) Tax
-  E-Commerce Delivery Fee
-  Income Tax Increase
-  Land Value Tax
-  Parking Sales Tax & Fees
-  Personal Property Tax

-  Real Estate Tax
  - Restaurant, Food, or Beverage Tax
-  Sales Tax Increase
-  Services Tax
-  Streaming Services Sales Tax
-  Transient Occupancy Tax (Lodging or Hotel)
-  Transportation Utility Fee

-  *Scored High Revenue*
-  *Pathway Exists Regionally*



# Recommendations

---

The following funding strategies were assessed highly, but are **not likely** to move forward regionally:

- Naming Rights
- Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)
- Congestion Pricing
- Mileage-Based Usage Fee/Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee
- Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreements

# Thank you!





**NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY****MEMORANDUM**

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Monica Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Approval of Recommendation to Allocate Transform 66 Outside the Beltway  
Concession Funds for the City of Fairfax

---

1. **Purpose:** To seek Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) approval to recommend allocating additional Transform 66 Outside the Beltway Concession Payment funds for the City of Fairfax.
2. **Suggested Motion:** *I move Authority approval to recommend the Commonwealth Transportation Board approve allocation of \$4,600,000 in I-66 Concession Funds to (UPC 112816) George Snyder Trail.*
3. **Background:** As part of the Transform 66 Outside the Beltway Project, the Concessionaire paid the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), a Concession Fee/Payment to fund additional transportation improvements in the corridor (Concession Payment).

Virginia Code specifies that allocations from the Concession Payments may be used to pay or finance all or part of the costs of programs or projects, but that (i) the allocations must be limited to programs and projects that are reasonably related to or benefit the users of the qualifying transportation facility that was the subject of a concession pursuant to the PPTA; and (ii) the priorities of metropolitan planning organizations, planning district commissions, local governments, and transportation corridors shall be considered by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) in making project allocations from moneys in the Account.

On July 13, 2017, the Authority, with input from local jurisdictions, developed a list of projects for presentation to and consideration by the CTB of projects that may be funded with funds from the Concession Payment. VDOT also recommended that the funding be used to fund, in whole or part, several Route 29 Projects in Fairfax County. On December 6, 2017, the CTB endorsed the list of projects recommended by the Authority and the Route 29 Projects. Since this action, the Authority has subsequently reviewed and recommended approval of additional transfers on some of the previously approved projects.

- 4. Discussion:** On October 22, 2025, the City of Fairfax requested allocation of \$4,600,000 in I-66 Concession Funds to support the George Snyder Trail project (UPC 112816) for the City of Fairfax.

The City of Fairfax has previously been awarded \$20.6 million dollars in I-66 Outside the Beltway Project concessionaire funding for the George Snyder Trail project. The City has recently received construction bids which exceed the \$16 million remaining in the project budget. They estimate that, with additional costs such as contingency, construction management, and VDOT oversight, the remaining project cost will exceed current budget by \$4.6 million. Contingent on the City Council's endorsement of this method to fund the construction phase of the project, the City of Fairfax seeks NVTa endorsement for additional funding.

At its meeting on October 23, 2025, the RJACC recommended approval of the request.

- 5. Next Steps:** Upon Authority recommendation of approval, the transfer request will be sent to the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

**Attachments:**

- A.** City of Fairfax Request Letter
- B.** DRAFT Letter to VDOT NOVA District Administrator Cuttler

**Coordination:** Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee

**City of Fairfax, Virginia**

10455 Armstrong Street • Fairfax, VA 22030-3630

703-385-7930 • [www.fairfaxva.gov](http://www.fairfaxva.gov)

October 22, 2025

Ms. Megan Landis, RJACC Chair  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority  
2600 Park Tower Drive, Suite 601  
Vienna, VA 22180

**RE: George Snyder Trail Request for Additional Funding**

Dear Ms. Landis,

The City was awarded \$20.6M in I-66 Outside the Beltway Project concessionaire funding for the George Snyder Trail project; approximately \$16M in funding is remaining. The City received two construction bids for the project. The low bid was \$17.1M. The construction phase of the project, which includes this bid amount as well as contingency, construction management and VDOT oversight, is estimated to cost approximately \$20.6M. This amount exceeds the \$16M in remaining funding for the project by approximately \$4.6M. Accordingly, the city requests the RJACC and NVTa's recommendation to the Commonwealth Transportation Board for \$4.6M to fully fund the construction phase of the project.

At this time, the City requests the RJACC's endorsement for additional funding. The subsequent request to the NVTa is contingent upon the City Council's endorsement of this option to fund the construction phase. The city requests the RJACC's recommendation now in order to meet the timeframe for NVTa and CTB concurrence as well as City Council award of contract prior to expiration of the low bid.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (703) 385-7889 or [Wendy.Sanford@fairfaxva.gov](mailto:Wendy.Sanford@fairfaxva.gov).

Sincerely,

Wendy Block Sanford  
Transportation Director

CC:

Monica Backmon, NVTa Executive Director  
Bryan Foster, City Manager  
Carol Bondurant, VDOT

November 13, 2025

Mr. William Cuttler  
District Administrator  
Virginia Department of Transportation  
4975 Alliance Dr., Suite 4E-342  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Reference: Request to Allocate Transform 66 Outside the Beltway Concession Funding  
for the City of Fairfax

Dear Mr. Cuttler,

As part of the Transform 66 Outside the Beltway Project, the Concessionaire paid the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) a Concession Fee/Payment to fund additional transportation improvements in the corridor (Concession Payment). Virginia Code specifies that allocations from the Concession Payments may be used to pay or finance all or part of the costs of programs or projects, but that (i) the allocations must be limited to programs and projects that are reasonably related to or benefit the users of the qualifying transportation facility that was the subject of a concession pursuant to the PPTA; and (ii) the priorities of metropolitan planning organizations, planning district commissions, local governments, and transportation corridors shall be considered by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) in making project allocations from moneys in the Account.

On July 13, 2017, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (the Authority), with input from local jurisdictions, developed a list of projects for presentation to and consideration by the CTB of projects that may be funded with funds from the Concession Payment. On December 6, 2017, the CTB endorsed the list of projects recommended by the Authority.

On October 22, 2025, the City of Fairfax has requested the following:

- Allocation of \$4,600,000 in I-66 Concession Funds to support the George Snyder Trail project (UPC 112816) for the City of Fairfax.

The City of Fairfax has previously been awarded \$20.6 million dollars in I-66 Outside the Beltway Project concessionaire funding for the George Snyder Trail project. The City has recently received construction bids which exceed the \$16 million remaining in the project budget. They estimate that, with additional costs such as contingency, construction management, and VDOT oversight, the remaining project cost will exceed current budget by \$4.6 million.

Mr. William Cuttler  
November 13, 2025  
Page Two

Contingent on the City Council's endorsement of this method to fund the construction phase of the project, the City of Fairfax seeks this additional allocation.

On October 23, 2025, the Authority recommended Commonwealth Transportation Board approval of the request noted above. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Phyllis J. Randall

cc: Monica Backmon, CEO, NVTA  
Wendy Block Sanford, Transportation Director, City of Fairfax  
Melanie Zipp, Acting City Manager, City of Fairfax  
Carol Bonduront, VDOT



## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Monica Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2026

---

1. **Purpose:** To adopt the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) meeting dates for Calendar Year (CY) 2026.
2. **Background:** Per NVTa's current Bylaws, the Authority shall adopt a schedule of times, dates, and places of its regular meetings for the calendar year no later than the Annual Organizational Meeting. The proposed schedule outlined below will allow early coordination for calendar year 2026 with other regional entities.
3. **Suggested Motion:** *I move Authority approval of the calendar year 2026 meeting schedule as noted below.*
4. **Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2026:** Consistent with prior practice, the Chief Executive Officer proposes the Authority continue to meet on the second Thursday of each month at 7:00 p.m. at the NVTa office for CY2026 as indicated below with noted exceptions:
  - January 8, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. – 2025 Annual Organizational Meeting
  - February 12, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - March 12, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - April 9, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - May 14, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - June 11, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - July 9, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - **August - No meeting, unless special circumstances require.**
  - September 10, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - October 8, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - November 12, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - December 10, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
  - January 14, 2027, at 7:00 p.m. – 2026 Annual Organizational Meeting



## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## M E M O R A N D U M

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Alyssa Beyer, Regional Transportation Planner

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** HB1915 Annual Update

---

1. **Purpose:** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of the FY2025 reporting requirement for HB1915 (2015).
2. **Background:** HB1915 requires NVTa's regional long-range transportation plan, TransAction, to make reducing congestion in Planning District 8 its primary objective to the greatest extent practicable. The bill requires each locality embraced by the Authority to annually report to the Authority any land use or transportation elements of its comprehensive plan that are not consistent with the current version of TransAction.

To facilitate this reporting, NVTa staff developed a form for the jurisdictions to report the inconsistencies on an annual basis, as required by Code. The Code does not prescribe any action from NVTa based on jurisdictions' reporting.

3. **Discussion:** On August 29, 2024, NVTa staff requested jurisdictions submit the annual HB1915 reporting form by September 26, 2025, for the reporting period of July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025. All 14 jurisdictions (4 counties, 5 cities, and 5 towns) responded to the request.

The City of Alexandria reported an inconsistency within the treatment of the North Beauregard Street and Seminary Road intersection, which is outlined in TransAction Project 197: West End Alexandria Roadway Improvements. The current TransAction project specifies the construction of an ellipse at Beauregard Street and Seminary Road, while the City of Alexandria's new design includes the removal of slip lanes and widened medians/pedestrian refuge areas. This change was adopted by the City on December 14, 2024. The City has noted its intention to update the project in the next TransAction update. The next TransAction update is currently in the procurement process, with the update process anticipated to start early in CY2026.

No other jurisdiction reported updates in their Comprehensive or Mobility Plans that are inconsistent with TransAction.

The verification was conducted with the current version of TransAction adopted by the Authority in December 2022. NVTa staff have saved this information for recordkeeping.

4. **Next Steps:** NVTA staff will continue to collect and report this information from jurisdictions on an annual basis.

**Attachment:** Annual Reporting of HB1915 Form



Annual Reporting of HB 1915 Requirements

**Purpose:** HB 1915 (2015) requires NVT's regional transportation plan to make reducing congestion in Planning District 8 its primary objective to the greatest extent practicable. The bill requires each locality embraced by the Authority to annually report to the Authority any land use or transportation elements of its comprehensive plan that are not consistent with the regional transportation plan.

**Instructions:** Each locality (defined as counties and cities) is to submit an annual report noting all land use and transportation changes made to your comprehensive plan during the reporting period that are inconsistent with NVT's long range plan. This form must be signed by a person at the Director level or above. **NVT adopted TransAction Update on December, 8, 2022** and therefore, please report any inconsistencies with the 2022 TransAction Update (<https://thenovaauthority.org/transportation-planning/long-range-plan/transaction>).

Reporting Period: July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1. Were there any changes made to the transportation section of your locality's Comprehensive Plan or Mobility Plan during the reporting period that made any elements of the Plan inconsistent with TransAction? (circle one)      Yes / No
- 2. If yes, please identify each **CONFLICTING** element separately and describe below. Provide a weblink to the plan and the relevant chapter/section and page number(s).

Description of change made	Weblink	Section/Page reference	Date of Board/Council adoption

3. Were there any changes made to the land use section of your locality's Comprehensive Plan during the reporting period that made any elements of the Plan inconsistent with TransAction? (circle one) Yes / No
4. If yes, please identify each **CONFLICTING** element separately and describe below. Provide a weblink to the plan and the relevant chapter/section and page number(s).

Description of change made	Weblink	Section/Page reference	Date of Board/Council adoption

5. Please provide a copy (copies) of board/council item(s) in support of the Comprehensive Plan change(s) in addition to board/council resolution(s).

Name: _____ (Director level or above)	Signature: _____
Title: _____	Date: _____
Contact (Phone, email): _____	

## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Kristen Sarik, Regional Transportation Planner

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** FY2025 Annual Report to the Joint Commission on Transportation  
Accountability

- 
1. **Purpose:** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of the FY2025 Annual Report to the Joint Commission on Transportation Accountability (JCTA).
  2. **Background:** The Authority is required to submit an annual report to the JCTA regarding the usage of funding generated pursuant to the provisions of Title 33.2-2500, of the *Code of Virginia*, as amended. To meet this requirement, NVTa staff have prepared the attached report to inform the JCTA of the following:
    - the FY2025 revenues and allocations,
    - all funding programs approved by the Authority to date,
    - the 70% Regional Revenue Funds appropriated in FY2025, and,
    - the details of the usage of 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds for FY2014 to FY2025, which the NVTa jurisdictions used for various transportation projects and programs.

The report also provides revenue estimates for the period FY2026-2029. The report will be submitted to the JCTA before the November 15, 2025, deadline.

**Attachment:** FY2025 Annual Report to the Joint Commission on Transportation  
Accountability



# Annual Report to the Joint Commission on Transportation Accountability

Fiscal Year 2025



2600 Park Tower Drive, Suite 601 Vienna, VA 22180  
November 15, 2025



# 2025 NVTa MEMBERS

As of October 31, 2025

## VOTING MEMBERS

---

### Chair

**Hon. Phyllis J. Randall**, Loudoun County

### Vice Chairman

**Hon. David Snyder**, City of Falls Church

**Hon. Jennifer Boysko**, Virginia Senate

**Hon. Michelle Davis-Younger**, City of Manassas

**Hon. Karrie Delaney**, Virginia Speaker of the House Appointee

**Hon. Matt de Ferranti**, Arlington County

**Hon. Alyia Gaskins**, City of Alexandria

**DJ Gribbin**, Governor's Appointee, Commonwealth Transportation Board

**Hon. Deshundra Jefferson**, Prince William County

**Hon. Jeffrey C. McKay**, Fairfax County

**Hon. Alanna Mensing**, City of Manassas Park

**Hon. Catherine S. Read**, City of Fairfax

**Hon. Briana D. Sewell**, Virginia Speaker of the House Appointee

**Vacant**, Gubernatorial Appointee

## NON-VOTING MEMBERS

---


**Hon. Linda Colbert**, Town of Vienna

**Bill Cuttler**, Virginia Department of Transportation

**Tiffany Robinson**, Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation



# NVTA Jurisdictions and Major Transportation Facilities



# Table of Contents

<b>1. Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. What is New?.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Fiscal Year 2025 – Overall Revenue and Allocation .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. 70 Percent Regional Revenue Funds .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. 30 Percent Local Distribution Revenue Funds.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6. Fiscal Year 2026-2029 Revenue Estimates.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7. NoVA Gateway .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix: Projects Programmed with 30 Percent Local Distribution Revenue Funds from FY2014 through FY2025 by Jurisdictions .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Arlington County .....	14
Fairfax County .....	17
Loudoun County .....	20
Prince William County.....	24
City of Alexandria .....	28
City of Fairfax .....	30
City of Falls Church .....	33
City of Manassas .....	36
City of Manassas Park.....	39
Town of Dumfries .....	41
Town of Herndon .....	43
Town of Leesburg .....	45
Town of Purcellville .....	48
Town of Vienna.....	50

## List of Tables

Table 1: NVTAs Funding Programs.....	5
Table 2: <b>Projects that Jurisdictions/Agencies Voluntarily Withdrew in FY2025</b> .....	5
Table 3: Projects that Received 70% Regional Revenue Fund Appropriations in FY2025 .....	6
Table 4: 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds for FY2025 (as of June 30, 2025) .....	7
Table 5: Summary of All Projects Programmed by Jurisdictions with 30% Local Distribution Funds from FY2014 through FY2025 – Number of Projects by Mode and Jurisdiction .....	8
Table 6: Summary of All Projects Programmed by Jurisdictions with 30% Local Distribution Funds from FY2014 through FY2025 – 30% Funds Allocated to Projects by Mode and Jurisdiction.....	9
Table 7: NVTAs Revenue Estimates for FY2026–2029 .....	10
Table 8: NVTAs FY2026-2029 Estimated Revenue Allocation .....	11

## List of Figures

Figure 1: NVTAs FY2025 Revenue Breakdown.....	3
Figure 2: FY2025 70% Regional Revenue and 30% Local Distribution Revenue.....	4
Figure 3: NVTAs 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds Number of Projects by Mode .....	8
Figure 4: NVTAs 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds Allocated Funds by Mode .....	9
Figure 5: Projected FY2026-2029 Revenue by Type .....	10

# 1. BACKGROUND

The Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) is a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia, created in 2002 by the General Assembly through the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority Act, Chapter 25, Title 33.2, of the *Code of Virginia*. The NVTA's primary functions are to develop and update the region's long range transportation plan (TransAction), conduct regional transportation project planning, and with the funds available to NVTA, fund regional multimodal transportation projects benefiting Northern Virginia by giving priority to projects that achieve the greatest congestion reduction relative to cost.

On April 3, 2013, the Virginia General Assembly approved House Bill 2313 (HB 2313, 2013). This legislation established a funding stream for transportation in Northern Virginia and allowed NVTA to begin fulfilling its mission to address regional transportation challenges. Title 33.2-2500, of the *Code of Virginia* requires the separation of these funds into "70% Regional Revenue", which is allocated by NVTA for regional transportation projects; and "30% Local Distribution Revenue", which is distributed to jurisdictions for their transportation projects and purposes. Revenues began to flow to NVTA on July 1, 2013. Subsequently, on July 24, 2013, NVTA approved its first project list using the 70% Regional Revenues, the FY2014 Program, setting in motion a new era of transportation improvements for the Northern Virginia region. Following the adoption of the first three funding programs, NVTA currently conducts biannual updates to its Six Year Program (SYP). The most recent update was adopted on July 11, 2024, with 24 projects totaling more than \$700 million in funding. In total, NVTA has approved 135 multimodal projects and committed nearly \$3.7 billion in 70% Regional Revenue Funds. In addition to NVTA 70% Regional Revenue funded projects, through the provisions of HB 2313, NVTA has distributed \$1,253,837,046 in 30% Local Distribution Revenue funding directly to member jurisdictions for public transportation priorities of their choice within their jurisdictions.

NVTA embraces the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William, and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park. NVTA's governing body consists of seventeen members as follows: the chief elected official, or his/her designee, of each county or city embraced by NVTA; two members appointed by the Speaker of the House; one member of the Senate appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules; and two citizens who reside in different counties or cities embraced by NVTA, appointed by the Governor, including a member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board. In addition, the Director of the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, the Commissioner of Highways or their designee(s); and the chief elected official of one town in a county embraced by NVTA, all serve as non-voting members.

Per the Virginia General Assembly Budget Bill HB 5002 of 2014, the Joint Commission on Transportation Accountability (JCTA) shall regularly review and provide oversight of the usage of funding generated pursuant to the provisions of HB 2313. To meet this requirement, NVTA has prepared this report to inform the JCTA on the uses of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority Fund through FY2025.

## 2. WHAT IS NEW?

Pursuant to the Virginia General Assembly's 2020 Omnibus Transportation Bill, House Bill 1414 / Senate Bill 890 (HB1414/SB890, 2020), effective on July 1, 2020, the General Assembly amended numerous laws related to transportation funds, revenue sources, construction, and safety programs. The bill adopted numerous structural changes to the transportation funding system in the Commonwealth. Most transportation revenues are now being directed to a new Commonwealth Transportation Fund and the existing Highway Maintenance and Operating Fund. Funds are then disbursed, based on codified formulas, to sub-funds established to meet the varying transportation needs of different modes of transportation.

In Northern Virginia, the Omnibus Transportation Bill established a new regional congestion fee imposed at a rate of \$0.10 per \$100 for the recordation of conveyance of a deed to reinstate a portion of the HB2313 (2013) funds diverted to Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), July 1, 2018 (HB 1539/SB 856, 2018).

