FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TYSONS CORNER COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, JULY 24, 2012

Completed 11-15-12
Revised 11-16-12
Emailed 11-16-12

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Walter L. Alcorn, At-Large, Chairman
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
Jay P. Donahue, Dranesville District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
None

OTHER COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
James R. Hart, At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District

FAIRFAX COUNTY STAFF PRESENT:
Daniel B. Rathbone, Chief, Transportation Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
Ray Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner, Coordination & Funding Division, FCDOT
Barbara A. Byron, Director, Office of Community Revitalization (OCR)
Charles Wu, Deputy Director, OCR
Scott Sizer, Revitalization Program Manager, OCR
Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office
Dawn M. Ashbacher, Assistant Director, Planning Commission Office
Kara A. DeArrastia, Clerk to the Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:
Brian M. Gordon, Vice President, Government Affairs, Virginia, Apartment and Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington
Bruce Bennett, Chairman of Hunter Mill Defense League's Transportation Committee
Christian Deschauer, Director of Government Relations, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce
Don Bowers, Senior Vice President, Lincoln Property Company
Elizabeth Baker, Land Use Planner, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, PC
James Williamson, Tysons Green neighborhood in Vienna
Jane Seeman, Mayor, Town of Vienna
Jill Parks, Esquire, Cooley LLP
Jonathan B. Cox, Senior Vice President, AvalonBay Communities, Inc.
Keith S. Turner, Vice President, Cityline Partners LLC
Mark Zetts, Co-Chairman of McLean Citizens Association (MCA)'s Planning & Zoning Committee
Michael Caplin, Executive Director, Tysons Partnership
Michael P. Carlin, Co-Founder and Partner, Access Point Public Affairs, LLC/Macerich

UNAPPROVED

OTHERS PRESENT (Continued):

Mike Meegan, Senior Business Director, Government Contracting & Technology, Watkins Meegan
Rob Whitfield, Dulles Corridor Users Group
Roger Diedrich, Fairfax resident
Sally K. Horn, President, MCA
Thomas Cranmer, First Vice President, Fairfax County Taxpayers Alliance
Tom D. Fleury, Executive Vice President, Cityline Partners LLC

ATTACHMENTS:

A. "Update on Planning Commission Discussions" document
B. Draft Strawman II: Planning Commission Tysons Committee Recommendations to the Board on Certain Tysons-related Activities, Marked-up Version dated July 18, 2012
C. Draft Strawman II, Clean Version dated July 18, 2012
D. Revised Letter from Sally K. Horn, President, McLean Citizens Association, dated July 23, 2012
E. Written Statement from Sally K. Horn, President, McLean Citizens Association, to the Planning Commission's Tysons Corner Committee Regarding Its Strawman Recommendations to the Board on Certain Tysons-Related Activities, dated June 21, 2012
F. July 10, 2012 Board Agenda Item, Approval of the Board's Third Four-Year Transportation Program (FY2013-FY2016)

Chairman Walter L. Alcorn called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m., in Conference Rooms 9/10 of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE TYSONS CORNER COMMITTEE MINUTES OF MAY 24, 2012 BE APPROVED.

Commissioner Donahue seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

SUMMARY OF JULY 17, 2012 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION AND REINVESTMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Chairman Alcorn noted that on Tuesday, July 17, 2012, he had joined several members of the County staff to provide the Board of Supervisors' Community Revitalization and Reinvestment Committee an update on the Tysons Corner Committee's deliberations. He said the document entitled, "Update on Planning Commission Discussions" as shown in Attachment A, had been distributed at this meeting. Chairman Alcorn explained that the document summarized the first

UNAPPROVED

draft "strawman" document (Strawman I) detailing the Committee's recommendations to the Board on certain Tysons-related activities.

Barbara Byron, Director, Office of Community Revitalization (OCR), pointed out that members of the Board of Supervisors were extraordinarily complimentary of and impressed with the work of this Committee and appreciative of the tremendous efforts expended thus far. She stated that the second draft strawman document (Strawman II), dated July 18, 2012, as shown in Attachments B and C, addressed specific comments from Board members.

