

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SCHOOL FACILITIES COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2004**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District  
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District, Chairman  
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Walter A. Alcorn, At-Large  
Laurie Frost Wilson, At-Large

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Catherine Belter, Springfield District  
Ilryong Moon, At-Large  
Janet Oleszek, At-Large  
Kathy Smith, Sully District, Chairman  
Tessie Wilson, Braddock District

OTHER PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Janet R. Hall, Mason District  
James R. Hart, At-Large

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gary Chevalier, Director, Office Facilities Planning Services, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS)  
Donna McNeally, Assistant Division Director, Zoning Evaluation Division, (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)  
Dean Tistadt, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Facilities and Transportation Services, FCPS  
Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office  
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk, Planning Commission

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Suzanne F. Harsel, in the Board of Supervisors' Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 20035.

//

Chairman Harsel MOVED THAT THE SCHOOLS FACILITIES COMMITTEE MINUTES OF APRIL 22, 2004 AND JUNE 3, 2004 BE APPROVED.

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Donna McNeally, Assistant Division Director, Zoning Evaluation Division, ZED, DPZ, distributed sample school proffers revised October 15, 2004, a Board of Supervisors' Motion (Public Facilities Criterion), and Board of Supervisors' Adopted Plan Text to replace Appendix 9 of the Land Use Element of the Policy Plans, copies of which are in the date file.

Following up on discussion from the previous meeting, Chairman Harsel suggested that proffered money for schools be designated for districts, pyramids or individual schools.

Commissioner Hall commented that unless proffered funds were going to a specific school, they should go to the School Board because it was familiar with the needs of all schools. Chairman Harsel responded by saying that she and Commissioner Alcorn believed that the funds should be spent in the area in which the school was located.

Commissioner Hart stated he believed both views could be accommodated by writing a model proffer which would allow flexibility on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Hall suggested combining sample proffers number 2, "Contributions to a Specific School for a Specific Improvement" and number 3, "Goods/Services Provided Directly to a School." Concerning number 4, "Cash Contributions to a School Pyramid or Other Area," she said that most people did not know what pyramids were. She added that she thought four sample proffers would be adequate.

Chairman Harsel said the important thing was to make the Commissioners aware of the options as they worked with developers on proffers.

Gary Chevalier, Director, Office Facilities Planning Services, FCPS, said too many options could be confusing and suggested that the number of options be narrowed and that they focus on land or other things related directly to capital improvements.

Catherine Belter, School Board Member, Springfield District, said although most of the School Board members represented districts, she thought it was important for the Board to work together as a group to ensure that the needs of all schools were met.

Tessie Wilson, School Board Member, Braddock District, said she would like to see number 3 more narrowly defined so schools would not be given software or modifications which were not needed, yet offer flexibility to allow funds to be directed where they were most needed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Byers, Ms. Wilson said that she was referring to needs that may or may not be in the CIP, such as maintenance requirements and capital or operating needs.

Commissioner de la Fe recommended that sample proffers numbers 3 and 6 be deleted and pointed out that maintenance could be considered a capital improvement, depending upon the project.

Commissioner Hall noted that contributions could be money, time, goods, services, the dedication of land, or that contributions could be made to a specific school for a specific purpose. She added that the contributions could be defined or they could be designated for County schools in general. She emphasized that it was important not to be too restrictive because needs often changed.

Chairman Harsel pointed out that when Planning Commissioners had rezoning applications in their districts, they should call their School Board member or Mr. Chevalier to determine the best way to use proffered funds.

In response to a question from Chairman Harsel, Ms. Wilson said that if money had been contributed toward a specific item in the CIP, for example, the replacement of a roof in five years, but money was needed for something else, such as replacement of the air conditioning system, a way could be found to use the money for that purpose.

Commissioner Hall pointed out that proffered trail money often never got spent because if needs changed, it was not available for other uses.

Ms. McNeally called the Committee's attention to page two of the implementation motion which said that if projects had already been completed, were no longer needed, or had been removed from the school's CIP prior to the receipt of the proffered funds, they would be considered funds for school capital construction without restriction and appropriated by the Board of Supervisors during the budget review/first year CIP cycle.