Additional efforts by the General Assembly to restore funds diverted to WMATA, the Omnibus Transportation Bill provided a \$20 million transfer from the Northern Virginia Transportation District Fund (the NVTD Fund Transfer) to NVTDA. Also, the Interstate 81 Improvement Fund (SB1716/HB2718, 2019) revenue (which did not meet initial revenue projections) was changed. The General Assembly moved this revenue from the I-81 Improvement Fund to an annual allocation of 8.4% of funds available in the Interstate Operations and Enhancement Program through SB890/HB1414 (2020). These actions have resulted in the return of \$63.5 million (based on Commonwealth estimates) of the \$102 million annually diverted to the WMATA in 2018, SB856/HB1539. As of FY2025, this leaves a remaining unrestored amount of \$38.5 million.

In September of 2021, furthering the principles of transparency and accountability, NVTDA unveiled its project dashboard, [NoVA Gateway](#). The dashboard provides details of projects funded with 70% Regional Revenues in the form of maps, tables, charts and descriptions. In March of 2025, NVTDA began to provide details of projects funded with 30% Local Distribution Revenue in the form of maps, tables, charts and descriptions. This update also included added lane miles for active transportation, dedicated transitway and roadway for both 70% Regional Revenue and 30% Local Distribution Revenue projects. Details are provided in Section 7.

The current version of the long-range multimodal transportation plan for Northern Virginia, TransAction, was adopted in December of 2022. An update to the plan with a horizon year of 2050 is anticipated to be adopted by December of 2027. The update involves a two-year process that includes confirming transportation needs, identifying multimodal recommendations, and evaluating projects in the plan leveraging model analytics and conducting public engagement.

The FY2026-2031 Six Year Program (SYP) application process is currently underway as of July 2025. The SYP will be adopted in the Summer of 2026 after extensive data-driven project evaluation and public engagement.


NVTDA adopted the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Action Plan in July of 2025. This BRT Action Plan builds upon NVTDA's BRT investments totaling more than \$880 million to create a blueprint for a regionally connected BRT system providing fast, frequent and reliable transit service. Developed with the help of a multi-agency BRT Planning Working Group established by NVTDA in early 2021, the Action Plan evaluates the impact of, and opportunities and challenges with, 28 potential BRT routes serving multiple areas in Northern Virginia, as well as popular destinations in Maryland and Washington, DC. The BRT Action Plan provides a strong blueprint for jurisdictions and agencies to develop BRT lines incrementally in addition to supplying the information necessary to demonstrate how they can successfully function as an integrated system once fully implemented.




### 3. FISCAL YEAR 2025 – OVERALL REVENUE AND ALLOCATION

HB 2313 generated approximately \$437.3 million in FY2025. These funds were then distributed, as per Title 33.2-2500, of the *Code of Virginia*, with 30% to the member jurisdictions and 70% to the selected regional transportation projects. See Figures 1 and 2 below.

**Figure 1: NVTAFY2025 Revenue Breakdown**



**Figure 2: FY2025 70% Regional Revenue and 30% Local Distribution Revenue**



*Source: NVTA FY2025 Financial Reports*

## 4. 70 PERCENT REGIONAL REVENUE FUNDS

In total, NVTA has approved 179 project applications, representing an investment of nearly \$3.7 billion. There are a number of projects that received funding for different phases across various funding programs. Therefore, while 179 total project applications have been approved, these represent 135 unique projects through the seven funding programs. See details of each program in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: NVTA's Funding Programs**

Program	Adoption Date	Number of project applications approved**	Total funds approved
FY2014*	7/24/2013	30	\$178,784,455
FY2015-2016*	4/23/2015	35	\$324,483,482
FY2017*	7/14/2016	11	\$166,043,951
FY2018-2023 SYP*	6/14/2018	42	\$1,192,773,281
FY2020-2025 SYP*	7/9/2020	19	\$520,460,783
FY2022-2027 SYP*	7/14/2022	18	\$583,201,714
FY 2024-2029 SYP	7/11/2024	24	\$717,435,252
<b>Total</b>		<b>179</b>	<b>\$3,683,182,918</b>

\* There were one or more projects in these programs that were withdrawn partially or fully by the applicant prior to or after the adoption. Such projects and funding are excluded in this table.

\*\* Projects that received funding through applications in different programs are counted in each program. When counted as single projects, the total number of unique projects approved is 135.

The projects shown on Table 2 below were approved by the Authority for funding but were withdrawn subsequently by the project sponsors. These project withdrawals resulted in \$134,231,000 returned to the 70% Regional Revenue fund to be used in future SYPs.

**Table 2: Projects that Jurisdictions/Agencies Voluntarily Withdrew in FY2025**

Funding Program(s)	Jurisdiction	Project Name	Funding Amount
FY2015-2016/ FY2018-2023	Prince William County	Route 28 Corridor Roadway Improvements (Route 28 Bypass)	\$95,000,000
FY2020-2025	Arlington County/ NOVA Parks	Arlington W&OD Trail Enhancements	\$650,000
FY2020-2025	Loudoun County	Evergreen Mills Road Widening from Northstar Blvd to Stone Springs Boulevard	\$18,000,000
FY2022-2027	Loudoun County	Ryan Road Widening (Phase 2): Evergreen Mills Road to Beaverdam Drive	\$16,000,000
FY2022-2027	Town of Herndon	Herndon Parkway Improvements at Worldgate Drive Extension	\$4,581,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$134,231,000</b>

Additionally, NVTA appropriated \$358,400,000 toward 9 projects in FY2025. Details are provided in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Projects that Received 70% Regional Revenue Fund Appropriations in FY2025**

<b>Jurisdiction / Agency</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>NVTA Funding Amount</b>
<b>Arlington County</b>	CC2DCA Intermodal Connector, Crystal City to Ronald Reagan National Airport	\$18,000,000
<b>Arlington County</b>	Ballston-MU Metrorail Station West Entrance	\$58,900,000
<b>Fairfax County</b>	Rolling Road Widening: Hunter Village Drive to Old Keene Mill Road	\$27,700,000
<b>Fairfax County</b>	Fairfax County Parkway Widening: Route 29 to Nomes Court.	\$37,400,000
<b>Fairfax County</b>	Fairfax County Parkway Widening: Nomes Court to Route 123	\$108,000,000
<b>Loudoun County</b>	Construct Crosstrail Boulevard: Sycolin Road to Dulles Greenway	\$36,700,000
<b>Loudoun County</b>	Evergreen Mills Road Widening: Northstar Boulevard to Stone Springs Boulevard*	\$18,000,000
<b>Prince William County</b>	University Boulevard Extension: Devlin Road to Wellington Road	\$53,000,000
<b>City of Fairfax</b>	Jermantown Road/Route 29 Intersection Improvements	\$700,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$358,400,000</b>

*\*Project was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant*

## 5. 30 PERCENT LOCAL DISTRIBUTION REVENUE FUNDS

Title 33.2-2500, of the *Code of Virginia*, provides that 30% of the revenues received by NVTa shall be distributed to the member jurisdictions, on a pro rata basis, after NVTa completes the annual certification for each jurisdiction, ensuring that the funds were only used under legislated requirements.<sup>1</sup> Counties are required by law to work cooperatively with towns (with a population of 3,500 or more) to ensure the towns receive their respective share of the 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds.


Each city's or county's 30% share is based on the total taxes that are generated in or attributable to that locality. Towns with populations of 3,500 or more receive their 30% share through the county they are in. The town's allotment of 30% funds is based on the total number of school-age children within the town. The use of 30% revenues is solely the decision of the jurisdiction, provided they are used for one of the four public transportation purposes delineated in the Code of Virginia:

1. Additional urban or secondary highway construction;
2. Other capital improvements that reduce congestion;
3. Other transportation capital improvements which have been approved by the most recent long range transportation plan adopted by NVTa; or,
4. Public transportation purposes.

Each jurisdiction annually certifies to NVTa that the funds were used as required by statute. The distribution of FY2025 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds is noted in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds for FY2025 (as of June 30, 2025)**

Jurisdiction	30% Local Funds
Arlington County	\$ 12,156,713
Fairfax County	\$ 54,775,929
Loudoun County	\$ 26,723,017
Prince William County	\$ 20,921,115
City of Alexandria	\$ 8,827,721
City of Fairfax	\$ 2,825,357
City of Falls Church	\$ 1,360,268
City of Manassas	\$ 3,228,302
City of Manassas Park	\$ 659,588
<b>Total Disbursements</b>	<b>\$ 131,478,010</b>



Source : NVTa FY2025 Financial Reports

Note: Distribution includes interest accrued on the 30% Local Distribution Revenue Fund


All member jurisdictions received their proportional share of the 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds in FY2025. Table 5 and Figure 3 show the number of projects by mode that the jurisdictions are advancing with 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds through FY2025. Table 6 and Figure 4 show the dollar amount allocated to these projects. The appendix at the end of the report provides a list of projects and other details by jurisdiction. It is important to note that 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds can be accumulated over multiple years to advance projects.

<sup>1</sup> As required in the annual certification to NVTa, jurisdictions must enact the local Commercial and Industrial Property (C&I) at \$0.125 per \$100 valuation. Those jurisdictions that do not impose the C&I tax at the maximum allowed rate, will have to make an equivalent transfer for the difference or have their 30% revenues reduced by a corresponding amount. Jurisdictions that use the funds for non-transportation purposes will not receive 30% funds in the following year. Jurisdictions must also maintain a required level of prior local transportation funding in order to continue to receive 30% funds in the future.

**Table 5: Summary of All Projects Programmed by Jurisdictions with 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds from FY2014 through FY2025 – Number of Projects by Primary Mode and Jurisdiction**

Jurisdictions	Bus	Rail	Bike/Ped	Roadway	Intersection/ Interchange	Transportation Technology	Other
Arlington County	8	3	2	6	0	5	4
Fairfax County	3	2	6	7	5	0	4
Loudoun County	4	1	13	20	14	0	3
Prince William County	1	1	5	13	7	0	2
City of Alexandria	10	3	1	0	5	0	0
City of Fairfax	1	0	9	7	4	3	3
City of Falls Church	2	1	11	2	5	2	3
City of Manassas	0	0	10	8	2	1	0
City of Manassas Park	0	3	3	8	1	0	0
Town of Dumfries	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Town of Herndon	0	0	1	4	4	0	0
Town of Leesburg	0	0	8	9	0	1	0
Town of Purcellville	0	0	5	3	2	0	0
Town of Vienna	0	0	6	1	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Total Number of Projects that have 30% Revenue: 290</b>							

**Figure 3: NVT A 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds Number of Projects by Primary Mode**






**Table 6: Summary of All Projects Programmed by Jurisdictions with 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds from FY2014 through FY2025 – 30% Local Distribution Revenue Allocated to Projects by Primary Mode and Jurisdiction**

Jurisdictions	Bus	Rail	Bike/Ped	Roadway	Intersection/ Interchange	Transportation Technology	Other
Arlington County	\$30,614,717	\$437,852	\$21,801,530	\$15,075,967	\$0	\$16,922,072	\$5,031,485
Fairfax County	\$113,557,107	\$139,292,795	\$16,290,578	\$44,771,753	\$22,207,439	\$0	\$40,826,671
Loudoun County	\$7,003,332	\$27,793,989	\$22,195,656	\$73,857,239	\$16,715,735	\$0	\$310,615
Prince William County	\$167,587	\$50,642,486	\$6,486,552	\$52,394,931	\$92,119,228	\$0	\$3,659,222
City of Alexandria	\$23,250,565	\$38,243,328	\$241,331	\$0	\$2,625,000	\$60,000	\$0
City of Fairfax	\$20,633,585	\$0	\$301,320	\$935,640	\$1,089,745	\$533,341	\$785,345
City of Falls Church	\$368,572	\$4,547,385	\$1,289,399	\$675,000	\$3,551,169	\$266,126	\$442,645
City of Manassas	\$0	\$0	\$8,900,997	\$9,329,300	\$1,953,687	\$1,300,000	\$0
City of Manassas Park	\$0	\$0	\$1,001,913	\$5,950,261	\$0	\$11,500	\$0
Town of Dumfries	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Town of Herndon	\$0	\$0	\$373,090	\$6,363,216	\$2,122,378	\$0	\$0
Town of Leesburg	\$0	\$0	\$9,564,879	\$12,745,914	\$0	\$150,000	\$0
Town of Purcellville	\$0	\$0	\$835,222	\$2,493,885	\$733,920	\$0	\$0
Town of Vienna	\$0	\$0	\$2,840,850	\$46,785	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$195,595,465</b>	<b>\$260,957,835</b>	<b>\$92,123,317</b>	<b>\$226,139,891</b>	<b>\$143,118,301</b>	<b>\$19,243,039</b>	<b>\$51,055,983</b>
<b>Total Amount of Funding of 30% Revenue Allocated to Projects: \$988,233,831</b>							

**Figure 4: NVTa 30% Local Distribution Revenue Allocated Funds by Primary Mode**



Notes: This 30% summary project list, and accompanying graphs, were generated on October 28, 2025, based on responses received from jurisdictions to an NVTa staff request. Jurisdictions may use 30% Local Revenue Distribution funds for staff resources but they are not reported here.

## 6. FISCAL YEAR 2026-2029 REVENUE ESTIMATES


Current revenue projections for FY2026 through FY2029 are shown in Table 7, Table 8 and Figure 5. NVTA determines estimates for Sales Tax and the Regional Congestion Fee (Grantor's). The Commonwealth provides estimates for the transfer from the Interstate Operations and Enhancement Program. The Northern Virginia Transportation District (NVTD) transfer is set by legislation at \$20 million annually. These estimates were adopted by NVTA in June 2024.

**Table 7: NVTA Revenue Estimates for FY2026–2029**

NVTA Revenue	FY2026 Projection	FY2027 Projection	FY 2028 Projection	FY 2029 Projection	Total
Sales Tax	\$392,473,042	\$404,247,234	\$391,800,000	\$405,500,000	\$1,594,020,276
Interstate Operations & Enhancement Program	\$23,800,000	\$24,200,000	\$23,705,472	\$25,509,274	\$97,214,746
Grantor's Tax	\$31,805,911	\$32,442,029	\$33,090,869	\$33,752,687	\$131,091,496
NVTD Transfer	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$80,000,000
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$468,078,954</b>	<b>\$480,889,263</b>	<b>\$468,596,341</b>	<b>\$484,761,961</b>	<b>\$1,902,326,519</b>

Source : NVTA Adopted Revenue Projections  
Note : The totals may not add up due to rounding.

**Figure 5: Projected FY2026-2029 Revenue by Type**



**Table 8: NVTa FY2026-2029 Estimated Revenue Allocation**


	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
70% Regional Revenue	\$327,655,267	\$336,622,484	\$328,017,439	\$339,333,373
30% Local Distribution Revenue	\$140,423,686	\$144,266,779	\$140,578,902	\$145,428,588

*Source : NVTa Adopted Revenue Projections*

## 7. NoVA Gateway

In September of 2020, NVTA unveiled its project dashboard, NoVA Gateway. The NoVA Gateway is a public-facing dashboard that provides details on projects funded by NVTA revenues. Throughout the years, various updates and upgrades were implemented to the NoVA Gateway to show more details. Most recently in March of 2025, the dashboard was updated to provide details of projects funded with 30% Local Distribution Revenue in the form of maps, tables, charts and descriptions. This update also included added lane miles for active transportation, dedicated transitway, and roadway for both 70% Regional Revenue and 30% Local Distribution Revenue projects. Visitors to the NoVA Gateway can see all projects or sort them by revenue type, funding status, project sponsor, project location, corridors, and/or transportation mode. Details are displayed as maps, tables, charts, and descriptions, and project information can be downloaded as an Excel file. Project details are updated regularly to give the latest information.

NoVA Gateway can be accessed at <https://novagateway.org>



Note: Screenshot as of 10/15/2025

## APPENDIX: PROJECTS PROGRAMMED WITH 30 PERCENT LOCAL DISTRIBUTION REVENUE FUNDS FROM FY2014 THROUGH FY2025 BY JURISDICTIONS

This section contains each individual jurisdiction’s list of projects using NVTAs’s 30% Local Distribution Revenue Funds. It includes the name of the project, 30% funds allocated, primary mode, phases of the project that funds are being applied towards, the status of the project, and the completion date of the project. Two accompanying charts are also included for each jurisdiction. The first highlights the 30% funding allocated to each primary mode of project for that jurisdiction. The second shows the total amount of funding allocated to projects alongside the remaining amount of funds received by the jurisdiction though not yet allocated to projects. Only the cumulative FY2014-2025 30% allocated funds are shown in these subsequent tables. The data presented in these charts are for contextual purposes only and are based on unverified survey responses from project coordinators at the jurisdiction, and not NVTAs controlled fiscal records. Any fields without data indicate that information was not supplied.

# ARLINGTON COUNTY

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Capital Bikeshare (multiple locations)	\$17,485,542	Bike/Ped	Operations, Expansion	Funded and ongoing	Ongoing
Improvements Outside Major Corridors (multiple locations)	\$11,819,711	Roadway	Design, CN	Funded and ongoing	Ongoing
Transit Operations (incremental cost for new routes)	\$10,083,085	Bus/BRT	Operations	Funded and ongoing	Ongoing
ART Bus Procurement	\$10,032,229	Bus/BRT	Acquisition	Funded and ongoing	
Traffic Signal Rebuilds, Infrastructure Upgrades, Facilities (multiple locations)	\$7,643,241	Transportation Technology	Design, CN	Funded and ongoing	Ongoing
ART Operations and Maintenance Facility	\$6,122,852	Bus/BRT	Design, CN	Under Construction	Fall 2024
Intelligent Transportation Systems (includes TMC and CCTV upgrades)	\$5,846,582	Transportation Technology	Design, Acquisition, CN	Funded and ongoing	Ongoing
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	\$4,315,988	Bike/Ped	Design, CN	Funded and ongoing	N/A
Project Development	\$3,509,023	Other	Other	Funded and ongoing	N/A
Transit ITS and Planning (Includes TSP)	\$3,335,754	Transportation Technology	Other	Funded and ongoing	N/A
Bus Stops and Shelters, including accessibility improvements (multiple locations)	\$2,694,737	Bus/BRT	Design, CN	Funded and ongoing	Ongoing
Traffic Counts (multiple locations)	\$1,359,287	Roadway	Other	Funded and ongoing	N/A
Safety Improvements	\$882,092	Roadway	Design	Ongoing	N/A
Strategic Network Analysis and Planning	\$682,049	Other	Plan	Ongoing	N/A
Transportation Demand Management	\$653,368	Other	Other	Funded and ongoing	N/A
Ballston Multimodal Improvements	\$650,270	Bus/BRT	CN	Completed	Completed
Transit Strategic Plan & ART Asset Management Plan	\$629,911	Bus/BRT	Plan	Transit Strategic Plan Update Funded and Ongoing	N/A
Carlin Springs Road Bridge over George Mason Drive (Replacement)	\$526,800	Roadway	CN	Completed	Completed
Arlington Blvd Intersections (multiple locations)	\$387,783	Roadway	Design	Completed	Completed



Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Bus Bay Expansion - East Falls Church Metro Station	\$384,063	Bus/BRT	Design, CN	Under Construction	Summer 2026
Crystal City Metro East Entrance	\$360,000	Rail	Design	Under Construction	Summer 2027
STAR Call Center Office Space	\$187,045	Other	Other	Completed	Completed
Arlington Blvd/Washington Blvd Interchange Access Improvements	\$100,294	Roadway	Design	Funded and ongoing	FY2034
Traffic Signal Optimization	\$61,095	Transportation Technology	Other	Ongoing	N/A
Court House Metrorail Station Access Improvements	\$60,894	Rail	Design	Design	FY2034
Microtransit Implementation Plan	\$35,400	Transportation Technology	Plan	Completed	N/A
Langston Multimodal Studies	\$17,570	Bus/BRT	Plan	Ongoing	N/A
Ballston-MU Metrorail Station West Entrance*	\$16,958	Rail	Design	Design	Summer 2029
<b>Total Number of Projects: 28</b>	<b>\$89,883,623</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with both 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