Chairman Alcorn noted that Board members understood and accepted the timeline, recognizing that the Committee had tried to move the process forward to the best of its ability, given the need for discussions and consideration of feedback from stakeholders. He indicated that the Capital One Bank applications (RZ/FDP 2010-PR-021 and PCA 92-P-001-08) were scheduled for a public hearing before the Planning Commission on Wednesday, July 25, 2012. He said he believed that the draft proffers for the Capital One proposal were generally consistent with the Committee's discussions thus far. Commissioner Lawrence replied that the proffers would need to be worded in such a way to sufficiently address the Board of Supervisors' final decision regarding proffer expectations associated with redevelopment in Tysons; for example, the per residential unit and per non-residential square foot dollar rates for the Tysons Road Fund.

Ms. Byron stated that staff anticipated presenting the Commission's recommendations to the Board of Supervisors at either its Transportation Committee meeting on Tuesday, September 18, 2012, or its Community Revitalization and Reinvestment Committee meeting on Tuesday, October 2, 2012.

Chairman Alcorn pointed out that this meeting marked the 23rd time the Committee had met since May 2011. Referencing a letter from Sally K. Horn, President, McLean Citizens Association (MCA), dated July 23, 2012, he cited the following excerpt: "It is simply not good, honest, and open government for a county to make decisions that will affect future residential real estate taxes and revenues available for other county and school programs without first informing residents of the possible effects of these decisions." He commented that he was very disappointed by this statement, but reaffirmed the Committee's commitment to work with MCA on addressing its issues. Chairman Alcorn said he believed that this had been and would continue to be a very open process, all the relevant information has always been available, and questions and requests for information have always been addressed. (A copy of the original letter is in the date file. It was later revised, as shown in Attachment D.) In response, Ms. Horn apologized and said this was not the intent of this letter. She said the letter was intended to express MCA's extreme disappointment that not one of MCA's specific recommendations (outlined in her statement, dated June 21, 2012, as shown in Attachment E) had been incorporated into Strawman II. Chairman Alcorn disagreed, noting that during the review of the strawman, he would be pointing out changes that had been made specifically in response to MCA's recommendations.

UNAPPROVED

Ms. Horn commented that Strawman II had neglected to more explicitly address the magnitude of the financial obligations and risks that Tysons' redevelopment would entail for Fairfax County taxpayers.

Commissioner de la Fe said he thought that this process has been open. However, he stated that it was the role of the Commissioners to exercise their judgment after they listened to all input received and not to necessarily agree or disagree with anyone. He explained that the recommendations would reflect what the Commissioners believed would be best from their perspective based on the input received and it would then be up to the Board of Supervisors to review the Commission's recommendations, hold public hearings, and make decisions. Commissioner de la Fe said he sincerely doubted that the Commission would derive such a complex proposal that would fully satisfy everyone. However, he noted that to accuse the Committee of not considering all input would be a disservice to everyone involved in this process.

Chairman Alcorn pointed out that he believed the MCA letter was the only public comment received so far on Draft Strawman II.

Rob Whitfield, representing the Dulles Corridor Users Group, expressed concern that the strawman had neglected to address the potential consequences of a lower rate of economic and employment growth in Tysons during the next decade than projected by the 2008 George Mason University's (GMU) High Forecast for Growth in Tysons study. Chairman Alcorn replied that the Committee would be mindful of this consideration.

Chairman Alcorn said he believed that using the 2008 GMU's estimates of growth reflected a conservative approach toward planning for a so-called "worst-case traffic scenario." He pointed out that the majority of the projects that occur inside of Tysons would be funded primarily by the landowners/developers. He suggested that everyone consider where there might be a logical review point during the 40-year financing plan. Chairman Alcorn noted one suggestion was to establish an initial commitment to fund 20 years of certain elements, such as the Tysons-wide Service District, and to provide an opportunity toward the end of the 20-year period to examine actual growth and determine whether the commitments should continue at the same level.

Commissioner Lawrence commented that it was uncertain what would happen over the next 40 to 50 years. He said he believed that planning for high growth was the most logical approach, such as in the case of the Consolidated Transportation Impact Analyses (CTIAs) for the East, Central, and West portions of Tysons. He explained that if the adopted funding mechanisms for transportation improvements could successfully support high growth, they could certainly be reduced to address less growth. Commissioner Lawrence said he strongly opposed running the risk of taking an approach that could lead to deficient transportation infrastructure and fail to adequately serve Fairfax County citizens.