Commissioner Byers questioned who determined the value of in-kind contributions. Mr. Chevalier noted that there were not many opportunities for in-kind contributions. Ms. McNeally pointed out that the developer had to verify the value of the contribution with the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), but Commissioner Byers said it had been his experience that DPWES took the contractor's word for the value.

Ilyong Moon, School Board Member, At-Large, commented that the School Board had not had a formal discussion about which option would be best. He said that when he had served on the Planning Commission, he had fought hard for cash proffers. He explained that from his perspective, the School Board and the Schools Facilities Planning staff knew best about capital needs and recommended that the Planning Commission and the Department of Planning and Zoning staff, who guided development, give the school system the maximum flexibility in using contributions to meet capital needs.

Ms. McNeally pointed out that page two of the implementation motion said that proffered monetary contributions made without restriction would be collected and transferred to the School Board as part of the annual budget/first year CIP transfer and that cash contributions for specific

school projects would be forwarded to the school system routinely within 30 days of receipt by DPWES.

A discussion ensued about sample proffer number 2 which required money to go to the Board of Supervisors for transfer to the School Board for a specific school and purpose.

Commissioner Byers pointed out that DPWES collected the money as the agent for the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Chevalier said he would work with the appropriate person in DPZ to come up with acceptable proffer language and report back to the Committee.

Commissioner Hall pointed out that sample proffer number 2 required that money go to the Board of Supervisors for transfer to the Fairfax County School Board for specific school for a specific purpose. Ms. McNeally added that it would go through the Board of Supervisors to DPWES. Chairman Harsel pointed out that Committee members seemed to prefer that a specific school be named so that the money could go directly to DPWES. Ms. McNeally said in that case, the proffer would have to so state.

Kathy Smith, School Board Member, Sully District, commented that flexibility was needed so that monies could be used elsewhere if a specific need had been satisfied and pointed out that the School Board represented the entire County, even though some of the members represented certain districts.

Dean Tistadt, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Facilities and Transportation Services, FCPS, said that when the residents had been insistent that the proceeds of recently sold school property in the Pohick area be spent on development issues there, it had been pointed out to them that the money would go to the School Board's capital improvement program because needs were prioritized on a County-wide basis.

Commissioner Hart remarked that a middle ground was necessary because one of the fears citizens had was that proffered funds would disappear into a central pot without any geographical restrictions. He said the objective of school proffers was to mitigate impacts of specific development.

Commissioner Hall pointed out that districts without a lot of development, such as the Mason District, could not depend on proffered money for their needs.

Chairman Harsel said that the formula for calculating the number of students generated by a development needed to be redone. She said she recently had a rezoning in the Braddock District and using the current formula, it had been determined that no school children would be generated. She said she found it hard to believe that someone moving into a 4,000 square foot house would not have children.

Mr. Chevalier pointed out that the formula was tied to the number of students a project would generate, not the number of units in a project, therefore, a development of only one or two houses, based on the ratios used, sometimes might not produce a yield. Commissioner de la Fe

added that the formula calculated the net impact of new development, so if two houses were built and only two could have been built, regardless of size, no more children would be generated by the formula.

Mr. Moon reiterated his position that flexibility was needed to optimize the use of proffered funds. He said, hypothetically, that a developer might give in to the demands of residents for a playground at an elementary school when the School Board would prefer to use the money to fix a roof at a middle school two miles away.

Commissioner de la Fe pointed out that public facilities as a whole should also be considered when making decisions about how to best spend the funds.

Chairman Harsel reiterated her position that Planning Commissioners needed to work closely with School Board members and staff to determine the most effective way to use proffered monies.

Commissioner de la Fe said the Planning Commission's joint Schools, Parks, and Housing Committees should meet in the near future to discuss the sale of unnecessary or surplus school land.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.  
Suzanne F. Harsel, Chairman

An audio recording of this meeting is available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved on: March 23, 2005

---

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk  
Fairfax County Planning Commission