Arlington County		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	8	\$30M
Rail	3	\$0.4M
Bike/Ped	2	\$21M
Roadway	6	\$15M
Intersection/ Interchange	0	\$0.0M
Technology	5	\$17M
Other	4	\$5M
Totals	28	\$89M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# FAIRFAX COUNTY

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Fairfax Connector Service	\$112,191,650	Bus/BRT	Operations	Service in effect	
WMATA Capital Funding	\$94,400,343	Rail	Transfer to WMATA Capital Fund	County transfer to the WMATA Capital Fund, per VA Code.	
Silverline Metrorail Ph II NVTA 30%	\$44,892,452	Rail	Design, CN	Silver Line Phase 2 Activity	11/1/2022
Various Project Implementation Works	\$24,544,970	Other	Other	Ongoing	
Rt29 Widening - Union Mill-Buckley Gate:	\$14,920,397	Bike/Ped	PE, CN	In construction/Ongoing	Spring 2026
Route 7 Widening: Colvin Forest Drive to Jarrett Valley Drive*	\$12,691,294	Roadway	PE, Design, CN	Completed	7/1/2024
Spot Roadway Program (6 individual projects)	\$10,912,876	Other	All	Project is completed. Punchlist corrections are anticipated to be completed in fall 2024.	
Fairfax County Parkway/Popes Head Road Interchange*	\$9,493,847	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design, CN	Project is ongoing. FHWA issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in January 2024.	12/1/2026
Route 28 Widening: Prince William County Line to Route 29 *	\$9,365,315	Roadway	PE, Design, CN	Various stages	10/9/2023
Town Center Parkway DTR Underpass Rail Support	\$8,772,952	Roadway	PE, CN	Ongoing	8/1/2019
Soapstone Drive DTR Overpass	\$8,530,365	Roadway	PE, Design	Various stages	Spring 2036
Balls Hill Road & Old Dominion Drive	\$5,494,301	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design	In design; ongoing	Fall 2028
Braddock Road Improvement Ph 2*	\$5,400,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design	Ongoing	
Traffic Studies/Planning (18 individual projects)	\$5,359,605	Other	Other	Design/PE ongoing	
Frontier Drive Extension*	\$3,000,000	Roadway	PE, Design	Completed. Design/Construction by VDOT	
Shirley Gate Road from Braddock to Fairfax County Pkwy	\$2,324,508	Roadway	PE, Design	In Design/Ongoing	2026

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Braddock Road Multimodal Study	\$1,622,687	Intersection/ Interchange	Study	Environmental study/Design ongoing	
I-66 OTB Active Transportation Projects/Post Forest Drive from West Ox Road to Random Hills Road/Legato Road	\$1,000,000	Bike/Ped	PE, CN	Completed	Mid-2026
Richmond Highway Bus Rapid Transit – Phase I & II*	\$714,033	Bus/BRT	PE, Design	99% Complete	12/1/2031
Route 1 Study (Pohick to Occoquan)	\$651,424	Bus/BRT	Study	In Design/Ongoing	
I-66/ Random Hills Road	\$277,999	Bike/Ped	PE	Ongoing	3/1/2026
Seven Corners Interchange Improvements*	\$196,604	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design	Completed	6/1/2030
Tysons Projects (Boone Blvd/Gosnell Feasibility Study)	\$87,319	Roadway	Study	Ongoing	
Active Transportation Wayfinding signage	\$82,131	Bike/Ped	Study	Completed	
Fairfax Corner Parking Facility	\$9,220	Other	Other	Construction substantially complete on 9/13/2021	9/1/2023
Telegraph Road Walkway	\$5,060	Bike/Ped	PE, Design, CN		
Redd Road Walkway (Idylwood to Pimmit)	\$4,990	Bike/Ped	PE, Design, CN		TBD
<b>Total Number of Projects: 27</b>	<b>\$376,946,342</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with both 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


Fairfax County		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	3	\$113.6M
Rail	2	\$139.3M
Bike/Ped	6	\$16.3M
Roadway	7	\$44.7M
Intersection/ Interchange	5	\$22.2M
Technology	0	\$0
Other	4	\$40.8M
Totals	27	\$376.9M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# LOUDOUN COUNTY

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Metro Capital Contribution	\$27,793,989	Rail	Other	Funded	Ongoing operational cost.
Northstar Blvd (Route 50 to Shreveport)*	\$15,997,922	Roadway	CN	Design/ROW/Construction on all on-going; Construction completed December 2024.	Completed December 2024
Sterling Blvd Extended (Pacific Blvd to Moran Rd)	\$12,315,652	Roadway	Design, ROW, Utility, CN	Funded and ongoing (Design)	Spring 2028
Belmont Ridge Road Improvements (Gloucester to Hay)	\$10,805,386	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	Construction completed	Fall 2018
Route 7 Shared Use Path	\$8,553,611	Bike/Ped	PE	Design	Fall 2029
Northstar Blvd 79 (Route 50 to Tall Cedars)*	\$7,350,000	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	CN on-going; Start Date 10/31/2021 & Contractual Substantial Completion Date 10/13/2023	Contractual Substantial Completion Date October 13, 2023
Prentice Lockridge Loudoun County Parkway*	\$7,319,000	Roadway	Design	Funded and ongoing (Design)	Summer 2030
Riverside Pkwy (Lexington Dr to Loudoun County Pkwy)	\$6,000,000	Roadway	ROW, Utility, CN	Completed; Start Date 11/14/2019 & Completion Date 07/29/2022	Completed July 29, 2022
Sidewalk and Trail Program	\$5,465,000	Bike/Ped	PE	Funded design	
Route 7 & Route 690 Interchange	\$3,845,000	Intersection/Interchange	CN	Construction Procurement	Fall 2028
Route 7 Improvements (Route 9 to Dulles Greenway)*	\$3,607,000	Roadway	Design, CN	Awaiting Design Procurement	Summer 2032
Farmwell Rd (Smith Switch to Ashburn Rd)	\$3,500,000	Intersection/Interchange	Design, CN	Funded and ongoing (Design)	Spring 2028
Hillsboro Route 9 Improvements*	\$3,361,000	Intersection/Interchange	CN	Complete	Completed April 30, 2021
Bus Shelters and Benches	\$3,293,000	Bus/BRT	PE	Design	Spring 2031
Westwind Drive State St to Ladbroke Drive	\$3,064,125	Roadway	CN	Westwind drive is in design	Fall 2031
Moorefield Parkway to Moorefield Station	\$2,624,078	Roadway	CN	Construction	Fall 2025
Braddock Summerall Supreme	\$2,421,000	Intersection/Interchange	CN	Completed	Completed
Harmony School Sidewalk	\$2,183,000	Bike/Ped	PE	Design	Spring 2029
Bus Stops for new Routes	\$2,000,000	Bus/BRT	ROW	Funded	



Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Leesburg Tuscarora Creek Trail	\$1,800,000	Bike/Ped	CN	Complete	Completed
Crosstrail Phase A2 Claudia Dr & Sycolin Road	\$1,594,493	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	Complete; Start Date 06/09/2015 & Substantial Completion 6/1/2019	Substantial Completion June 1, 2019
Montresor Road Sidewalk	\$1,510,700	Bike/Ped	PE, Design	Design	Spring 2029
Crosstrail Phase B	\$1,490,000	Roadway	CN	Complete; Start Date 06/17/2020 and Substantial Completion Date 08/19/2022	Substantial Completion Date August 19, 2022
Farebox Replacement	\$1,472,132	Bus/BRT	FF&E	Funded	
Contingency - Sidewalks (Countywide)	\$1,279,759	Bike/Ped	Design	Funded and ongoing	
Route 9 & Route 287 Roundabout	\$1,213,000	Intersection/ Interchange	Design, CN	Construction	3/15/2027
W&OD Crossing Improvements	\$934,500	Bike/Ped	Design	Construction	2/27/2026
LC Parkway Dulles Landing to Route 50	\$673,687	Roadway	CN	Project has completed design, and the Board chose to not pursue construction of the turn lane.	
Northstar / Belmont Ridge Rd Traffic Signal	\$620,000	Intersection/ Interchange	CN	Completed; Start Date 08/10/2017 & Completion Date 1/21/2021	Completed January 21, 2021
Evergreen Mills Road – Reservoir Road and Watson Road*	\$617,000	Intersection/ Interchange	ROW	Funded and ongoing (ROW)	Summer 2028
Route 50/Loudoun County Pkwy*	\$500,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE	Design	Spring 2034
Loudoun County Parkway and Beaumeade Circle Signal	\$457,987	Intersection/ Interchange	Design, ROW, CN	Completed 2018/2019	Completed 2018/2019
Mooreview Pkwy (Croson to Old Ryan Rd)	\$324,608	Roadway	CN	Complete; Start Date 03/17/2017 & Completion Date 10/6/2020	Completed October 6, 2020
Shaw Road Improvements	\$322,339	Roadway	CN	Completed; Start Date 11/1/2022 & Substantial Completion Date 4/30/2023	Substantial Completion Date April 30, 2023
Enterprise Steet Crosswalk	\$294,000	Bike/Ped	PE	Right-of-Way acquisition	Spring 2026
Project Management Consulting Services	\$238,750	Other	Design	Funded and ongoing	
Leesburg Bus Shelters	\$238,200	Bus/BRT	Design, CN	Funded	
Ryan Road - Evergreen Mills Road to Beaverdam Drive	\$138,000	Roadway	PE	Design Phase, ROW	Summer 2028

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Edgewater Street Sidewalk	\$135,822	Bike/Ped	PE, Design	Completed	Completed
Woodgrove & Fields Farm Road	\$77,488	Intersection/ Interchange	Design, ROW, CN	Construction completed	Spring 2025
Route 15 Improvements, Phase 2: Montresor to Point of Rocks, Segment 2	\$61,000	Roadway	PE	Funded and ongoing (Design)	Fall 2028
Oak Grove Road Route 824	\$54,969	Roadway	PE, Design	Completed	N/A
Traffic Calming Signs	\$54,256	Roadway	CN	Funded and ongoing (Construction)	Ongoing
Contingency - Traffic Calming (Countywide)	\$48,453	Roadway	Design, CN	Funded and ongoing	Completed
Braddock Riding Center Drive Signal	\$45,367	Intersection/ Interchange	Design, ROW, CN	Complete; Start Date 09/08/2016 & Completion Date 04/19/2018	4/19/2018
West Poplar Road Traffic Study	\$38,420	Other	PE	Complete	Completed
Route 7 – Blue Ridge Mountain / Raven Rocks Intersection	\$35,000	Intersection/I nterchange	PE	Funded for design only and ongoing (Design)	TBD
Marblehead Drive & Gloucester Traffic Study	\$33,445	Other	Design, ROW, CN	Completed fall 2018	Completed fall 2018
River Creek Sidewalks	\$23,305	Bike/Ped	Design	Complete	Completed
Contingency - Traffic Signal (Countywide)	\$18,991	Intersection/ Interchange	Design	Funded and ongoing	
Belmont Ridge Road & Freedom Trail Sidewalk	\$12,271	Roadway	Design, CN	Complete; Start Date 07/03/2019 and Completion Date 01/22/2021	Completed January 22, 2021
Sterling Sidewalks	\$9,956	Bike/Ped	Design	Complete	Completed
Ashbrook Pl & Atwater Drive Intersection	\$3,902	Intersection/ Interchange	PE	Completed; Start Date 09/29/2022 & Completion Date 06/17/2023	Completed June 17, 2023
Broadlands Blvd Sidewalk	\$3,278	Bike/Ped	CN	Completed	Completed
Route 7 Pedestrian Improvements *	\$2,725	Bike/Ped	ROW	Complete	Completed fall 2023
<b>Total Number of Projects: 55</b>	<b>\$147,876,566</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


Loudoun County		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	4	\$7M
Rail	1	\$27.8M
Bike/Ped	13	\$22.2M
Roadway	20	\$73.8M
Intersection/ Interchange	14	\$16.7M
Technology	0	\$0.0
Other	3	\$0.3M
Totals	55	\$147.8M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Minnieville Road/Prince William Parkway Interchange	\$80,000,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE	All offers have been made. Design work ongoing by developers. Utility duct bank project scheduled for advertisement pending completion of total takes being completed.	TBD
Virginia Railway Express (VRE) Subsidy	\$50,642,486	Rail	Transit Subsidy	FY24 Adopted Budget provided \$4,924,666. Amount updated in the interim between last year's JCTA publication to the current day. FY25 Adopted Budget provided \$5,468,148	N/A
Minnieville Road (Spriggs Rd to Route 234)	\$19,450,000	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	Complete
University Blvd Extension (Sudley Manor Dr to Edmonston Dr)	\$9,701,810	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Construction completed with a ribbon cutting ceremony held on sept 9th, 2024.	Completed
Prince William Parkway - University Blvd Interchange*	\$7,513,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, ROW, CN	Project is pending final inspection/approvals. Ribbon cutting event scheduled for September 2024.	Winter 2023
Potomac and Neabsco Parking Garage	\$5,280,000	Bike/Ped	ROW	65% of external road work paving has been completed. Dominion Energy installed permanent electric utilities in the parking structure in July 2024, coordinating with other PWC offices for smooth turn over after construction is complete. Anticipated ribbon cutting late Fall 2024.	Summer 2024 (FY 2025)
Neabsco Mills Road Widening (Route 1 to Smoke Court)	\$4,996,659	Roadway	ROW, CN	Project is completed and is just awaiting final financial closeout.	Spring 2024
University Blvd Extension (Devlin to Wellington)*	\$4,927,118	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Kickoff meeting held June 2024. County executed a construction agreement with NVTA July 2024 and is pending full execution.	FY 2027
Devlin Road Widening (Linton Hall Rd to Wellington Rd)*	\$4,000,000	Roadway	PE	Phase 1 of the project (Wellington - University Blvd) is partially completed. The Wellington - Jennell Dr segment was completed by the Balls Ford Road Interchange Project with surplus of funding and economies of scale. The Jennell Dr to University Blvd segment received design approval by VDOT on July 31, 2024. Utility relocations undergoing, construction award in Spring 2026.	Summer 2025 (FY 2026)

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Summit School Road & Telegraph Road Project	\$3,000,000	Roadway	CN	Construction was awarded April 2024 with construction activities beginning June 2024.	
Route 1 Widening (Featherstone to Mary's Way)*	\$2,170,000	Roadway	CN	Project Complete. Funds allocated for financial closeout.	2025
Transportation & Roadway Improvement Program (New)	\$2,106,272	Other	Discretionary / Various Improvements	Ongoing	N/A
Fuller Road Improvements	\$2,000,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, ROW, CN	Project is construction complete and is awaiting final financial closeout.	Spring 2024
Old Bridge Road at Gordon Boulevard (Route 123) Intersection Improvements	\$1,736,228	Intersection/ Interchange	PE	Advancing preliminary design phase in preparation for federal funding applications.	TBD
Van Buren Road Extension (Route 234 to Cardinal Drive) NEPA Study*	\$1,552,950	Other	PE	Draft environmental assessment approved. Design RFP issued/closed with evaluations submitted to PWC Procurement August 2024. FONSI will be completed by November 2024.	TBD
Route 28, Phase 2 (Relocated Vint Hill Road to Fitzwater Drive)*	\$1,500,000	Roadway	CN	Completed	Complete
Prince William Parkway (Old Bridge Rd to Minnieville Rd)	\$1,467,368	Roadway	ROW, CN, Project Management	Completed	Complete
North Woodbridge Pedestrian Bridge	\$1,000,000	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Design work ongoing and being completed by the developer.	FY 2027
Telegraph Road (Horner) Traffic Signal Project	\$650,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, ROW, CN	Completed - Signal operational	Complete
Elm Farm Road Shared Use Path and MOT Removal	\$625,000	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Project in design. Will not begin CN until Interchange is complete in 2028	2030
Route 1: Neabsco to Featherstone	\$361,976	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Complete	Complete
Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC) Subsidy	\$167,587	Bus/BRT	Transit Subsidy	One-time payment in June of 2017 (FY 17) of \$1,298,017 (\$167,587 30%) to PRTC to make up the shortfall between our subsidy obligations to PRTC and fuel tax revenue	N/A
Rollins Ford Rd Roundabout	\$145,000	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Design activities ongoing, Project kickoff meeting held with VDOT May 2024.	FY 2027

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Talon Median Extension	\$130,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, CN	Complete and awaiting final invoicing.	
Dumfries Road Shared Use Path/Trail (Country Club Drive to Exeter Drive)	\$91,552	Bike/Ped	CN	Completed	Complete
Old Bridge Road- Occoquan Road Interchange	\$90,000	Intersection/ Interchange	Contingen cy	Design approval anticipated Fall 2024, ROW activities completed, utility relocations anticipated to be completed October 2024, construction bid anticipated Fall 2024 (FY25)	
Rail-with-Trail	\$90,000	Bike and Pedestrian	PE	Planning study and public outreach activities in FY2025. Application submitted to SYP. Study complete 2026.	TBD
North Woodbridge Mobility Improvements (Marina Way)	\$50,000	Roadway	Contingenc y	Alternative Intersection Analysis submitted to VDOT. Public hearing is being scheduled. Right turn lane waivers being reviewed.	Summer 2027
Kerill Road Raised Crosswalk	\$25,000	Bike and Pedestrian	PE, CN	Complete and awaiting final invoicing.	
<b>Total Number of Projects: 29</b>	<b>\$205,470,006</b>				



*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with both 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*



Prince William County		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	1	\$0.16M
Rail	1	\$50M
Bike/Ped	5	\$6M
Roadway	13	\$52M
Intersection/ Interchange	7	\$92M
Technology	0	\$0.0
Other	2	\$3M
Totals	29	\$205M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*



The county may have allocated more funds to projects than it received.