//

UNAPPROVED

DISCUSSION OF THE JULY 18, 2012 STRAWMAN II DOCUMENT

Chairman Alcorn noted that staff had distributed marked-up and clean versions of Draft Strawman II, as shown in Attachments B and C, respectively.

Ms. Byron explained that the updated "strawman" document integrated the comments received and Committee discussions thus far. She noted that the revisions on page 1 were editorial in nature and reviewed the justification for the additional language in lines 54 through 59 and 71 through 73 on page 2.

Commissioner Hurley suggested that the additional language in lines 71 through 73 be refined.

In response to questions from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Byron stated that the Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) had received funding for some of the transportation projects. She explained that the recommendations did not include funding for Phase I of the Metrorail Silver Line Extension, maintenance of State roads, or County Metro payments to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority that were part of the multi-jurisdictional compact.

Chairman Alcorn pointed out that the whole focus of this funding plan was to pay for projects and some operating costs associated with transit that were not currently funded.

Commissioner Lawrence suggested that the strawman emphasize that the funding recommendations only addressed new projects that were not within the current programming and budgeting structure and did not include costs for maintenance of streets that were within the State system.

Chairman Alcorn pointed out that the Committee was not suggesting that the State change the way it funded road maintenance.

Daniel Rathbone, Chief, Transportation Planning Division, FCDOT, clarified that the project engineering and design costs were all included in the capital costs.

Commissioner Lawrence commented that the primary purpose of this exercise was to create a new transportation system to aid movement within Tysons.

Commissioner Hart recommended that the additional language in lines 71 through 73 on page 2 be removed because the strawman was an inappropriate format for such language.

Ms. Byron reviewed the editorial changes on page 3, noting that "primarily" was deleted from lines 106 and 113.

Following discussion of lines 106 through 109 on page 3, Ms. Byron noted that staff would revise the language to clarify that the private sector would be responsible for construction of the

UNAPPROVED

on-site portions of the grid of streets and contributions to the Tysons Road Fund to support the construction of off-site portions of the grid.

Ms. Byron reviewed the revisions on page 4 of the strawman, noting that all references to "Tysons Road Club" were replaced with "Tysons Road Fund" throughout the document. She explained the justification for the modification to the language in lines 158 through 160 (bullet c) on page 5.

Addressing bullet b (lines 148-156) on pages 4 through 5, Elizabeth Baker, Land Use Planner, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, PC, explained that developers should receive credit for construction of any off-site portions of the grid of streets not needed to support the proposed development based on traffic impact studies submitted in conjunction with the application.

Chairman Alcorn said construction of the on-site portions of the grid would not be subject to credit, but construction of any off-site portions not needed to support the project could be creditable against the contribution toward the Tysons Road Fund.

Tom Fleury, Executive Vice President, Cityline Partners LLC, indicated that the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and the CTIA associated with Cityline's Scotts Run Station South rezoning applications (RZ 2011-PR-010 and RZ 2011-PR-011) had identified Colony Drive and Lincoln Drive on either side of Westgate Park as critical missing links. He stated that if Cityline were to proffer in-kind construction of those off-site transportation improvements, it would expect credit against its Tysons Road Fund contribution. Ms. Byron concurred with this assessment.

Mr. Rathbone noted the distinction between constructing particular off-site links needed to support a proposed development versus constructing particular off-site portions of the grid not needed to support a proposed development.

Answering questions from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Byron explained that if a TIA or CTIA submitted in conjunction with the application did not identify any off-site missing portions of the grid that were needed to support the proposed development, but the applicant decided to construct them, such improvements should be subject to credit. Mr. Rathbone added that such traffic studies were now referred to by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) as an Operational Analysis because they were outside the formal VDOT Chapter 527 process.

Commissioner Hart suggested adding a comma after "new non-residential development" in line 156 on the top of page 5 and language to the effect of "subject to appropriate credits for in-kind construction of off-site missing links not necessary to support the proposed development" in addition to a reference to the TIA submitted in conjunction with the application.