# CITY OF ALEXANDRIA

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
DASH Bus Fleet Replacement*	\$20,998,000	Bus/BRT	Bus Procurement	Funded and ongoing	12/31/2037
WMATA Capital Contribution	\$19,801,911	Rail	Design, CN	Funded and ongoing	Ongoing program
WMATA Operating Subsidy	\$14,185,417	Rail	Support for WMATA subsidy	Ongoing	Ongoing program
Additional WMATA Subsidy (Base Ops)	\$4,256,000	Rail	Support for WMATA subsidy	Completed	Completed
I-395 Ramp at Duke Street/Landmark Mall	\$1,250,000	Intersection/Interchange	Design	Ongoing	12/31/2028
DASH Service Operations & Expansion	\$615,000	Bus/BRT	Operations	Ongoing	12/31/2028
Bus Shelters and Benches	\$519,227	Bus/BRT	Design, CN	Ongoing	Completed
Duke Street at Route 1 Safety Improvements	\$500,000	Intersection/Interchange	CN	Ongoing	12/31/2028
Route 1 at E Reed Intersection Improvements	\$350,000	Intersection/Interchange	CN	Completed	Completed
Seminary Rd at Beauregard St Ellipse	\$325,000	Intersection/Interchange	Design	Funded and ongoing	12/31/2027
Transit Staffing Contingency	\$300,000	Bus/BRT	Operations	Ongoing	Ongoing program
Landmark Transit Center	\$256,000	Bus/BRT	Design, CN	Ongoing	1/31/2027
Cameron & Prince Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	\$241,331	Bike/Ped	CN	Completed	Completed
West End High Crash Intersection Improvements*	\$200,000	Intersection/Interchange	CN	Ongoing	6/30/2029
Transit Access & Amenities	\$160,000	Bus/BRT	Design, CN	Ongoing	6/30/2027
DASH Technologies	\$150,000	Bus/BRT	Operations	Ongoing	12/31/2030
Transit Strategic Plan	\$133,669	Bus/BRT	Study	Ongoing	12/31/2030
Access to Transit - City Sidewalk Connections	\$60,000	Bus/BRT	CN	Completed	Completed
Transit Signal Priority	\$60,000	Transportation Technology	CN	Ongoing	Ongoing program
NVTC Envision Route 7	\$58,669	Bus/BRT	Operations	Ongoing	12/31/2029
<b>Total Number of Projects: 20</b>	<b>\$64,420,224</b>				

*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with both 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


City of Alexandria		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	10	\$23M
Rail	3	\$38M
Bike/Ped	1	\$0.2M
Roadway	0	\$0.0M
Intersection/ Interchange	5	\$2.6M
Technology	1	\$0.06
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	20	\$64M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# CITY OF FAIRFAX

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
CUE Operations	\$20,633,585	Bus/BRT	Operations	Ongoing	
Jermantown Road*	\$869,302	Intersection/Interchange	CN	Complete	6/30/2016
Transportation Project Evaluation for Smart Scale Applications	\$770,334	Other	Other	Ongoing	
Roadbed Reconstruction (Route 50 Kamp Washington to Fairchester Dr)	\$430,306	Roadway	CN	Complete	
University Drive Traffic Calming	\$407,327	Roadway	CN	Complete	
Traffic Signal Preemption	\$405,060	Transportation Technology	CN	Complete	
Eaton/CBR Intersection*	\$130,175	Intersection/Interchange	PE	PE completed, project ongoing	12/30/2026
George Snyder Trail	\$93,329	Bike/Ped	CN	Complete	
Emergency Power Battery Backup	\$93,067	Transportation Technology	CN	Complete	
Warwick/Fairfax Blvd	\$78,751	Intersection/Interchange	PE	PE completed, project ongoing	
Old Town Sidewalk Spot Widening	\$55,391	Bike/Ped	Study, PE	Complete	
University Drive Road Diet	\$48,262	Roadway	PE	Complete	
Pickett Trail Connector	\$37,559	Bike/Ped	PE	PE completed, project ongoing	
Traffic Signal Upgrades	\$35,214	Transportation Technology	CN	Complete	
Burke Station Road Sidewalk	\$33,329	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Complete	
Chain Bridge Road Sidewalk	\$32,823	Bike/Ped	PE, CN	Complete	
Northfax West Planning*	\$21,712	Roadway	PE	Complete	9/30/2024
Railroad Avenue Sidewalk	\$19,515	Bike/Ped	PE	Complete	
Old Town Traffic Study	\$14,841	Other	Study	Complete	

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Orchard Drive Sidewalk Design	\$14,775	Bike/Ped	PE	Complete	
Mason to Metro Bike Route	\$13,884	Bike/Ped	PE	Complete	
Government Center Parkway Extension*	\$12,715	Roadway	PE	PE completed, project ongoing	9/30/2024
Orchard Street/CBR Intersection Evaluation	\$11,517	Intersection/Interchange	PE	Complete	
Cobbdale Traffic Calming	\$9,107	Roadway	PE	Complete	
University Drive Extension	\$6,211	Roadway	PE	Complete	
Fairfax Boulevard Sidewalk Improvements	\$715	Bike/Ped	PE	Complete	
Downtown Electronic Parking Signage	\$170	Other	Other	Complete	
<b>Total Number of Projects: 27</b>	<b>\$24,278,976</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


City of Fairfax		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	1	\$20M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	9	\$0.3M
Roadway	7	\$0.9M
Intersection/ Interchange	4	\$1M
Technology	3	\$0.5
Other	3	\$0.8M
Totals	27	\$24M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds





# CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
WMATA Subsidy (Citywide)	\$4,547,385	Rail	Operations & Capital	Annual spending; used mostly for capital subsidy but also for operating subsidy	
South Washington POA Multimodal Improvements*	\$1,145,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, RW, CN	Completed FY23.	Completed FY 2023
Infrastructure Programs - Signals- S Maple Ave and W Annandale Rd Signal	\$1,125,925	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, RW, CN	CN started in FY26.	FY 2026
South Washington POA - Maple Ave & S Wash Intersection	\$523,228	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, RW, CN	Completed FY23. Remaining funds transferred to Wash & Columbia	Completed FY 2023
South Washington POA - S Wash & Annandale Intersection	\$412,500	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, RW, CN	VDOT project on hold, pending funding decision.	FY 2028
Downtown Multimodal/Park Ave Great Street (Downtown POA)*	\$410,000	Bike/Ped	PE, RW, CN	Funded and ongoing. In RW phase currently.	FY 2029
Neighborhood Traffic Calming	\$400,000	Roadway	PE, RW, CN	Funded and ongoing (\$100K added in FY21)	Ongoing program
Transportation Project Development	\$400,000	Other	Other	Funding for grant application, planning and project development of transportation projects.	Ongoing program
N Wash & Columbia Signal & Intersection Improvements	\$344,516	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, RW, CN	CN started in FY26.	FY26
Van Buren Bridge Improvements*	\$275,000	Roadway	PE, CN	Completed.	Completed FY 2018
Streetlight LED Conversion	\$263,000	Transportation Technology	PE	Funded and ongoing, PE only	Ongoing program
Funds Match DRPT Bus Shelter (Route 7, various locations)	\$220,772	Bus/BRT	PE, RW, CN	Completed.	Completed
W&OD Trail Crossings	\$200,175	Bike/Ped	PE, RW, CN	Completed in FY25.	FY 2025
Broad Street Ped Crossing	\$190,603	Bike/Ped	PE, RW, CN	Completed in FY25.	FY 2024
Envision Route 7	\$147,800	Bus/BRT	PE only	Route 7 Planning Project with NVTC in phases. Funded and ongoing	Ongoing program

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
BikeShare Operating (New)	\$120,000	Bike/Ped	Operating expense		
N West Pedestrian Improvements	\$101,397	Bike/Ped	PE, CN	Completed.	Completed FY 2019
Downtown Area Pre-scoping*	\$60,000	Bike/Ped	PE Only	Funded and ongoing; Pre-scoping completed. See Downtown Multimodal for project status and funding.	FY 2029
Veterans Commons Park	\$60,000	Bike/Ped	PE, RW, CN	Funded and expected to start in July 2023	
Bikeshare Connections to Metro (Citywide)	\$51,709	Bike/Ped	PE only	Completed. \$8,291 transferred to Berman Park in FY20	Completed FY 2018
BikeShare Founders Row	\$47,224	Bike/Ped	PE only	Completed. Remaining funds transferred to W&OD Trail Crossings project.	Completed FY 2023
Walter Mess Plaza	\$40,000	Bike/Ped	PE, RW, CN	Funded and expected to start in July 2023. Name changed in interim from last year's JCTA publication to the current day.	
NVTA Expense (Annual)	\$26,645	Other	Operating expense	Annual spending	
Transportation Program Management (DRPT match)	\$16,000	Other	Other	Completed FY2021.	Completed FY 2021
Berman Park	\$8,291	Bike/Ped	PE, RW, CN	Completed in FY25.	FY 2025
N West & Great Falls Signal	\$3,126	Transportation Technology	PE, RW, CN	Completed 2022.	Completed FY 2022
<b>Total Number of Projects: 26</b>	<b>\$11,140,296</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


City of Falls Church		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	2	\$0.3M
Rail	1	\$4.5M
Bike/Ped	11	\$1.3M
Roadway	2	\$0.7M
Intersection/ Interchange	5	\$3.6M
Technology	2	\$0.3M
Other	3	\$0.4M
Totals	26	\$11M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# CITY OF MANASSAS

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Mathis Avenue (Sudley Road to Liberia Avenue)	\$3,012,000	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	ROW	12/31/2027
Dean Dr Extended (Route 28 to existing Dean Drive)	\$2,769,000	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	
Sidewalk & Bicycle Infill Initiatives (Citywide)	\$2,631,700	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Multiple projects citywide	
Longstreet Sidewalk	\$1,750,000	Bike/Ped	CN	Under construction	6/30/2026
Prince William St (Grant Ave to Wellington Rd)	\$1,659,000	Roadway	ROW, CN	Completed	
Traffic Signal Coord & Upgrades (Citywide)	\$1,300,000	Transportation Technology	CN	On-going	
Sudley Sidewalk (Grant Ave. to Mathis Ave.)	\$1,230,000	Pedestrian	PE, ROW, CN	Design	6/30/2026
Roundabout Sudley/Centreville*	\$1,150,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, ROW	ROW	6/15/2027
Grant Avenue (Lee Avenue to Wellington Rd)	\$900,000	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Phase 1 completed - Phase 2 in design	6/30/2028
Godwin Drive Bike Trail (Wellington Road to Hastings Drive)	\$900,000	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	
Centreville Road Improvements (Liberia Ave to City Limits)	\$803,687	Intersection/ Interchange	PE	Completed	
Wellington Road Shared-Use Path Gap (Nokesville Road to Prince William Street)	\$787,971	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Substantially completed. Remaining work is within Railroad ROW	11/30/2025
Project Development (Citywide)	\$690,000	Bike/Ped	Planning	11 projects: 6 completed, 5 on-going	
Commercial Corridor streetscape: Mathis Streetscape from Sudley Road to Liberia Ave. (Planning); West Street sidewalk extension; Liberia Ave/Route 28 intersection pedestrian improvements	\$646,300	Roadway	Planning, PE, ROW, CN	3 projects completed	
Battle St (Portner Street to Quarry Road)	\$381,646	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	
Dumfries Road Sidewalk Infill (Milic St. to Hastings Dr.)	\$332,000	Pedestrian	PE, ROW, CN	Under construction	4/1/2026

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Vehicular Wayfinding (Citywide)	\$220,000	Roadway	CN	Completed	
Transportation Master Plan (Citywide)	\$175,000	Bike/Ped	Planning	Completed	
Culvert Maintenance	\$100,000	Roadway	Maintenance	On-going	
Route 28/Nokesville Rd widening (City Limits to Godwin Drive)*	\$23,000	Roadway	CN	Completed	
Grant Avenue Pedestrian Improvements (at Center Street)	\$22,680	Bike/Ped	CN	Completed	
<b>Total Number of Projects: 21</b>	<b>\$21,483,984</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with both 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


City of Manassas		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	0	\$0.0M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	10	\$8.9M
Roadway	8	\$9.3M
Intersection/ Interchange	2	\$1.9M
Technology	1	\$1.3M
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	21	\$21M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds





# CITY OF MANASSAS PARK


Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Street Resurfacing (Improvements and Resealing) - includes "Street resurfacing" from FY20 and FY21	\$2,928,057	Roadway	CN	Ongoing	
Conner Drive Extension	\$1,531,349	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Project complete.	
Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter, and Asphalt Repairs - old category FY20 and FY21	\$737,255	Bike/Ped	CN	Ongoing	
Moseby Drive Culvert Replacement	\$510,612	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Project complete.	
Manassas Drive Russia Branch Culvert Replacement	\$442,100	Roadway	CN	Project complete.	
Upper Kent Drive Reconstruction	\$396,087	Roadway	PE, ROW, CN	Project complete.	
Additional Streets Projects (concrete repair and paving) - new category	\$174,658	Bike/Ped	CN	Ongoing	
Rail with Trail Feasibility Study	\$90,000	Bike/Ped	Planning	Ongoing	
Manassas Drive Traffic Study	\$59,480	Roadway	Planning	Ongoing	
Culvert Upgrade at Manassas Drive - Public Works Office	\$49,842	Roadway	CN	Project Complete.	
Moseby Emergency Repairs	\$32,733	Roadway	CN	Completed in September 2021.	
Traffic Signal Upgrades	\$11,500	Transportation Technology	CN	Project complete.	
<b>Total Number of Projects: 12</b>	<b>\$6,963,673</b>				

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


City of Manassas Park		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	0	\$0.0M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	3	\$1.0M
Roadway	8	\$5.9M
Intersection/ Interchange	0	\$0.0M
Technology	1	\$0.01
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	12	\$6.9M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



The town may have allocated more funds to projects than it received.

# TOWN OF DUMFRIES

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Route 1 (Fraley Blvd) Widening: Brady's Hill Rd to Dumfries Rd.*	\$1,500,000	Roadway	ROW	ROW Activities Ongoing.	Winter 2027 (FY 2028)
<b>Total Number of Projects: 1</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with both 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


Town of Dumfries		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	0	\$0.0M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	0	\$0.0M
Roadway	1	\$1.5M
Intersection/ Interchange	0	\$0.0M
Technology	0	\$0.0M
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	1	\$1.5M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# TOWN OF HERNDON

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Widen East Spring Street (Herndon Parkway to Town limits)/with Herndon Parkway cycle track	\$3,845,876	Roadway	ROW, Utility, CN	PE completed, RW completed, CN underway	12/1/2024
Van Buren Street Improvements (Old Spring Street to Herndon Parkway)	\$2,288,202	Roadway	PE, Design, ROW, Utility, CN	PE completed, RW completed, CN completed	9/1/2023
Elden St and Monroe St Intersection Improvements	\$804,509	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design, ROW, Utility, CN	PE completed, RW completed, CN completed	4/1/2023
Elden St and Center St Intersection Improvements	\$567,869	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design, ROW, Utility, CN	PE completed, RW completed, CN completed	3/1/2023
Park Ave & Monroe St Intersection Improvements	\$450,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design, ROW, Utility, CN	Construction completed	12/1/2015
Park Avenue sidewalks (sidewalk extension of Park Ave. and Monroe St. project)	\$373,090	Bike/Ped	Utility, CN	Construction completed	12/1/2017
Herndon Parkway Intersection Improvements at Worldgate Drive Ext.*	\$300,000	Intersection/ Interchange	PE, Design	Project On Hold	6/1/2030
Sterling Road Improvements (Elden Street to Town Limits)	\$143,138	Roadway	PE, Design	Traffic study completed, Study and Concept Design underway	12/1/2030
Worldgate Drive Extension	\$86,000	Roadway	PE, Design	Survey completed, PE (30% design) completed 2016	30% local funds were used for a study that was completed in December 2018
<b>Total Number of Projects: 9</b>	<b>\$8,858,684</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*

Town of Herndon		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	0	\$0.0M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	1	\$0.4M
Roadway	4	\$6.4M
Intersection/ Interchange	4	\$2.1M
Technology	0	\$0.0
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	9	\$8.8M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds





# TOWN OF LEESBURG

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Evergreen Mill Rd Widening (Leesburg S Corporate Limits to S King St)	\$6,735,700	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	PE Phase. Design is ongoing. Construction scheduled to begin in 2026	Winter 2028/9
Morven Park Rd Sidewalk	\$4,648,200	Bike/Ped	Design, ROW, CN	PE Phase complete. Design is ongoing. ROW is ongoing. Construction scheduled to begin in FY25.	FY2026
Market Street/King Street Intersection Improvements	\$2,279,297	Roadway	Design, CN	Project complete	Complete
Sycolin Rd Widening Phase IV (Leesburg S Corporate Limits to Tolbert Ln)	\$2,186,770	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	Project complete.	Complete
Edwards Ferry Road NE Sidewalk Improvements	\$1,819,425	Bike/Ped	Design, ROW, CN	Construction underway.	FY2026
West Market St Sidewalk (Morven Park Rd to Ayr St)	\$1,664,000	Bike/Ped	Design, ROW, CN	Project complete	Complete
Royal Street Improvements - Church Street to Wirt Street	\$1,097,000	Bike/Ped	Design, ROW, CN	PE to begin in FY27	FY 2032
Battlefield Parkway (S King St to Dulles Greenway)	\$701,000	Roadway	CN	Project complete - final request submitted 7/31/19.	Complete
Traffic Management System/Emergency Evacuation System (Townwide)	\$521,347	Roadway	CN	Project complete - final request submitted 7/30/20.	Complete
Traffic Signal - Fieldstone Drive and Battlefield Parkway	\$280,000	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	PE underway	FY2028
Plaza Street Sidewalk	\$175,810	Bike/Ped	Design, CN	PE underway	FY 2027
Traffic Signal - Sycolin Rd & Gateway Dr	\$150,000	Transportation Technology	Design, ROW, CN	PE to begin in FY26	FY 2028

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Edwards Ferry Road Sidewalk, Bus Shelters & Bus Route Signs	\$104,444	Bike/Ped	Design, ROW, CN	Project complete.	Complete
Catoctin Circle Turn Lane and Trail	\$51,000	Bike/Ped	Design, ROW, CN	PE to begin in FY28.	FY 2031
Route 15 Bypass/Edwards Ferry Rd Interchange*	\$26,800	Roadway	Design, CN	PE underway	TBD
East Market Street & Battlefield Parkway Interchange*	\$10,000	Roadway	CN	Project completed in FY2025	
East Market Street Improvements (Plaza Street to Fort Evans Road)*	\$5,000	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	PE to begin in FY2026	FY2030
Morven Park Road Crosswalk - West Market Street and Loudoun Street	\$5,000	Bike/Ped	CN	CN to begin in FY2026	FY2026
<b>Total Number of Projects: 18</b>	<b>\$22,460,793</b>				


*Note: Projects with an asterisk (\*) next to the end of their title represent projects with 30% Local Distribution Revenue funds and 70% Regional Revenue funds allocated towards them.*

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


Town of Leesburg		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	0	\$0.0M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	8	\$9.5M
Roadway	9	\$12.7M
Intersection/ Interchange	0	\$0.0M
Technology	1	\$0.2M
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	18	\$22M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# TOWN OF PURCELLVILLE


Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
12th Street Drainage & Roadway Improvements	\$1,026,689	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	In Construction	Fall 2025
Nursery Ave Improvements	\$909,244	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	Completed in FY22	Completed in FY 2022
Main & Maple Intersection Improvements, Phase 2	\$557,952	Roadway	Design, ROW, CN	Completed in FY25	Completed in FY 2025
32nd & A Street Intersection Improvements	\$510,822	Intersection/ Interchange	Design, ROW, CN	Completed in FY20	Completed in FY 2020
Hatcher Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	\$314,972	Pedestrian	Design, ROW, CN	Completed in FY22	Completed in FY 2022
East Main Street Sidewalk Improvements	\$258,460	Pedestrian	CN	Completed in FY16	Completed in FY 2016
32nd & Main Street Intersection Improvements	\$223,098	Intersection/ Interchange	Design, ROW, CN	Phase 1: completed in FY22 Phase 2: 100% Design, in ROW phase	Phase 1: Completed FY 2022 Phase 2: Fall 2026
S. 32nd Street Sidewalk, J St to Nursery Ave	\$188,217	Pedestrian	Design, ROW, CN	At 60% Design, ROW phase to begin in FY26, CN expected in FY27	Fall 2027
G Street Sidewalk Improvements	\$72,925	Pedestrian	Design, ROW, CN	At 90% Design, ROW phase to begin FY26, CN expected in FY27	Fall 2027
Main & Maple Intersection Improvements, Phase 1	\$648	Pedestrian	Design, ROW, CN	Completed IN FY19	Completed in FY 2019
<b>Total Number of Projects: 10</b>	<b>\$4,063,027</b>				

*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*


Town of Purcellville		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	0	\$0.0M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	5	\$0.8M
Roadway	3	\$2.5M
Intersection/ Interchange	2	\$0.7M
Technology	0	\$0.0M
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	10	\$4M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds



# TOWN OF VIENNA

Project Title	30% Local Distribution Fund	Primary Mode	Phases Funded	Project Status	Completion Date
Follin Lane SE Reconstruction (Echols St SE to Maple Ave)	\$1,512,695	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	
Marshall Road SW Sidewalk	\$699,655	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	January 2025
Park Street NE Sidewalk	\$368,621	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	
Church Street NE Sidewalk	\$221,871	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	Completed	
Church Street and East Street	\$46,785	Roadway		Project canceled - The PE effort resulted in a roundabout study.	
Church St Sidewalk	\$33,937	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	PE nearly complete	
Bikeshare Stations	\$4,071	Bike/Ped	PE, ROW, CN	CN Phase has begun	
<b>Total Number of Projects: 7</b>	<b>\$2,887,635</b>				


*Note: PE – Preliminary Engineering; ROW – Right of Way; CN – Construction*




Town of Vienna		
Primary Mode	Number of Projects	Amount of 30% Funds Allocated
Bus	0	\$0.0M
Rail	0	\$0.0M
Bike/Ped	6	\$2.8M
Roadway	1	\$0.04M
Intersection/ Interchange	0	\$0.0M
Technology	0	\$0.0M
Other	0	\$0.0M
Totals	7	\$2.8M

*Note: The total may not add up due to rounding.*

30% Funds Allocated by Mode



Allocation of 30% Funds





Northern Virginia Transportation Authority



## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Chair Randall, Governance and Personnel Committee Chair

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Governance and Personnel Committee Report

---

- 1. Purpose:** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of recent activities of the NVTa Governance and Personnel Committee (Committee, or GPC).
- 2. Background:** The most recent GPC meeting was held on October 9, 2025. The next meeting is scheduled for December 11, 2025.
- 3. Discussion/Information Items:** Chair Randall and Ms. Tracy Baynard (McGuire Woods Consulting LLC) will deliver a verbal update.

## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Vice Chair David Snyder, Finance Committee Chair

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Finance Committee Report

---

1. **Purpose:** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of recent activities of the NVTa Finance Committee (Committee).

2. **Background:** The last Committee meeting was held on October 9, 2025. The next Committee meeting is scheduled for December 11, 2025, as the November Finance Committee meeting was cancelled.

3. **Action Items:**

A. **Recommendation of Authority acceptance of the FY2025 Audited Financial Statements and Compliance Reports:**

The following items were considered and acted on at the Committee's October 9, 2025, meeting.

- ✓ Mr. Garber, CPA, Partner with PBMares, LLP, presented the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025, Financial and Compliance Reports; the required Results of the Audit that explains the overview of the Financial Statements, and required communications under Government Auditing Standards.
- ✓ The Authority's FY2025 Financial and Compliance Reports received an unmodified (clean) audit opinion. This opinion reflects that the Authority's financial statements, in all material respects, fairly and accurately represents the financial position of the Authority for FY2025.
- ✓ A PowerPoint summarizing the key highlights from the Financial Statements and audit process was presented by Mr. Longhi and Mr. Garber.

4. **Discussion/Information Items:**

A. **FY2026 Budget Guidance Discussions:**

The development of NVTa's three budgets for FY2027 – Local Distribution Fund Budget (30%), Regional Revenue Fund Budget (70%), and Operating Budget will be based on guidance from the Committee.

- ✓ **Local Distribution Fund Budget:** The Committee has previously recommended establishing the budgeted amount by utilizing the finalized FY2027 revenue projections which were adopted by the Authority on June 13, 2024.
  - Wording within the final proposed budget will include language which stresses compliance with the State Code that such that distributions will be

made based on revenues received from the Commonwealth, regardless of projection variances.

- Subject to adherence with the State Code required annual certification, the Local Distribution Fund revenues are restricted to proportional distribution to NVTAs's member jurisdictions.
- ✓ **Regional Revenue Fund Budget:** Prior guidance for this budget has been to base the budget on the finalized FY2025/29 revenue projections and PayGo analysis which were adopted by the Authority on June 13, 2024. The PayGo analysis confirmed funding for all previously approved projects and sets the recommended amount of funding to be made available for the FY2026/31 update to the Six Year Program.
- ✓ **Operating Fund Budget:** The Committee was provided with Operating Fund Budget guidance, organized into two distinct categories. The first category encompasses base budget escalations driven by factors such as inflation, contract terms, and required service extensions, excluding prior one-time funding. The second category pertains to new initiatives, accompanied by supporting narratives and cost estimates. The Operating Budget is funded through a transfer from the Regional Revenue Fund as an alternative to prorating the cost among member jurisdictions based on population. The Committee agreed to continue the use of the Regional Revenue Fund to support the operating budget, rather than requiring population-based contributions from member jurisdictions.

**B. Monthly Investment Portfolio Report:** The Committee received the Monthly Investment Performance update, which outlined the economic factors influencing the Federal Reserve's decision to cut interest rates. These included inflation metrics (CPI and PCE), labor market conditions, growth data, housing and credit markets, consumer sentiment, and global financial stress.

**C. Monthly Revenue Report:** The Committee received and reviewed the Monthly Revenue Report as provided in the packet.

**D. Monthly Operating Budget Report:** The Committee received and reviewed the Monthly Operating Budget Report. As of September FY2026, 15% of the budget was expended through 17% of the fiscal year.

**Attachments:**

- A.** Investment Portfolio Report
- B.** Monthly Revenue Report
- C.** Monthly Operating Budget Report

## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Dev Priya Sen, Investment & Debt Manager

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Investment Portfolio Report

1. **Purpose:** To provide the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) with required reports on investment activities and portfolio performance through August 31, 2025.
2. **Background:** This report reflects investment activity through August 31, 2025, and affirms the portfolio's investments were acquired based on safety, liquidity, and then yield. This report summarizes the portfolio structure and adherence to the NVTa Investment Policy.

**A. Current Period Reports:** The safety of the portfolio is reflected in the actual composition of the portfolio as shown below.




**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**  
**Distribution by Asset Category - Book Value**  
**Report Group: Regional Revenue**


Begin Date: 7/31/2025, End Date: 8/31/2025

Asset Category Allocation				
Asset Category	Book Value 7/31/2025	% of Portfolio 7/31/2025	Book Value 8/31/2025	% of Portfolio 8/31/2025
CD - Bank 60% Maximum	17,145,895.36	0.84	17,145,895.36	0.83
CD - Negotiable 25% Maximum	230,800,000.00	11.37	213,800,000.00	10.40
Commercial Paper 35% / 5% Maximum	18,287,238.85	0.90	18,354,819.29	0.89
Corporate Notes 50% Maximum	944,201,981.55	46.50	940,675,048.45	45.78
LGIP 100% Maximum	24,499,253.84	1.21	16,236,555.53	0.79
Money Market 60% Maximum	10,989,817.51	0.54	20,123,884.56	0.98
Municipal Bonds - US 30% Maximum	1,896,775.08	0.09	1,894,516.72	0.09
Municipal Bonds - Virginia 30% Maximum	18,577,004.39	0.91	11,578,090.80	0.56
Supranational 50% Maximum	110,748,827.45	5.45	110,727,043.93	5.39
US Agency 100% Maximum	630,966,878.38	31.08	681,976,171.33	33.19
US Treasury 100% Maximum	22,340,474.32	1.10	22,419,888.52	1.09
<b>Total / Average</b>	<b>2,030,454,146.73</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,054,931,914.49</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Portfolio Holdings as of 7/31/2025**




**Portfolio Holdings as of 8/31/2025**





- B. The liquidity of the portfolio is reflected in the portfolio's duration as 2.06 (1.0 = 1 year) and the maturity schedule is shown below.



- C. The yield on the portfolio at the end of August 2025 was 4.53%. The policy required benchmarks are shown below for yield performance comparison.

NVTA Investment Benchmarks	Aug-25 Month End
LGIP Extended Maturity Pool	3.87%
ICE BofA 1-3 Year (18-Month Avg)	4.19%
<b>NVTA Performance</b>	<b>4.53%</b>

Source: Bloomberg/NVTA Statements

### 3. Portfolio Analysis & Statistics Overview:

- A. **Safety:** The portfolio is invested primarily in:


- Local Government Investment Pool (1.21% to 0.79%)
- Commercial Paper (0.90% to 0.89%)
- Collateralized bank money market accounts (1.38% to 1.81%)
- Negotiable CD's (11.37 % to 10.40%)

- AAA/AA rated investment grade corporate bonds (46.5% to 45.78%)
- Treasuries and Agencies (32.18% to 34.28%)
- VA & US Municipals (1.00% to 0.65%)

**B. Liquidity:** The NVTa Portfolio duration is 2.06 in August 2025 (1.0 = 1 year). There was no scheduled Federal Reserve (Fed) meetings in August. At the meeting on September 17, 2025, the Fed cut interest rates for the first time in nine months amid ongoing economic uncertainty. The Fed lowered the target range for the federal funds rate by 25 basis points to 4.00%–4.25%, marking the first rate cut since December 2024. The Committee’s median projections indicate an additional 50 basis points of rate cuts by the end of 2025.

**C. Yield:** Staff continue to ladder monthly maturities in the range of \$80-\$100 million in securities, alongside managing up to \$20 million per month in positive cash flow, following these strategies:

- Staff continue to invest in bonds with to three-four-year maturities, with a focus on gradually extending portfolio duration while strategically filling maturity gaps across the curve.
- NVTa’s strategy is to benefit from potential rate cuts while maintaining a balance between return and risk. With a new Fed Chair expected in May 2026 and a series of rate cuts likely to follow, staff are deliberately extending maturities beyond two years to help preserve yield. In the event of a market or rate downturn, the portfolio is expected to adjust more gradually with the market and recover more quickly relative to the broader market, in the case or rate increases.
- NVTa's portfolio outperformed the ICE BofA 18-month average index benchmark by 34 basis points, demonstrating slightly stronger returns in a declining rate environment.
- While no significant impact is expected in the foreseeable future, we are continuing to monitor developments related to the privatization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.
- Staff consistently monitor Federal Reserve actions, market trends, and economic indicators to make informed decisions, strategically positioning the portfolio to capitalize on market shifts and emerging opportunities.



4. **Custodian Certification:** Truist Bank is the custodian of all NVTA’s investment purchases and is where all NVTA’s non-deposit investments are held. Deposit type investments are protected through the Commonwealth of Virginia collateralization program or FDIC Insurance.
5. **Policy Required Reports:** The attached Compliance - GASB 40 Report addresses specific Investment Policy requirements regarding the purchase and holding of securities. This report is fundamental for the Authority’s Annual Financial Statements and annual audit. The attached report documents:
  - **Compliance – Investment Policy, Summary:** The report shows the percentage of the portfolio by each type of investment.
  - **Investment Portfolio – By Maturity Range:** The report shows the yield to maturity and percentage of the portfolio which each type of investment represents.
  - **Portfolio Holdings by Custodian:** This report shows each depository, investment firm, or custodian holding NVTA securities or cash.

**Attachment:** Compliance - GASB 40 Report



## Portfolio Holdings Compliance - GASB 40 Report - As of 8/31/2025

Description	CUSIP/Ticker	Face Amount/Shares	Book Value	Market Value	Credit Rating 1	Credit Rating 2	% of Portfolio	Days To Maturity	Days To Call/Maturity	Maturity Date	Next Call Date	YTM @ Cost	Duration To Maturity
CD - Bank 60% Maximum													
John Marshall Bank 4.29 1/15/2027	JMBCD011624	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	None	None	0.49	502	502	1/15/2027		4.290	1.38
John Marshall Bank 4.7 4/19/2027	JMBCD041924	7,145,895.36	7,145,895.36	7,145,895.36	None	None	0.35	596	596	4/19/2027		4.700	1.63
Sub Total / Average CD - Bank 60% Maximum		17,145,895.36	17,145,895.36	17,145,895.36			0.83	541	541			4.461	1.48
CD - Negotiable 25% Maximum													
Credit Agricole 4.32 2/18/2026	22536HPV5	39,000,000.00	39,000,000.00	39,000,000.00	Fitch-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	1.89	171	171	2/18/2026		4.320	0.48
Credit Agricole 4.38 7/8/2026	22536XS9	8,000,000.00	8,000,000.00	8,016,160.00	S&P-A1	Moody's-P1	0.39	311	311	7/8/2026		4.380	0.86
Credit Agricole 4.92 6/22/2026	22536HHY8	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	Moody's-P1	S&P-A1	1.21	295	295	6/22/2026		4.920	0.82
Credit Industriel Et Commercial 4.55 9/2/2025	22536WHN9	38,000,000.00	38,000,000.00	38,000,000.00	S&P-A1	Moody's-P1	1.84	2	2	9/2/2025		4.550	0.01
DZ Bank NY 3.9 2/9/2027	23344JDH5	41,000,000.00	41,000,000.00	41,063,550.00	Fitch-AA-	Moody's-Aa2	1.99	527	527	2/9/2027		3.900	1.37
DZ Bank NY 4.22 5/12/2027	23344JDK8	27,000,000.00	27,000,000.00	27,085,320.00	Fitch-AA-	Moody's-Aa2	1.31	619	619	5/12/2027		4.220	1.67
Mizuho Bank 4.34 3/13/2026	60710TH20	15,800,000.00	15,800,000.00	15,804,582.00	S&P-A1	Moody's-P1	0.77	194	194	3/13/2026		4.340	0.54
Natixis 5.83 9/8/2025	63873QN83	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	19,989,800.00	S&P-A1	Moody's-P1	0.97	8	8	9/8/2025		5.830	0.02
Sub Total / Average CD - Negotiable 25% Maximum		213,800,000.00	213,800,000.00	213,959,412.00			10.37	272	272			4.483	0.73
Commercial Paper 35% / 5% Maximum													
MUFG Bank 0 10/21/2025	62479LXM2	18,466,000.00	18,354,819.29	18,359,635.84	S&P-A1	Moody's-P1	0.90	51	51	10/21/2025		4.360	0.14
Sub Total / Average Commercial Paper 35% / 5% Maximum		18,466,000.00	18,354,819.29	18,359,635.84			0.90	51	51			4.360	0.14
Corporate Notes 50% Maximum													
Amazon.com, Inc. 3.15 8/22/2027-27	023135BC9	30,000,000.00	29,388,723.33	29,614,200.00	S&P-AA	Fitch-AA-	1.46	721	629	8/22/2027	5/22/2027	4.260	1.93
Amazon.com, Inc. 4.55 12/1/2027-27	023135CP9	20,000,000.00	19,982,857.66	20,283,000.00	S&P-AA	Fitch-AA-	0.97	822	792	12/1/2027	11/1/2027	4.590	2.14
Amazon.com, Inc. 4.55 12/1/2027-27	023135CP9	26,000,000.00	25,967,011.76	26,367,900.00	S&P-AA	Fitch-AA-	1.26	822	792	12/1/2027	11/1/2027	4.610	2.14
Apple 1.2 2/8/2028-27	037833EC0	22,500,000.00	20,849,069.57	21,162,375.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aaa	1.09	891	829	2/8/2028	12/8/2027	4.520	2.41
BlackRock Funding 3.2 3/15/2027-27	09247XAN1	15,000,000.00	14,715,753.20	14,849,850.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.73	561	533	3/15/2027	2/15/2027	4.520	1.49
BlackRock Funding 4.6 7/26/2027-27	09290DAH4	15,000,000.00	15,026,010.74	15,188,100.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.73	694	664	7/26/2027	6/26/2027	4.502	1.84
Guardian Life 3.246 3/29/2027	40139LBF9	11,000,000.00	10,786,067.13	10,859,640.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.53	575	575	3/29/2027		4.585	1.53
Guardian Life 3.246 3/29/2027	40139LBF9	25,000,000.00	24,468,252.10	24,681,000.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.21	575	575	3/29/2027		4.710	1.53
Guardian Life 4.179 9/26/2029	40139LB1J	10,893,000.00	10,932,764.14	10,902,476.91	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.53	1,487	1,487	9/26/2029		4.080	3.72
Hanwha Q Cells 5 7/27/2028	41136TAA5	11,580,000.00	11,644,981.30	11,836,728.60	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa2	0.56	1,061	1,061	7/27/2028		4.785	2.73
Mass Mutual Global Funding 3.4 3/8/2026	57629WCH1	25,000,000.00	24,779,068.24	24,889,500.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa3	1.21	189	189	3/8/2026		5.230	0.51
Mass Mutual Global Funding 3.4 3/8/2026	57629WCH1	10,000,000.00	9,915,326.18	9,955,800.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa3	0.49	189	189	3/8/2026		5.150	0.51
Mass Mutual Global Funding 4.5 4/10/2026	57629WF2	9,000,000.00	8,966,390.54	9,016,110.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa3	0.44	222	222	4/10/2026		5.157	0.60
Mass Mutual Global Funding 4.5 4/10/2026	57629WF2	16,000,000.00	15,983,264.20	16,028,640.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa3	0.78	222	222	4/10/2026		4.680	0.60
Mass Mutual Global Funding 4.85 1/17/2029	57629WSB2	10,000,000.00	10,009,070.72	10,224,700.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa3	0.49	1,235	1,235	1/17/2029		4.820	3.14
Mass Mutual Global Funding 5.05 12/7/2027	57629WDL1	14,000,000.00	14,143,717.57	14,292,040.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa3	0.68	828	828	12/7/2027		4.550	2.15
Mass Mutual Global Funding 5.1 4/9/2027	57629W4S6	15,000,000.00	15,099,546.31	15,241,650.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa3	0.73	586	586	4/9/2027		4.652	1.53
Met Tower Global Funding 4 10/1/2027	58989V2J2	31,100,000.00	30,856,566.97	31,012,298.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	1.51	761	761	10/1/2027		4.401	1.99
MetLife 3.45 12/18/2026	59217GBY4	14,899,000.00	14,518,384.62	14,773,401.43	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.72	474	474	12/18/2026		5.620	1.27
MetLife 3.45 12/18/2026	59217GBY4	14,088,000.00	13,871,584.55	13,969,238.16	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.68	474	474	12/18/2026		4.730	1.27
MetLife 4.4 6/30/2027	59217GFB0	15,000,000.00	14,864,842.89	15,089,700.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.73	668	668	6/30/2027		4.942	1.77
MetLife 4.85 1/16/2027	58989V2G8	25,000,000.00	25,028,380.28	25,240,000.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	1.21	503	503	1/16/2027		4.760	1.34
MetLife 5.05 1/6/2028	592179KF1	7,100,000.00	7,200,607.00	7,253,502.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.34	858	858	1/6/2028		4.400	2.23
MetLife 5.4 9/12/2028	59217GFQ7	10,000,000.00	10,285,565.59	10,383,200.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.49	1,108	1,108	9/12/2028		4.375	2.77
Morgan Stanley 4.754 4/21/2026	61690U4T4	10,000,000.00	9,939,810.47	10,021,800.00	Fitch-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.49	233	233	4/21/2026		5.780	0.63
Morgan Stanley 5.882 10/30/2026-26	61690U7W4	15,000,000.00	15,180,807.14	15,294,150.00	Fitch-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.73	425	395	10/30/2026	9/30/2026	4.759	1.12
Morgan Stanley 5.882 10/30/2026-26	61690U7W4	20,000,000.00	20,233,607.66	20,392,200.00	Fitch-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.97	425	395	10/30/2026	9/30/2026	4.793	1.12
Nestle Holdings 1.15 1/14/2027-26	641062AV6	8,000,000.00	7,647,393.00	7,712,560.00	Moody's-Aa3	S&P-AA-	0.39	501	470	1/14/2027	12/14/2026	4.590	1.36
New York Life 3.25 4/7/2027	64952WEQ2	15,000,000.00	14,776,488.72	14,839,200.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.73	584	584	4/7/2027		4.231	1.55
New York Life 4.7 1/29/2029	64952WFF5	21,000,000.00	20,922,548.77	21,401,310.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.02	1,247	1,247	1/29/2029		4.820	3.18
New York Life 4.7 4/2/2026	64952WFB4	10,000,000.00	9,959,414.19	10,025,500.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.49	214	214	4/2/2026		5.450	0.57
New York Life 4.7 4/2/2026	64952WFB4	11,890,000.00	11,838,439.42	11,920,319.50	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.58	214	214	4/2/2026		5.501	0.57
New York Life 4.9 4/2/2027	64953BBM9	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	20,289,600.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.97	579	579	4/2/2027		4.900	1.52
New York Life 5.45 9/18/2026	64953BBF4	11,000,000.00	11,003,549.41	11,153,450.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.53	383	383	9/18/2026		5.416	1.01
New York Life 5.45 9/18/2026	64953BBF4	12,500,000.00	12,560,142.97	12,674,375.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.61	383	383	9/18/2026		4.950	1.01
Northwestern Mutual Global 1.75 1/11/2027	66815L2F5	25,000,000.00	24,061,698.00	24,244,750.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.21	498	498	1/11/2027		4.726	1.35

Description	CUSIP/Ticker	Face Amount/Shares	Book Value	Market Value	Credit Rating 1	Credit Rating 2	% of Portfolio	Days To Maturity	Days To Call/Maturity	Maturity Date	Next Call Date	YTM @ Cost	Duration To Maturity
Northwestern Mutual Global 4.11 9/12/2027	66815L2T5	5,650,000.00	5,607,123.84	5,660,565.50	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.27	742	742	9/12/2027		4.510	1.93
Northwestern Mutual Global 4.35 9/15/2027	66815L2K4	9,354,000.00	9,325,288.29	9,412,556.04	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.45	745	745	9/15/2027		4.510	1.94
Northwestern Mutual Global 4.35 9/15/2027	66815L2K4	15,000,000.00	14,960,012.09	15,093,900.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.73	745	745	9/15/2027		4.488	1.94
Northwestern Mutual Global 5.07 3/25/2027	66815L2R9	21,000,000.00	21,020,390.49	21,325,080.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.02	571	571	3/25/2027		5.000	1.49
Northwestern Mutual Global 5.07 3/25/2027	66815L2R9	15,000,000.00	15,108,659.14	15,232,200.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.73	571	571	3/25/2027		4.570	1.49
Nuveen 4 11/1/2028-28	67080LAA3	20,000,000.00	19,819,906.69	19,957,000.00	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa2	0.97	1,158	1,066	11/1/2028	8/1/2028	4.309	2.97
Pacific Life 1.375 4/14/2026	6944PL2E8	20,000,000.00	19,502,052.48	19,642,400.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.97	226	226	4/14/2026		5.750	0.62
Pacific Life 1.375 4/14/2026	6944PL2E8	20,000,000.00	19,496,625.00	19,642,400.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.97	226	226	4/14/2026		5.800	0.62
Pacific Life 4.45 5/1/2028	69448TAC5	10,525,000.00	10,616,350.04	10,654,562.75	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.51	974	974	5/1/2028		4.100	2.51
Pacific Life 5.5 7/18/2028	6944PL2U2	25,000,000.00	25,695,017.72	25,870,250.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	1.21	1,052	1,052	7/18/2028		4.450	2.69
Pacific Life 5.5 8/28/2026	6944PL2W8	17,000,000.00	16,993,611.56	17,238,170.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.82	362	362	8/28/2026		5.539	0.98
PEFCO 4.5 2/7/2027	74274TAL4	5,000,000.00	5,027,827.43	5,033,550.00	Fitch-AA	Moody's-Aa1	0.24	525	525	2/7/2027		4.090	1.40
Pricoa Global Funding 4.4 8/27/2027	74153WCU1	15,000,000.00	15,013,581.63	15,098,700.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.73	726	726	8/27/2027		4.350	1.93
Pricoa Global Funding 5.55 8/28/2026	74153WCT4	10,000,000.00	10,073,433.23	10,133,600.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa3	0.49	362	362	8/28/2026		4.747	0.98
Protective Global Life 1.303 9/20/2026	74368CBH6	10,000,000.00	9,568,670.18	9,707,500.00	S&P-AA-	Fitch-AA-	0.49	385	385	9/20/2026		5.800	1.04
Protective Global Life 4.714 7/6/2027	74368CBP8	7,655,000.00	7,491,519.82	7,726,497.70	S&P-AA-	Fitch-AA-	0.37	674	674	7/6/2027		6.019	1.78
Protective Global Life 4.714 7/6/2027	74368CBP8	6,000,000.00	5,871,864.00	6,056,040.00	S&P-AA-	Fitch-AA-	0.29	674	674	7/6/2027		6.019	1.78
Protective Global Life 4.714 7/6/2027	74368CBP8	14,000,000.00	14,021,277.40	14,130,760.00	S&P-AA-	Fitch-AA-	0.68	674	674	7/6/2027		4.624	1.78
Protective Global Life 5.366 1/6/2026	74368CBQ6	10,000,000.00	9,985,466.83	10,031,000.00	S&P-AA-	Fitch-AA-	0.49	128	128	1/6/2026		5.810	0.35
Protective Global Life 5.366 1/6/2026	74368CBQ6	17,295,000.00	17,263,182.36	17,348,614.50	S&P-AA-	Fitch-AA-	0.84	128	128	1/6/2026		5.930	0.35
Protective Global Life 5.366 1/6/2026	74368CBQ6	15,016,000.00	14,997,067.11	15,062,549.60	S&P-AA-	Fitch-AA-	0.73	128	128	1/6/2026		5.750	0.35
Roche Holdings 2.314 3/10/2027	771196BV3	15,440,000.00	14,919,112.97	15,080,093.60	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa2	0.75	556	556	3/10/2027		4.716	1.49
Roche Holdings 2.375 1/28/2027-26	771196BL5	11,725,000.00	11,396,333.61	11,482,996.00	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa2	0.57	515	423	1/28/2027	10/28/2026	4.524	1.39
Roche Holdings 5.265 11/13/2026-26	771196CE0	10,000,000.00	10,038,534.44	10,147,700.00	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa2	0.49	439	408	11/13/2026	10/13/2026	4.916	1.16
Roche Holdings 5.265 11/13/2026-26	771196CE0	10,000,000.00	10,080,647.51	10,147,700.00	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa2	0.49	439	408	11/13/2026	10/13/2026	4.540	1.16
USAA Capital Corp 4.375 6/1/2028-28	90327QDA4	12,000,000.00	12,036,024.82	12,131,760.00	S&P-AA-	Moody's-Aa2	0.58	1,005	974	6/1/2028	5/1/2028	4.257	2.60
Walmart 3.95 9/9/2027-27	931142EX7	17,500,000.00	17,337,761.43	17,545,500.00	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa2	0.85	739	730	9/9/2027	8/31/2027	4.450	1.93
Sub Total / Average Corporate Notes 50% Maximum		947,710,000.00	940,675,048.45	949,677,910.29			45.97	606	594			4.831	1.59
LGIP 100% Maximum													
Commonwealth of Virginia LGIP	LGIP0549	16,236,555.53	16,236,555.53	16,236,555.53	S&P-AAA	NR	0.79	1	1	N/A	N/A	4.502	0.00
Sub Total / Average LGIP 100% Maximum		16,236,555.53	16,236,555.53	16,236,555.53			0.79	1	1			4.502	0.00
Money Market60% Maximum													
Freedom Bank ICS MM	MM2554	5,668,483.10	5,668,483.10	5,668,483.10	NR	NR	0.27	1	1	N/A	N/A	4.360	0.00
Truist MM	MM1006	10,615,109.05	10,615,109.05	10,615,109.05	NR	NR	0.51	1	1	N/A	N/A	4.139	0.00
United Bank MM	MM3272	3,840,292.41	3,840,292.41	3,840,292.41	NR	NR	0.19	1	1	N/A	N/A	4.430	0.00
Sub Total / Average Money Market60% Maximum		20,123,884.56	20,123,884.56	20,123,884.56			0.98	1	1			4.257	0.00
Municipal Bonds - US 30% Maximum													
Carroll CNTY MD 2 11/1/2025	144880CL3	1,890,000.00	1,894,516.72	1,883,876.40	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.09	62	62	11/1/2025		0.570	0.17
Sub Total / Average Municipal Bonds - US 30% Maximum		1,890,000.00	1,894,516.72	1,883,876.40			0.09	62	62			0.570	0.17
Municipal Bonds - Virginia 30% Maximum													
FFX CNTY VA GO 0.645 10/1/2025	30382AKC5	5,000,000.00	5,000,732.48	4,986,100.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.24	31	31	10/1/2025		0.470	0.08
Loudoun County Economic Development 3.75 6/1/2026	54589SDQ4	1,500,000.00	1,529,228.27	1,497,105.00	Fitch-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.07	274	274	6/1/2026		1.080	0.74
VA Resources Auth Infrastructure Rev 0.736 11/1/20	92818NVC9	1,180,000.00	1,180,000.00	1,173,333.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.06	62	62	11/1/2025		0.736	0.17
VA St Resources Authority 2.45 11/1/2027	92818NHN1	4,000,000.00	3,868,130.05	3,898,160.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.19	792	792	11/1/2027		4.131	2.11
Sub Total / Average Municipal Bonds - Virginia 30% Maximum		11,680,000.00	11,578,090.80	11,554,698.00			0.57	326	326			1.829	0.87
Supranational 50% Maximum													
African Development Bank 4.125 5/13/2030-27	00828EFG9	15,110,000.00	14,993,541.52	15,107,733.50	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.73	1,716	620	5/13/2030	5/13/2027	4.310	4.32
African Development Bank 4.125 7/30/2030-27	00828EFL8	18,000,000.00	18,000,000.00	18,072,360.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.87	1,794	698	7/30/2030	7/30/2027	4.125	4.54
African Development Bank 4.3 6/27/2030-27	00828EFK0	29,000,000.00	29,000,000.00	28,985,500.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	1.41	1,761	665	6/27/2030	6/27/2027	4.300	4.43
African Development Bank 4.5 7/12/2029-28	00828EFC8	13,900,000.00	14,019,761.11	14,097,519.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.67	1,411	1,046	7/12/2029	7/12/2028	4.249	3.61
African Development Bank 4.75 4/25/2028	00828EFB0	20,100,000.00	20,497,944.62	20,617,776.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.97	968	968	4/25/2028		3.950	2.48
African Development Bank 4.75 4/25/2028	00828EFB0	13,950,000.00	14,215,796.68	14,309,352.00	S&P-AAA	Moody's-Aaa	0.68	968	968	4/25/2028		3.980	2.48
Sub Total / Average Supranational 50% Maximum		110,060,000.00	110,727,043.93	111,190,240.50			5.34	1,471	806			4.162	3.73
US Agency100% Maximum													
FFCB 0.6 11/24/2025-21	3133EMHF2	19,100,000.00	19,099,555.20	18,936,695.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.93	85	85	11/24/2025		0.610	0.23
FFCB 3.875 10/23/2029	3133ERYH8	20,125,000.00	20,023,847.43	20,210,128.75	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.98	1,514	1,514	10/23/2029		4.010	3.82
FFCB 4.5 9/22/2028	3133EPWK7	10,000,000.00	9,878,933.02	10,240,000.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.49	1,118	1,118	9/22/2028		4.950	2.84
FFCB 4.75 5/28/2026	3133EPUJ5	20,000,000.00	19,988,825.15	20,125,200.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.97	270	270	5/28/2026		4.834	0.73
FFCB 4.75 7/8/2026	3133EPVP7	20,000,000.00	19,995,344.02	20,134,800.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.97	311	311	7/8/2026		4.782	0.84
FFCB 4.875 4/20/2026	3133EPWD3	20,000,000.00	19,990,700.21	20,108,600.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.97	232	232	4/20/2026		4.955	0.62
FFCB 5 10/1/2025	3133ERJR3	21,000,000.00	20,999,419.76	21,009,870.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.02	31	31	10/1/2025		5.040	0.08

Description	CUSIP/Ticker	Face Amount/Shares	Book Value	Market Value	Credit Rating 1	Credit Rating 2	% of Portfolio	Days To Maturity	Days To Call/Maturity	Maturity Date	Next Call Date	YTM @ Cost	Duration To Maturity
FHLB 1.3 12/15/2025-22	3130AQ5U3	25,000,000.00	24,999,546.54	24,785,250.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.21	106	106	12/15/2025		1.306	0.29
FHLB 3.77 9/18/2029-27	3130B2QY4	19,000,000.00	19,000,000.00	18,807,720.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.92	1,479	536	9/18/2029	2/18/2027	3.770	3.73
FHLB 3.95 10/2/2029-26	3130B32F9	22,500,000.00	22,500,000.00	22,298,175.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.09	1,493	397	10/2/2029	10/2/2026	3.950	3.75
FHLB 4.09 9/4/2029-26	3130B2M36	23,000,000.00	23,000,000.00	22,905,930.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.12	1,465	369	9/4/2029	9/4/2026	4.090	3.66
FHLB 4.1 8/28/2029-26	3130B2K95	38,000,000.00	38,000,000.00	37,865,100.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.84	1,458	362	8/28/2029	8/28/2026	4.100	3.72
FHLB 4.32 10/2/2029-25	3130B32E2	22,500,000.00	22,500,000.00	22,458,150.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.09	1,493	32	10/2/2029	10/2/2025	4.320	3.72
FHLB 4.33 10/23/2029-26	3130B3FM0	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	19,994,800.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.97	1,514	418	10/23/2029	10/23/2026	4.330	3.78
FHLB 4.45 2/12/2030-27	3130B4YA3	27,000,000.00	27,000,000.00	27,217,350.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.31	1,626	711	2/12/2030	8/12/2027	4.450	4.08
FHLB 4.5 2/12/2030-27	3130B4YB1	27,000,000.00	27,000,000.00	27,126,900.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.31	1,626	530	2/12/2030	2/12/2027	4.500	4.07
FHLB 4.52 3/15/2029-27	3130B0GZ6	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	25,178,000.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.21	1,292	561	3/15/2029	3/15/2027	4.520	3.24
FHLB 4.585 1/11/2030-28	3130B4KZ3	17,500,000.00	17,500,000.00	17,767,750.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.85	1,594	863	1/11/2030	1/11/2028	4.585	3.98
FHLB 4.65 4/2/2029-27	3130B0PZ6	27,000,000.00	27,000,000.00	27,296,460.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.31	1,310	579	4/2/2029	4/2/2027	4.650	3.28
FHLB 4.675 1/7/2030-27	3130B4KY6	17,500,000.00	17,500,000.00	17,627,575.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.85	1,590	494	1/7/2030	1/7/2027	4.675	3.96
FHLB 4.7 3/22/2029-27	3130B0L64	30,000,000.00	30,000,000.00	30,262,800.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.46	1,299	568	3/22/2029	3/22/2027	4.700	3.25
FHLB 4.83 6/22/2028	3130B1SX6	31,000,000.00	31,000,000.00	31,143,530.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.50	1,026	1,026	6/22/2028		4.830	2.64
FHLB 4.87 12/17/2029	3130B45N7	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	19,986,000.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	0.97	1,569	1,569	12/17/2029		4.870	3.86
FHLB 4.92 4/19/2029-27	3130B0VM8	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	25,404,750.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.21	1,327	596	4/19/2029	4/19/2027	4.920	3.32
FHLB 5.03 6/26/2029-25	3130B1SW8	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	25,033,750.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.21	1,395	117	6/26/2029	12/26/2025	5.030	3.49
FHLB 5.04 4/20/2029-27	3130B15S2	24,000,000.00	24,000,000.00	24,276,000.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.16	1,328	597	4/20/2029	4/20/2027	5.040	3.31
FNMA 3.96 8/19/2030-27	3136GANZ8	26,000,000.00	26,000,000.00	26,029,640.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.26	1,814	718	8/19/2030	8/19/2027	3.960	4.55
FNMA 4 8/19/2030-27	3136GAQ69	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	24,986,500.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.21	1,814	718	8/19/2030	8/19/2027	4.000	4.55
FNMA 4.2 7/16/2030-27	3136GAKN8	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	35,155,050.00	S&P-AA+	Moody's-Aa1	1.70	1,780	684	7/16/2030	7/16/2027	4.200	4.44
Sub Total / Average US Agency100% Maximum		682,225,000.00	681,976,171.33	684,372,473.75			33.09	1,239	547			4.274	3.12
US Treasury100% Maximum													
T-Bill 0 9/18/2025	912797PX9	22,466,000.00	22,419,888.52	22,423,539.26	S&P-AA	Moody's-Aa1	1.09	18	18	9/18/2025		4.250	0.05
Sub Total / Average US Treasury100% Maximum		22,466,000.00	22,419,888.52	22,423,539.26			1.09	18	18			4.250	0.05
<b>Total / Average</b>		<b>2,061,803,335.45</b>	<b>2,054,931,914.49</b>	<b>2,066,928,121.49</b>			<b>100</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>532</b>			<b>4.532</b>	<b>2.06</b>



# NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

# 14.B

## MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Michael Longhi, Chief Financial Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Monthly Revenue Report

---

1. **Purpose:** To update the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) on monthly revenue receipts and 30% funds distributed to member localities.
2. **Background:** The attached reports reflect funding received and distributed through September 30, 2025.
3. **Comments:**
  - A. **FY2026 Revenues (Attachment A):**
    - I. The Authority has received approximately \$43.6 million through September 30, 2025, transfers from the Commonwealth.
      1. \$6.8 million in Regional Congestion Relief Fees (Grantor's Tax).
      2. \$31.8 million in Regional Sales Tax.
      3. \$5 million from the Northern Virginia Transportation District Fund transfer.
    - II. September 2025 represents the first month of sales tax receipts for FY2026. Attachment A shows a 2.7% negative variance between the budgeted sales tax receipts compared to the annualized actual sales tax receipts.
    - III. As of September 2025, the FY2026 Regional Congestion Relief Fees (Grantor's Tax) reflect a 27.5% positive when compared to the annualized FY2026 budget projections.
  - B. **FY2026 Distribution to localities (Attachment B)**
    - I. As of September 2025, six member jurisdictions completed the Code of Virginia Section 33.2-2510 required annual certification to receive FY2026 Local Distribution Funds (30%).
    - II. If the annual certification is not filed by August 1, Local Distribution Fund Transfers are suspended. Subsequently, if the certification is not received, in acceptable form, by March 1 of the current fiscal year, the jurisdiction's share of the Local Distribution Fund will be irrevocably transferred to the Regional Revenue Fund.
    - III. As of September 2025, \$6.6 million has been distributed in FY2026 Local Distribution funds to members jurisdictions who submitted the annual certification.

**C. FY2020 to FY2026 Year over Year Revenue Comparison (Attachment C).**

- I. The first chart on the attachment provides a year-to-year Sales Tax comparison.
- II. The second chart shows, by fiscal month, the portfolio's Market Value, Book Value and income. The Investment Income-BV line shows the portfolio earned \$15.7 million from July 2025 to August 2025. This is actual interest earned, inclusive of accrued earnings, coupon payments and purchase discounts/premiums. Not included in this figure is the impact of Mark to Market valuations which will result in unrealized gains or losses in the year-end financial statements.
- III. The third chart provides a year-to-year Grantor's Tax comparison.