Responding to a suggestion from Keith Turner, Vice President, Cityline Partners LLC, on how the County should issue credit against a developer's Tysons Road Fund contributions for the construction of off-site portions of the grid of streets not needed to support its project, Ms. Byron

UNAPPROVED

said that such a suggestion was outside the scope of this strawman proposal. She noted that FCDOT would administer credits similar to that applied to other road funds in the County.

In reply to a question from Mark Zetts, Co-Chairman of MCA's Planning & Zoning Committee, Ms. Byron explained that each year FCDOT provided a package to the Board of Supervisors that outlined adjustments to the County road funds.

Commissioner Lawrence recommended that bullet c in lines 158 through 160 on page 5 of the strawman be revised as follows: "Adjust the Tysons Road Fund rates annually in a manner that is consistent with other adjustments to other County road funds and in conformance with the *Code of Virginia*." Ms. Byron agreed with this recommendation.

Jill Parks, Esquire, Cooley LLP, suggested that the strawman clarify that the TIA submitted with the application, not the CTIA, determined the specific transportation improvements that were needed to support the requested development due to the difference in focus and scope between the two studies.

Answering a question from Mr. Whitfield, Ms. Byron explained that staff anticipated that changes to the conceptual road network map in the Tysons Corner Comprehensive Plan resulting from the CTIA process would be part of a Plan Amendment in the next six months.

In response to questions from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Byron stated that additional amendments to the Tysons Plan were expected for consideration over the next 12 months to include revisions to the grid of streets and other editorial changes. She said the street network map would not be as conceptual in nature, but the option for an official map could be pursued later if determined beneficial.

Replying to a question from Mr. Whitfield, Ms. Byron said the updated gird of street network would accommodate additional lane miles of either new roads or widening of roads.

Chairman Alcorn indicated that staff was currently developing a "crosswalk" analysis that captured the expected cash flow for each Table 7 improvement project and its associated need.

Ms. Byron explained that based upon the priorities established in Table 7, the funding plan recommendations, and funding secured currently for certain projects, staff was developing an estimated transportation cash flow model to guide the implementation of the Tysons-wide road improvements over the next 40 years, which she anticipated would be completed soon. She noted that the priorities and cash flow analysis would be updated periodically as needed.

Answering a question from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Byron stated that the cash flow analysis would include the projects, cost projections, funding sources, and timing of design and construction.

UNAPPROVED

Ms. Horn asked whether the cash flow model would disaggregate the funding sources to delineate the expected contributions from the County, State, and Federal governments. Ms. Byron replied that she believed that the model would distinguish the projects determined to be primarily the responsibility of the private sector versus those of the public sector. However, she cautioned against disaggregating the public funding category. Ms. Horn pointed out that MCA's principal concern was to understand the financial risks and obligations for County taxpayers and the total burden expected to be borne by County taxpayers.

Commissioner Lawrence emphasized the importance of publicizing the County taxpayers' share of paying for the Tysons transportation infrastructure.

Ms. Horn explained that MCA was concerned, in a worst-case scenario, that County taxpayers would be liable for a potential burden of upwards of 46 percent of the total tab for the Tysons-related transportation infrastructure. She said County taxpayers should not be expected to shoulder such a potentially significant financial burden.

Responding to a concern expressed by Mr. Whitfield, Ms. Byron pointed out that the cash flow analysis would indicate which projects were determined to be primarily the responsibility of the public sector.

In reply to a question from Ms. Byron, Ray Johnson, Senior Transportation Planner, Coordination & Funding Division, FCDOT, reported that approximately $16.5 million out of a total of $41 million had been secured for the Jones Branch Connector project from Federal government sources. Mr. Rathbone added that the Tysons Metrorail Station Access Management Study (TMSAMS) projects were funded by Federal sources.

Ms. Horn explained that MCA requested best-, worst-, and middle-case estimates, over the next five years, ten years, and for the entire planning horizon, including an estimate that assumed that only County funding sources might be available. She reiterated that the total potential financial burden that County taxpayers were expected to bear needed to be explicitly stated in the funding plan.

Ms. Byron said the financial burden would not accrue entirely to the homeowner, noting that Tysons was a growing tax base. She commented that investment in Tysons was investment in the whole County because it would grow the County's tax base, which would benefit everyone including homeowners. She added that calculation of the burden on County taxpayers should be based on the context that this constituted only one portion of a larger equation.