**Attachments:**

- A. FY2026 Revenues Received by Tax Type Compared to NVTAs Estimates, through September 2025
- B. FY2026 30% Distribution by Jurisdiction, as of September 2025
- C. Sales Tax Revenue, Portfolio Income and Grantor's Tax Receipts Monthly Yearly Comparisons

# NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## SALES TAX REVENUES RECEIVED BY JURISDICTION, COMPARED TO NVTB ESTIMATES

Based on: Revenue Data Through September 2025

FYE June 30, 2026




Regional Sales Tax Transaction Months	1	Received To Date	Annualized Revenue based on YTD Receipts	FY2026 Budget	Annualized Actual To Budget	
Total Sales Tax Revenue		\$ 31,820,721	\$ 381,848,649	\$ 392,473,042	\$ (10,624,393)	-2.7%
Interstate Operation Enhance Program Transaction Months	-	Received To Date	Annualized Revenue based on YTD Receipts	FY2026 Budget	Annualized Actual To Budget	
Interstate Operation Enhance Program		\$ -	-	\$ 23,800,000	\$ (23,800,000)	-100.0%
Regional Congestion Relief Fee Transaction Months	2	Received To Date	Revenue based on YTD Receipts	FY2026 Budget	Annualized Actual To Budget	
Total Regional Congestion Relief Fee		\$ 6,759,739	\$ 40,558,432	\$ 31,805,911	8,752,521	27.5%
NVTB Transfer from COVA Transaction Months	1	Received To Date	Revenue based on YTD Receipts	FY2026 Budget	Annualized Actual To Budget	
Total NVTB Transfer from COVA		\$ 5,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	\$ -	0.0%
Total Revenue Received		\$ 43,580,459	442,407,080	\$ 468,078,953	\$ (25,671,873)	-5.48%

## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

FY2026 30% Distribution By Jurisdiction

Based on: Revenue Data Through September 2025

Jurisdiction	Interstate Operat Enhance Program	Regional Sales Tax	Regional Congestion Relief Fee	NVTD Transfer From COVA	CoVa NVTA Interest	Cumulative Total	30% Funds	Interest 08/31/2025	As of 08/31/2025	Current Month Distribution	Total Funds Transferred
								Accrued Interest (1)	Prior Distributions		
								(+)			
City of Alexandria	\$ -	\$ 1,999,833.99	\$ 510,350.80	\$ 333,621	\$ -	\$ 2,843,806.07	\$ 853,141.82	\$ 1,212.24		\$ 854,354.06	
Arlington County	\$ -	\$ 2,871,427.99	\$ 724,849.80	\$ 466,892	\$ -	\$ 4,063,169.33	\$ 1,218,950.80	\$ 1,732.03		\$ 1,220,682.83	\$ 1,220,682.83
City of Fairfax	\$ -	\$ 700,155.51	\$ 82,735.40	\$ 111,607	\$ -	\$ 894,497.91	\$ 268,349.37	\$ 381.30		\$ 268,730.67	
Fairfax County	\$ -	\$ 12,864,091.58	\$ 2,923,366.70	\$ 2,068,649	\$ -	\$ 17,856,107.48	\$ 5,356,832.24	\$ 7,611.63		\$ 5,364,443.87	
City of Falls Church	\$ -	\$ 313,080.89	\$ 55,644.50	\$ 53,673	\$ -	\$ 422,398.62	\$ 126,719.59	\$ 180.06	\$ 25,992.87	\$ 100,906.78	\$ 126,899.65
Loudoun County	\$ -	\$ 6,996,215.54	\$ 1,350,081.40	\$ 1,013,645	\$ -	\$ 9,359,942.08	\$ 2,807,982.62	\$ 3,989.91	\$ 515,636.36	\$ 2,296,336.17	\$ 2,811,972.53
City of Manassas	\$ -	\$ 768,338.25	\$ 66,125.40	\$ 128,066	\$ -	\$ 962,529.62	\$ 288,758.89	\$ 410.30	\$ 49,212.01	\$ 239,957.18	\$ 289,169.19
City of Manassas Park	\$ -	\$ 158,862.19	\$ 27,385.00	\$ 25,144	\$ -	\$ 211,391.68	\$ 63,417.50	\$ 90.11	\$ 12,013.48	\$ 51,494.13	\$ 63,507.61
Prince William County	\$ -	\$ 5,148,714.79	\$ 1,019,199.60	\$ 798,702	\$ -	\$ 6,966,616.54	\$ 2,089,984.96	\$ 2,969.70	\$ 384,787.33	\$ 1,708,167.33	\$ 2,092,954.66
Total Revenue	\$ -	\$ 31,820,720.73	\$ 6,759,738.60	\$ 5,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ 43,580,459.33	\$ 13,074,137.79	\$ 18,577.28	\$ 987,642.05	\$ 12,105,073.02	\$ 6,605,186.47
Interest 08/31/2025						\$ 43,580,459.33	\$ 13,074,137.79				\$ 13,092,715.07



## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Michael Longhi, Chief Financial Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Monthly Operating Budget Report

---

- 1. Purpose:** To update the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) on the Authority's Operating Budget for FY2026.
- 2. Background:** The Authority elected to fund the Operating Budget for FY2026 through transfers from the Regional Revenue Fund.
- 3. Monthly Operating Budget Report:** Through August 31, 2025, the FY2026 Operating Budget has produced the following:
  - A.** The Operating Budget was fully funded through transfers from the Regional Revenue Fund.
  - B.** As of August 31, 2025, the attached Income Statement shows the Authority has utilized 15% of the expenditure budget through 16.7% of the fiscal year.
  - C.** Certain major FY2026 budgeted expenses, including the remaining budget for the Website Modernization project, will continue into FY2026.
  - D.** As of August 31, 2025, the Authority earned \$25,746 through investment income from interest accrued on budgeted funds deposited in the Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP).
  - E.** As of August 31, 2025, all expense categories remained within the approved budget.
  - F.** The attached statement provides a summary of total Operating Budget income and expenditure activity through August 31, 2025.

**Attachment:** FY2026 Monthly Operating Budget through August 31, 2025



09/18/25  
10:52:10

NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
Income Statement  
For the Accounting Period: 8 / 25

Page: 1 of 2  
Report ID: LB170A

## 1000 General Fund

		----- Current Year -----				
Account Object	Description	Current Month	Current YTD	Budget	Variance	%
Expenses						
410000	Personnel Expenses					
110	Salaries-Regular Pay	228,721.32	430,942.48	3,067,669.00	2,636,726.52	14
130	Health, Dental & Vision Benefits	22,902.60	69,107.78	500,609.00	431,501.22	14
131	Payroll Taxes	15,824.33	30,265.41	239,781.00	209,515.59	13
132	Retirement VRS	16,441.40	31,497.26	232,987.00	201,489.74	14
133	Life Insurance	2,951.63	5,665.69	38,347.00	32,681.31	15
134	FSA/DCA	41.33	41.33	1,512.00	1,470.67	3
135	Workers Comp		2,139.00	3,376.00	1,237.00	63
137	Disability Insurance	641.20	6,753.72	33,026.00	26,272.28	20
138	Commuter Benefits	205.40	410.40	3,350.00	2,939.60	12
	Total Account	287,729.21	576,823.07	4,120,657.00	3,543,833.93	14
420000	Professional Services					
210	Audit & Accounting Services			62,250.00	62,250.00	
220	Bank Service			750.00	750.00	
230	Insurance		16,492.00	20,231.00	3,739.00	82
240	Payroll & Human Resource Services	993.47	1,198.00	11,640.00	10,442.00	10
260	Public Outreach & Regional Event Support	345.00	605.99	41,610.00	41,004.01	1
261	Legal/Bond Counsel Services			75,000.00	75,000.00	
262	Financial Advisor Services			10,000.00	10,000.00	
263	Bond Trustee Fees			2,900.00	2,900.00	
264	Legislative Services	2,746.18	5,492.36	89,305.00	83,812.64	6
265	Investment Custody Fees			25,000.00	25,000.00	
	Total Account	4,084.65	23,788.35	338,686.00	314,897.65	7
430000	Technology/Communication					
310	Financial Reporting & Invest Monitoring/Mgt	14,116.04	25,696.04	85,950.00	60,253.96	30
330	IT Support Svc Incl Hosting	3,531.56	8,560.70	57,327.00	48,766.30	15
335	GIS/Project Mgt/Modeling	2,400.00	13,545.07	39,125.00	25,579.93	35
340	Phone Service & Video Srvs Chgs	1,405.48	3,063.67	20,105.00	17,041.33	15
350	Web Develop & Hosting	15,683.29	15,874.54	133,170.00	117,295.46	12
940	Equip/Computer HW SW & Peripheral		275.98	5,725.00	5,449.02	5
	Total Account	37,136.37	67,016.00	341,402.00	274,386.00	20
440000	Administrative Expenses					
405	Building/Office Related Expenses	91.20	182.40	3,500.00	3,317.60	5
410	Advertisement		463.57	1,000.00	536.43	46
411	Memberships & Subscriptions	2,058.99	5,264.73	26,945.00	21,680.27	20
412	Duplication & Printing	1,205.36	1,871.92	15,672.00	13,800.08	12
414	Hosted Meeting Expenses	544.61	1,206.05	7,515.00	6,308.95	16
415	Local Travel/Commuter Benefits	472.29	682.29	11,150.00	10,467.71	6
417	Office Lease	40,401.66	117,882.86	478,940.00	361,057.14	25
418	Office Supplies	813.68	1,022.29	7,015.00	5,992.71	15
419	Postage & Delivery	10.48	25.36	700.00	674.64	4
420	Professional Development	1,347.58	5,338.77	32,940.00	27,601.23	16
421	Professional Outreach	1,221.10	5,866.06	24,300.00	18,433.94	24

09/18/25  
10:52:10

NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
Income Statement  
For the Accounting Period: 8 / 25

Page: 2 of 2  
Report ID: LB170A

1000 General Fund

Account Object	Description	----- Current Year -----				
		Current Month	Current YTD	Budget	Variance	%
945	Office Furniture & Fixtures	394.97	394.97		-394.97	
	Total Account	48,561.92	140,201.27	609,677.00	469,475.73	23
	Total Expenses	377,512.15	807,828.69	5,410,422.00	4,602,593.31	15
	Net Income from Operations	-377,512.15	-807,828.69			
	Other Revenue					
370000	Investment Earnings	12,503.72	25,746.83		25,746.83	
383000	Transfer Operating Budget from Regional			5,263,402.00	-5,263,402.00	
	Total Other Revenue	12,503.72	25,746.83	5,263,402.00	-5,237,655.17	
	Other Expenses					
521000	Transfers					
820	Transfer to Operating Reserve			1,057,640.00	1,057,640.00	
825	Transf to Equip Reserve			50,000.00	50,000.00	
	Total Account			1,107,640.00	1,107,640.00	
	Total Other Expenses	0.00	0.00	1,107,640.00	1,107,640.00	
	Net Income	-365,008.43	-782,081.86			

Note: Formula for % columns = revenue\*100/total expense for Fund.

## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Council Member Selonia Miles, Vice Chair  
Planning Coordination Advisory Committee

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Planning Coordination Advisory Committee Report

---

1. **Purpose:** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of recent activities of the NVTa Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC).
2. **Background:** The PCAC met on October 29, 2025, at 6:30 PM, on an online virtual platform. Nine (9) committee members participated in this virtual meeting. The meeting was also livestreamed on YouTube.
3. **Action Items:**
  - A. **Summary Notes of the September 24, 2025, Meeting:** The September 24, 2025, meeting summary was approved unanimously, with abstentions from members not present.
  - B. **Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure:** Ms. Couso provided context for the origin of the initiative, stating that this was a formal request made by the House and Senate Transportation Committee Chairs to the Authority in March 2025. After approval of the response by the Authority in May 2025, NVTa staff began working on the initiative to review the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study and prepare regional recommendations to fund the infrastructure identified in VDOT's Study. Ms. Kate Widness, from the consultant team at Kimley Horn, provided a brief presentation to committee members highlighting the following topics from this initiative including background on VDOT's Study, the goals and approach of this initiative, the qualitative research approach for evaluation of the funding strategies identified, and the funding strategies suggested for further study and consideration. After the presentation, several committee members raised comments made by a local advocacy group and requested additional clarification be made in the report to address the comments. Ms. Couso stated that NVTa staff are preparing responses to all comments received during the comment period (October 8, 2025, to October 22, 2025) on the draft report. Ms. Backmon noted that NVTa staff will work closely with VDOT staff to confirm the responses on comments received that are related to VDOT's Study.

The Members then unanimously endorsed the report.

**4. Discussion/Information Items:**

**A. NVTA Update:** Ms. Backmon mentioned that there will be two presentations at the November Authority meeting. Mr. Mercer (Executive Director, MWCOG) and Mr. Hill (County Executive, Fairfax County) will discuss task force recommendations from the recent regional initiative known as DMVMoves; and VDOT staff will provide status updates of I-66 concessionaire-funded projects. In addition, there are two action items for Authority's approval - item 3B above, and NVTA's five-year Strategic Plan.

**5. Next steps:** The next scheduled meeting for the PCAC is on November 19, 2025, at 5:00 pm EST.

## NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Randy Boice, Chair, Technical Advisory Committee

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Technical Advisory Committee Report

---

- 1. Purpose:** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of recent activities of the NVTa Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).
- 2. Background:** The TAC met on October 15, 2025, at 7 PM. The meeting was held in-person and virtually over Zoom. Six (6) committee members attended, five (5) in-person and one (1) virtually. The meeting was also livestreamed on YouTube.
- 3. Action Items:**
  - A. Summary Notes of September 17, 2025, Meeting:** The September 17, 2025, meeting summary was approved unanimously.
  - B. Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure:** Ms. Couso, Transportation Planning & Programming Manager at NVTa, and Ms. Widness, Transportation and Community Resilience Planner with Kimley-Horn, presented on the request by the Chairs of the Transportation House and Senate Committees in March 2025 to review the findings of the 2024 Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Northern Virginia Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Study and make recommendations on regional funding options for the infrastructure identified in VDOT's study. Ms. Couso and Ms. Widness reviewed the purpose of the request, the steps taken, and recommendations within the report, including the 14 funding strategies that scored highly on revenue estimation and/or which have pathways to exist regionally. Discussion included consideration of the funding challenges highlighted in the report and the final suggestions. The Committee unanimously endorsed the Regional Approach to Funding Northern Virginia's Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Report.
- 4. Information Items:**
  - A. NVTa Update:** Ms. Backmon shared that the Request for Proposals for TransAction was open until the following week, October 21, 2025. She also shared that NVTa received 26 applications for FY2026-2031 Six Year Program, for a total of \$1.3 billion, and that resolutions of support are due on Friday October 31, 2025. Lastly, she reminded the Committee about NVTa's second annual State of the Region's Transportation event on October 22, 2025.

5. **Next steps:** The next scheduled meeting for the TAC is on November 19, 2025, in person at the NVTa offices.

# CEO Report



# NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## MEMORANDUM

**FOR:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Monica Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Chief Executive Officer's Report

---

**1. Purpose:** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of items of interest not addressed in the agenda.

**2. Discussion Items:**

**A. FY2026-2031 Six Year Program (SYP):** By the deadline of August 1, 2025, 27 applications from 8 applicants were received for a total request of \$1,265,831,274. All applicants submitted governing body resolutions in support of applications by the deadline October 31, 2025. NVTa staff and the consultant team have started evaluating the candidate projects using model and off-model tools to derive congestion reduction relative to cost (CRRC) rating, TransAction rating, Long Term Benefit, and qualitative measures such as past performance on NVTa-funded projects. The SYP update is anticipated to be adopted by the Authority in July 2026.

**B. TransAction:** NVTa's long range multimodal transportation plan, TransAction, is updated every five years. The Authority adopted the most recent update in December 2022. The next update is anticipated to be adopted in December 2027. A Request for Proposals (RFP) for professional services was issued on September 15, 2025. A pre-proposal meeting was held on September 25, 2025, where staff walked participants through the tasks included in the RFP and answered questions. The deadline for submitting proposals was October 21, 2025, and NVTa staff received four complete proposals. The selection committee—consisting of staff from NVTa, NVTa's member jurisdictions, and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)—reviewed and ranked the four proposals. Oral presentations with the top-ranked firms are planned to be conducted in the week of November 10, 2025. The contract is anticipated to be approved by the Authority in February 2026.



# Outreach Events

# ➤ NVTA Across the Region

## NoVA Joint Transportation Meeting *Fairfax, VA*

**On October 20**, the annual **NoVA Joint Transportation Meeting** was held at VDOT's NoVA District office. This legislatively mandated event provided an opportunity for state and regional organizations to share ongoing initiatives with the public and receive comments on transportation projects. Ms. Backmon joined a panel comprising representatives from the CTB, VDOT, DRPT, VRE, NVTC, and MWCOG/TPB to emphasize the importance of collaboration in building a safe, integrated transportation network that enhances the quality of life for all Northern Virginians. During the Open House, NVTA staff Harun Rashid, Starla Couso, Sharara Faisal, and Griffin Frank highlighted the Authority's current initiatives, including the Bus Rapid Transit Action Plan, the FY2026-2031 Six Year Program, and NVTA's multimodal transportation investments.



# NVTA's State of the Region's Transportation Network

## *NVTA Office*

**On October 22**, NVTA hosted our second **State of the Region's Transportation Network event**. Phyllis J. Randall, Chair, NVTA and the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, opened the event by highlighting NVTA's role in moving Northern Virginia forward. Ms. Backmon delivered keynote remarks on how NVTA is addressing regional transportation challenges and future growth.

A lively panel discussion featured Alyia Gaskins, Mayor, City of Alexandria, Virginia and NVTA member, Clark Mercer, Executive Director, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC), and Nuria I. Fernandez, President/CEO, AMDC Consulting, LLC, who explored opportunities and challenges in implementing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) across the region. All speakers emphasized that advancing transit is about moving our community efficiently.

The event concluded with remarks from Bill Cuttler, Northern Virginia District Engineer, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), who reflected on the region's impact and the power of collaboration across the Commonwealth. This event highlighted how, by working together, NVTA and our partners are building a transportation future that connects people, strengthens communities and supports Northern Virginia's growth.





# Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance's "What You Need to Know About Transportation" Event

## *Falls Church, VA*

**On October 24**, the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance hosted its 21<sup>st</sup> Annual **What You Need to Know About Transportation event**, convening leaders who are committed to shaping the future of transportation across the Commonwealth. Governor Glenn Youngkin emphasized the importance of reducing congestion, improving reliability and connecting multimodal capabilities across the region.

Ms. Backmon built on that message, highlighting how the Authority's multimodal investments are keeping the region and the economy moving. Additionally, she reflected on a century of remarkable transportation growth, from 1925 to 2025, and the continued progress ahead.



# ➤ NVTA Across the Commonwealth

## 2025 Governor's Transportation Conference

*Richmond, VA*

**On October 17**, Ms. Backmon was a key participant during the 2025 Governor's Transportation Conference. As a “Local Perspectives on Transportation” panelist, she highlighted NVTA’s ongoing collaboration with local jurisdictions and agencies across Northern Virginia and emphasized how the Authority’s regional investments and partnerships continue to strengthen our region’s transportation network and make an economic impact across the Commonwealth.





# NVTA Across the Nation

Mpact: Transit + Community Conference  
*Portland, OR*

**On October 28**, Keith Jasper, Principal, NVTA, participated in the **2025 Mpact Transit + Community conference** along with transportation professionals from across the nation. Mpact has a strong focus on transit, especially development, implementation, and operation of BRT, and its relationship with strong communities, and transit-oriented development. Mr. Jasper was a panelist alongside representatives from Orange County, CA, and the City of Portland, OR, in a very well-attended session entitled *BRT Bits and Bytes: Data Insights for Corridor Planning*. Mr. Jasper discussed the analytical approach used for NVTA's BRT Action Plan approved by the Authority in July 2025.





# NVTA is WTS-DC's 2025 Employer of the Year!



With a small but mighty team of 22, NVTA is over 60% women, including holding seven of 11 management positions. NVTA is led by a woman CEO, and women lead every department and major initiative. Key areas under women's leadership include communications, regional long-range planning, project investments totaling \$3.6 billion+, and financial operations including accounting, budgeting, procurement, and managing a \$2 billion+ investment portfolio.

NVTA is honored to receive this annual award that recognizes an organization for recruiting, retaining, and advancing women.

## » Events & Webinars

### InNoVation Lunch & Learn Webinar

**On November 6**, the **NVTA InNoVation Lunch & Learn webinar series** featured Rama Mitry, Manager, Charge Up Fairfax Program, and Julie Gurnee, Program Manager, EV Readiness. The presenters discussed how the Charge Up Fairfax program is shaping EV readiness and advancing the future of sustainable mobility in the region. They highlighted the program's support for installing Level 2 EV charging stations at multifamily communities, nonprofits, and places of worship, and its role in helping Fairfax County reach carbon-neutrality goals by 2050. The session's recording is available on NVTA's YouTube Channel.

*Details regarding NVTA's December's Lunch & Learn session are being finalized and will be announced soon.*

A dark blue poster for an 'Innovation Lunch & Learn' webinar. At the top left is a white logo consisting of three right-pointing chevrons. The title 'INNOVATION LUNCH & LEARN' is in large, bold, white capital letters. Below it, the subtitle 'Fairfax County's Electric Vehicle Initiatives' is in a smaller white font. Two circular headshots of women are shown side-by-side. The woman on the left has blonde hair and is wearing a white shirt. The woman on the right has brown hair and is wearing a red shirt. Below each headshot is the person's name and title in white text. At the bottom, there are three white rectangular boxes containing the date, the word 'Free', and the time.

» **INNOVATION  
LUNCH & LEARN**

Fairfax County's Electric Vehicle Initiatives

  
**Rama Mitry**  
Charge Up Fairfax Program Manager,  
Fairfax County

  
**Julie Gurnee**  
EV Readiness Strategy Program Manager,  
Fairfax County


November 6, 2025    Free Webinar    12:00 PM



# GoMyWayVA™ App Launch

The **GoMyWayVA™ app**, developed through the Regional Multi-Modal Mobility Program (RM3P) and cosponsored by NVTa, VDOT and DRPT, launched on **October 28, 2025**. GoMyWayVA represents major advancement in the Authority's commitment to innovation and improving regional mobility. The AI-powered mobile app aims to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion in Northern Virginia by incentivizing and rewarding commuters to change travel modes and change route or departure time.

"As a decade-long partner of RM3P and strong supporter of innovation, NVTa is proud to celebrate the successful launch of GoMyWayVA™. As Northern Virginia continues to grow, this innovative app offers a new approach to reducing congestion by promoting alternatives to driving alone, ultimately enhancing mobility and helping improve quality of life across our region." - *Monica Backmon, NVTa CEO, Vice-Chair of the RM3P Executive Committee*





# Project Status Update


**As of October 20, 2025**

NVTA reports monthly the status of projects funded through the Regional Revenue (70%) Fund. Realtime updates can also be found on [Novagateway.org](https://Novagateway.org)

# Project Status – Standard Project Agreements (SPAs)

There are a number of projects that received funding for different phases across various funding cycles. This results in the establishment of a SPA (Standard Project Agreement). The stages of a SPA are listed in 5 categories below. While there are a total of 179 SPAs across the different categories, these represent 135 unique projects.

Status: Number of SPAs by Category



## 5 Classification Categories and Stages of a SPA

**SPA closed out, Project complete:** SPA has been closed out and NVTA funding has completed, and overall project has been completed.


**SPA closed out, Project ongoing:** SPA has been closed out and NVTA funding has completed. Overall project however, is still ongoing.

**SPA Executed:** SPA has been approved by NVTA.

**Appropriated but no SPA yet:** Funding allocation has been appropriated by NVTA, but SPA has not been executed yet. (Note: NVTA appropriates the total approved funding amount at time of appropriation)

**Approved but not appropriated yet:** Project Application approved by NVTA, but funding allocation has not been appropriated yet.


Status: Number of SPAs by Program by Category



Note: NVTA’s updates to the Six Year Program (SYP) allocate revenues from two future (outer) fiscal years (e.g., the FY2024-2029 SYP allocated funding for FY2028 and FY2029).


# Project Status – Revenue Approved, Appropriated and Reimbursed as of October 20, 2025

NVTA has **approved** a total of: **\$3,683,182,918**  
NVTA has **appropriated** a total of: **\$2,416,024,959**  
NVTA has **reimbursed** a total of: **\$1,121,153,871**



**5 Classification Categories and Stages of a SPA**

SPA closed out; Project complete  
SPA closed out; Project ongoing  
SPA Executed  
Appropriated but no SPA yet  
Approved but not appropriated yet



Note: SPAs usually request NVTA funds in the outer years of their approved funding period and then continue to drawdown into subsequent fiscal years. (e.g. SPAs in the FY2024-2029 SYP typically begin drawing funds by the end of FY2029, with most not fully utilizing their allocations until FY2032.)



# Recent Project Milestones



## VRE Manassas Park Station Parking Expansion

- Ribbon Cutting event held on October 21.
- NVTA invested **\$2.5 million in Regional Revenue funds** toward the design of this project.
  - Additionally, NVTA recommended **\$23.5 million** to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) through the I-66 Concessionaire Program toward this project.




## Arlington County Army Navy Drive

- Ribbon Cutting event held on October 29.
- Army Navy Drive is one portion of the overarching Pentagon City Multimodal Connections and Transitway Extension project, in which NVTA invested a total of **\$28.8 million in Regional Revenue funds**.
  - In the Army Navy Drive portion, NVTA has invested **\$9.7 million**.





# Recent Project Milestones *Continued*



## Alexandria DASH Facility

- Groundbreaking event held on October 30.
- NVTa invested a total of **\$11.9 million in Regional Revenue funds** on this project.
  - \$9.2 million toward eight new battery electric buses and \$2.7 million toward construction of the facility.



# Substantive Project Status Updates

Substantive changes to SPAs for the period September 23, 2025- October 20, 2025, are outlined below.

## **SPAs Executed**

- None

## **Updated Funding Schedules**

- Arlington County:
  - Intelligent Transportation System Improvements (2018-5-1)

## **SPAs Closed Out**

- None



# Substantive Project Status Updates *Continued*

Substantive updates reported by the project sponsor for the period of September 23, 2025, to October 20, 2025, are outlined below.

*Substantive changes include but are not limited to project administration advancements, start/completion of phases, major engineering progress, project completion date changes, etc.*

Project Sponsor	Project Title	Updated Status	% Reimbursed (Program Year(s))
Arlington County	ART Operations and Maintenance Facilities	Project is currently awaiting Dominion Energy to install the transformer & meter for the Battery-electric bus equipment, which remains on back order. Given this, <b>the project completion timeline revised from 6/30/2025 to 3/31/2026.</b>	FY2018: 99%
Arlington County	Columbia Pike Multimodal Street Improvements - East	Utility companies continue to do work for cutover in preparation for the switch from above ground to underground utility service. <b>Completion pushed back one month to 11/31/2025.</b>	FY2015: 91%
Loudoun County	Dulles West Boulevard Widening: Loudoun County Parkway to Northstar Boulevard	Land acquisition and utility relocation activities continue. Land acquisition scheduled to complete December 2025. Construction Notice to Proceed is expected September 2026. <b>Project Completion date pushed from 6/30/2027 to 3/20/2028.</b>	FY2018: 11%
Loudoun County	Northstar Boulevard - Evergreen Mills Rd to Tall Cedars Parkway	<b>Project has achieved substantial completion.</b> The contractor is currently addressing punch list items and is also working on the VDOT street acceptance package.	FY2018: 75%
Loudoun County	Route 15 at Braddock Road Roundabout	After a 9-month hold on the project, Locally Administered Project (LAP) agreement has been completed. <b>Project completion date advanced from 8/17/2031 to 10/31/2029.</b>	FY2024: No SPA yet
City of Fairfax	Jermantown Road/Route 29 Intersection Improvements	<b>Preliminary Design settled.</b> Soil Investigation scheduled.	FY2020: 2%

# Substantive Project Status Updates *Continued*

## Flagged Projects – as of October 20, 2025

*Projects are flagged when there has been no update or no new information provided for three consecutive months.*

Date of Last Update	Jurisdiction	Project Title	NVTA Funds	% Reimbursed
No new update since July 2025. Last update noted “ <i>Pre-construction meeting held 7/17/2025. NTP expected to be issued by end of the month</i> ”	ARL	Crystal City Streets: 12th Street Transitway	\$11,600,000	FY2017: 60%
No new update since June 2025. Last update noted “ <i>Under Active Construction.</i> ”	CFX	Government Center Parkway Extension	\$3,540,000	FY2020: 3%

## No Response Received This Cycle

Project sponsors are required to provide monthly updates on projects. NVTA did not receive a monthly update on the projects listed below.

- **Arlington County:** Crystal City Streets: 12th Street Transitway (FY2017), Intelligent Transportation System Improvements (FY2018-23) and Rosslyn Multimodal Network Improvements (FY2020-25)
- **VRE:** Franconia- Springfield Platform Improvements (FY2015), VRE Crystal City Station Improvements (FY2015/FY2018-23/FY2020-25)



# **CMAQ-RSTP Transfers**

# NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Monica Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Approval of Reallocation of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for Prince William County

---

- 1. Purpose.** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) of Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC) approval of the reallocation of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for Prince William County.
- 2. Background:** On September 11, 2008, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) delegated the authority to approve requests to reallocate Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding between projects that were previously approved by the NVTa to the Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC).

On October 23, 2025, Prince William County requested the following reallocation:

- Transfer of \$4,466,000 of RSTP funds from UPC 121761 (FY2029 Devlin Road Widening – Linton Hall Road to University Boulevard) to UPC T29186 (FY2025 Route 15 Improvements with Railroad Overpass Project)

Prince William County requested this transfer to ensure that the recipient project, Route 15 Improvements with Railroad Overpass, would be included in the FY2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Project (TIP). The project currently does not have federal funds within the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) TIP window, which is needed to advance project design. The donor project, Devlin Road Widening, has a north portion and south portion. The north portion is fully funded, and Prince William County intends to apply for 2032 funds to address the south portion's shortfall.

At its meeting on October 23, 2025, the RJACC approved this request.

**Attachments:**

- A. Prince William County Request Letter
- B. DRAFT Letter to VDOT NOVA District Administrator Cuttler

**Coordination:** Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee





October 23, 2025

Christina Alexander, Co-Chair  
Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC)  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa)  
2600 Park Tower Drive, Suite 601  
Vienna, VA 22180

RE: Request to Transfer Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funds

Dear Ms. Alexander,

Prince William County requests the approval of the NVTa RJACC for the transfer of RSTP funding. Prince William County requests the transfer of a total of \$4,466,000 in RSTP funds from the following balance account:

- Devlin Road Widening - Linton Hall Road to University Boulevard (UPC 121761)

The funds are requested to be transferred to the receiving project Route 15 Improvements with Railroad Overpass project (UPC T29186).

In recent years, the Prince William County Board has reaffirmed this project as a priority for grant funding. As one of the few remaining projects on the County Board's Priority Primary Roadway Project List, the County requests approval to transfer funds from the above-mentioned donor project UPC 121761 to ensure that it is included in the FY 2026–2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance the project for design as desired.

The recipient project has been previously approved for FY2030-2031 RSTP funding, and this request only needs RJACC approval to move forward.

If you have questions or comments regarding this request, please contact me at (703) 792-6825.

Sincerely,



Ricardo Canizales  
Director of Transportation

# CMAQ/RSTP Transfer Request Form

(One Sheet Needed Per Donor Project)

Date: 10/23/2025

Name of Jurisdiction/Agency Requesting: Prince William County Department of Transportation

Current Balance of RSTP Funds Currently Allocated to Donor Project (Prior to this Transfer): \$9,466,000

From (Donor):

To (Recipient):

<u>UPC</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Type of Funds</u>	<u>Transfer from Previous Fiscal Years</u>	<u>If No, Year Requested</u>	<u>Transfer Amount</u>	<u>UPC</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Previously Approved by NVTA</u>	<u>If Yes, Year Approved</u>	<u>JACC Approval (NVTA)</u>	<u>Authority Approval (NVTA)</u>	<u>Funds Verified (VDOT)</u>	<u>Completed (VDOT)</u>
121761	Devlin Road Widening - Linton Hall Road to University Boulevard	RSTP	N	FY2029	\$4,466,000.00	T29186	Route 15 Improvements with Railroad Overpass Project	Y	FY2025				

TOTAL OF TRANSFER - \$4,466,000

Attach Signed Request of Transfer Letter

November 13, 2025

Mr. William Cuttler  
District Administrator  
Virginia Department of Transportation  
4975 Alliance Dr., Suite 4E-342  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Reference: Request to Transfer Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funds  
for Prince William County.

Dear Mr. Cuttler,

On September 11, 2008, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) delegated the authority to approve requests to reallocate Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding between projects that were previously approved by the NVTA to the Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC).

On October 23, 2025, Prince William County requested the following:

- Transfer of \$4,466,000 of RSTP funds from UPC 121761 (FY2029 Devlin Road Widening – Linton Hall Road to University Boulevard) to UPC T29186 (FY2025 Route 15 Improvements with Railroad Overpass Project)

Prince William County requested this transfer to ensure that the recipient project, Route 15 Improvements with Railroad Overpass, would be included in the FY2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Project (TIP). The project currently does not have federal funds within the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) TIP window, which is needed to advance project design. The donor project, Devlin Road Widening, has a north portion and south portion. The north portion is fully funded, and Prince William County intends to apply for 2032 funds to address the south portion's shortfall.

The RJACC approved the request on October 23, 2025, and the NVTA was informed at their November 13, 2025, meeting. The NVTA has not objected to these reallocations.

Mr. William Cuttler  
November 13, 2025  
Page Two

Please take the necessary steps to reallocate these funds in the Transportation Improvement Program and the State Transportation Improvement Program. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Phyllis J. Randall, Chair

cc: Monica Backmon, CEO, NVT  
Ricardo Canizales, Director of Transportation, Prince William County



# NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Chair Phyllis J. Randall and Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Monica Backmon, Chief Executive Officer

**DATE:** November 6, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Approval of Reallocation of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for Loudoun County

---

- 1. Purpose.** To inform the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) of Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC) approval of the reallocation of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for Loudoun County.
- 2. Background:** On September 11, 2008, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) delegated the authority to approve requests to reallocate Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding between projects that were previously approved by the NVTA to the Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC).

On October 23, 2025, Loudoun County requested the following reallocation:

- Transfer of \$7,996,758 of RSTP funds from UPC 112296 (Holding Account for Loudoun County Metro Bike and Ped Projects) to several projects:
  - \$317,677 to UPC T31083 (STP Blossom Drive – Victoria Station Drive to Magnolia Road)
  - \$2,509,000 to UPC T30143 (STP Cascades Parkway – Church Road to Victoria Station Drive)
  - \$2,371,036 to UPC T31084 (STP Cascades Parkway – Nokes Boulevard / Potomac View Road to Woodshire Drive)
  - \$1,799,045 to UPC T31082 (STP Pacific Boulevard – Waxpool Road to W&OD Trail Connection)
  - \$1,000,000 to UPC 121558 (STP Sterling Boulevard – W&OD to Shaw Road)

Loudoun County requests this transfer to resolve funding shortfalls for accounts under the previously approved UPC 112296 (Loudoun County Metro Station – Bicycle & Pedestrian Access). In addition to addressing funding gaps on the recipient projects, transferring these funds also avoids the risk of deallocation due to fund age. The donor project will remain fully funded.

At its meeting on October 23, 2025, the RJACC approved this request.

**Attachments:**

- A.** Loudoun County Request Letter
- B.** DRAFT Letter to VDOT NOVA District Administrator Cuttler

**Coordination:** Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee



October 23, 2025

Megan Landis, Co-Chair  
Regional Jurisdictions and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC)  
2600 Park Tower Dr. Suite 601  
Viera, VA 22180

Re: Request to Reallocate Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Balance Entry Funds

Ms. Landis,

Loudoun County requests the approval of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) RJACC to make the following transfer of previously allocated RSTP funding from the following Balance Entry account:

<u>Transfer Amount</u>	<u>UPC</u>	<u>Project Description</u>
\$7,996,758	112296	Metro Station Pedestrian Improvements project

To the following projects:

<u>Transfer Amount</u>	<u>UPC</u>	<u>Project Description</u>
\$317,677.00	T31083	STP Blossom Drive – Victoria Station Drive to Magnolia Road
\$2,509,000.00	T30143	STP Cascades Parkway – Church Road to Victoria Station Drive
\$2,371,036.00	T31084	STP Cascades Parkway – Nokes Boulevard / Potomac View Road to Woodshire Drive
\$1,799,045.00	T31082	STP Pacific Boulevard – Waxpool Road to W&OD Trail Connection
\$1,000,000.00	121558	STP Sterling Boulevard – W&OD to Shaw Road

The requested transfer will move previously allocated RSTP funds from the overfunded balance entry account to these designated projects to resolve funding shortfalls. In addition, due to the age of these funds, using them for these projects avoids the risk of deallocation. This will not affect the currently planned Metro Bike and Pedestrian projects, and they will remain fully funded.

If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact Sarah Sade, Loudoun's representative to the RJACC at 571-627-7089 or [sarah.sade@loudoun.gov](mailto:sarah.sade@loudoun.gov).

Sincerely,

Signed by:  
**Sherene.Dorazio**  
474C4685086A4D7...  
**Sherene Dorazio**  
Director

Attachments:  
CMAQ/RSTP Transfer Worksheet

**CMAQ/RSTP Transfer Request Form**  
(One Sheet Needed Per Donor Project)

Date: 09.24.25

Name of Jurisdiction/Agency Requesting: Loudoun County

Current Balance of CMAQ/RSTP Funds Currently Allocated to Donor Project (Prior to this Transfer): RSTP - \$7,996,758

From (Donor): To (Recipient):

UPC	Project Description	Type of Funds	Transfer from Previous Fiscal Years	If No, Year Requested	Transfer Amount	UPC	Project Description	Previously Approved by NVTA	If Yes, Year Approved	JACC Approval (NVTA)	Authority Approval (NVTA)	Funds Verified (VDOT)	Completed (VDOT)
112296	Holding Account for Loudoun County Metro Bike and Ped Projects	RSTP	Y		\$317,677.00	T31083	STP Blossom Drive – Victoria Station Drive to Magnolia Road						
					\$2,509,000.00	T30143	STP Cascades Parkway – Church Road to Victoria Station Drive						
					\$2,371,036.00	T31084	STP Cascades Parkway – Nokes Boulevard / Potomac View Road to Woodshire Drive						
					\$1,799,045.00	T31082	STP Pacific Boulevard – Waxpool Road to W&OD Trail Connection						
					\$1,000,000.00	121558	STP Sterling Boulevard – W&OD to Shaw Road						

TOTAL OF TRANSFER \$7,996,758.00

Attach Signed Request of Transfer Letter

November 13, 2025

Mr. William Cuttler  
District Administrator  
Virginia Department of Transportation  
4975 Alliance Dr., Suite 4E-342  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Reference: Request to Transfer Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funds for Loudoun County.

Dear Mr. Cuttler,

On September 11, 2008, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) delegated the authority to approve requests to reallocate Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding between projects that were previously approved by the NVTA to the Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC).

On October 23, 2025, Loudoun County requested the following reallocation:

- Transfer of \$7,996,758 of RSTP funds from UPC 112296 (Holding Account for Loudoun County Metro Bike and Ped Projects) to several projects:
  - \$317,677 to UPC T31083 (STP Blossom Drive – Victoria Station Drive to Magnolia Road)
  - \$2,509,000 to UPC T30143 (STP Cascades Parkway – Church Road to Victoria Station Drive)
  - \$2,371,036 to UPC T31084 (STP Cascades Parkway – Nokes Boulevard / Potomac View Road to Woodshire Drive)
  - \$1,799,045 to UPC T31082 (STP Pacific Boulevard – Waxpool Road to W&OD Trail Connection)
  - \$1,000,000 to UPC 121558 (STP Sterling Boulevard – W&OD to Shaw Road)

Loudoun County requests this transfer to resolve funding shortfalls for accounts under the previously approved UPC 112296 (Loudoun County Metro Station – Bicycle & Pedestrian Access). In addition to addressing funding gaps on the recipient projects, transferring these funds also avoids the risk of deallocation due to fund age. The donor project will remain fully funded.

The RJACC approved the request on October 23, 2025, and the NVTA was informed at their November 13, 2025, meeting. The NVTA has not objected to these reallocations.

Mr. William Cuttler  
November 13, 2025  
Page Two

Please take the necessary steps to reallocate these funds in the Transportation Improvement Program and the State Transportation Improvement Program. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Phyllis J. Randall, Chair

cc: Monica Backmon, CEO, NVT  
Sherene Dorazio, Director of Transportation & Capital Infrastructure, Loudoun County