Ms. Parks asked whether the Commercial and Industrial (C&I) funds were considered a public or private transportation funding option. Chairman Alcorn responded that this issue would be addressed during review of the "crosswalk" analysis. Ms. Byron said she believed that the C&I funds represented private contributions to the County to cover costs of transportation projects.

UNAPPROVED

Answering another question from Ms. Parks, Ms. Byron indicated that the C&I contributions would reduce the total public sector share.

Ms. Parks said she thought that C&I funds should be considered a private transportation funding option.

Mr. Fleury expressed concern about the excessive cost of development in Tysons, noting that developers must pay approximately $13 per new square foot. He said no caps were imposed on the infrastructure costs to be paid for by private developers, and these costs would be adjusted periodically to account for changes in construction, commodity, and labor costs and priorities. He stated that implementation of the Tysons Plan was reaching a tipping point, especially given the extent of all the proffer expectations associated with redevelopment in Tysons. He noted that Tysons developers and members of the Tysons Partnership have already started a concerted effort to lobby and secure funds for Tysons from the State and Federal governments.

Commissioner Donahue said he appreciated Mr. Fleury's comments, commended those who were already participating in this lobbying effort, and anticipated that County officials would join this effort once the financing plan had been approved.

Bruce Bennett, Chairman of Hunter Mill Defense League's Transportation Committee, said unlike the development community, County citizens did not have representatives to lobby for funding from State officials. He commented that County taxpayers would have to shoulder a share of the Tysons infrastructure costs in perpetuity. In addition, he expressed agreement with MCA's letter.

In response to a question from Chairman Alcorn, Mr. Bennett said he thought that the lobbying effort was unrealistic and did not recognize the high probability that the State would refuse to give the County more money because it was not available. He cited the example of a project to construct a permanent bridge for Hunter Mill Road over Difficult Run, which had initially been funded for $42 million and was "shovel ready," but $38 million had been transferred from this project toward a study for the Dulles Metrorail Project. He said residents have pleaded to State officials to replace the funding for this project so that construction could begin.

Commissioner Donahue commented that although success was not guaranteed, the County should still make an effort to lobby and secure funds for Tysons from the Federal and State governments. Chairman Alcorn recommended that toward the end of this process, Commissioners and staff should discuss how all stakeholders in Tysons could work together to make this effort successful.

Ms. Byron announced that on Tuesday, July 10, 2012, the Board of Supervisors had adopted the Third Four-Year Transportation Program for Fiscal Years 2013 through 2016, as outlined in the Board Agenda Item shown in Attachment F.

UNAPPROVED

Replying to a question from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Byron stated that the majority of the estimated $77 million cost of the neighborhood and access improvements had been secured from Federal funding sources.

Ms. Byron described the major revisions on page 6 of the strawman.

Answering questions from Chairman Alcorn, Mr. Rathbone explained that the high costs associated with a streetcar system due to construction of tracks, power supply, and vehicles, would make it difficult to implement during the initial phase of redevelopment in Tysons. He noted, therefore, the Tysons Circulator Study was expected to recommend the operation of bus service to address capacity needs until the year 2050. He added that the estimated $155 million in transit capital costs was consistent with this preliminary recommendation.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zetts, Mr. Rathbone said the transit capital costs included the replacement of buses every 10 to 12 years between now and the year 2050.

In reply to a question from Ms. Horn, Mr. Johnson indicated that the Four-Year Plan included nearly 50 percent of the funding for the TMSAMS projects, and staff envisioned that Federal sources would fund the remainder.

Answering questions from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Byron noted that the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) development process was part of the annual budget cycle. Mr. Rathbone pointed out that adoption of the Four-Year Plan, which included 16 TMSAMS projects, had occurred subsequent to the adoption of the current CIP.

Ms. Horn suggested that language be added following "Staff estimates the value of these improvements at $77,000,000 (in 2012 dollars)" in lines 193 through 194 on page 5, indicating the amounts of funding that had been identified for Fiscal Years 2013 through 2018 and secured from the Federal government.

Ms. Byron noted that the changes on page 7 of the strawman were editorial.

In response to questions from Mr. Zetts, Ms. Byron explained that the Committee had discussed the possibility that in the long term, transit service might evolve in a way that facilitated private operation of the transit system in Tysons. She said increased participation from the private sector and new funding sources in the operation of the transit system might entail monetary contributions and other opportunities, such as ownership and operation of private jitney services.

Commissioner Lawrence said he envisioned that increased participation from the private sector was more entrepreneurial than monetary in that as energy sources and the nature of vehicles evolved, the County should allow for the private ownership and operation of a transit system like jitney services if it might prove to be successful.

UNAPPROVED

Chairman Alcorn pointed out that it was estimated that the $155 million in capital costs to provide the expanded transit service from the years 2013 to 2050 would be covered by State and County funds. He said any private entrepreneurial participation in the operation of the transit service would presumably reduce the public sector funding contribution. Commissioner Lawrence replied that these activities were not mutually exclusive, noting that private-enterprise services could operate within a traditional public-operated transit system.

Replying to questions from Mr. Whitfield, Mr. Rathbone explained the following:

- Staff had conducted Tysons transit passenger counts. In addition, the "Tysons Link" internal shuttle service would provide ample spare capacity in the case of increased frequencies or route variations and maintain ten-minute headway during the peak period.

- The Tysons rezoning applications included Transit Demand Management goals, a concept that was embedded in the Tysons Plan.

- Table 2 in the Transportation Section of the Tysons Plan depicted the required transit mode share during peak periods (person trips, all trip purposes, to and from Tysons) at increasing levels of development (total gross floor area, square feet) and forecast timeframe (years 2030, 2040, and 2050).

- Staff work on the Fairfax County Transit Development Plan was completed in December 2009, but planning for transit services would continue throughout the years. For example, an analysis of bus stop placement was conducted to support the proposed Tysons Link routes.

- The Tysons Link service, proposed as part of the Transit Development Plan, had been approved by the Board of Supervisors. In addition, numerous neighborhood feeders from the areas surrounding Tysons into Tysons itself would be provided.

Ms. Byron noted that the revisions on pages 8 through 9 of the strawman were editorial.

Answering a question from Mr. Zetts, Ms. Byron said if the current CTIAs identified a need for additional projects before the year 2050, it was possible that they would be added to Table 7. She noted that to date, the need for a few projects had been identified beyond the year 2050 but not necessarily before this period.

Chairman Alcorn said he believed that the estimated $506 million contribution from the private sector to fund the Tysons-wide road improvements constituted responsibility for 90 percent of the cost of improvements that occur inside of Tysons and 10 percent of the cost of improvements that occur outside of Tysons. Ms. Byron confirmed this assessment.

Responding to questions from Chairman Alcorn, Mr. Rathbone indicated that the cost to construct the projects outside of Tysons was estimated at $700 million. He discussed the

UNAPPROVED

exercise where staff had estimated the percentages of Tysons-specific traffic generated by the road improvements outside of Tysons.

Ms. Horn called attention to the language, "FCDOT should continue its current process of acquiring funding from outside sources wherever possible and using the County funding sources as the source of last resort for Tysons-wide Road Improvements," in lines 344 through 347 on page 9 of the strawman. She explained that MCA had expressed concern about this language because it could be construed that there might be a possibility that County taxpayers would be liable for all or a substantial portion of the public funding. She noted that MCA had recommended that the strawman convey a firm commitment that County taxpayers would shoulder no more than 25 percent of the financial burden for the Tysons transportation infrastructure. In the situation where the County did not receive enough funding from State and/or Federal sources, Ms. Horn asked whether County taxpayers would be expected to pay for all or most of the public funding or would the level of development be adjusted so that it did not outpace the acquisition of the transportation infrastructure. She suggested that the sentence end at "possible" and language be added to address MCA's concern.

Commissioner Lawrence pointed out to Ms. Horn that limiting the public responsibility of funding the Tysons-wide road improvements to 25 percent of the total cost as had been applied in the Route 28 corridor was not viable due to vast differences between the Route 28 corridor and Tysons.

Commissioner Hart recommended that the language, "using the County funding sources as the source of last resort," be revised to read, "only using the County funding as the source of last resort" in lines 346 through 347 on page 9.

Ms. Byron provided background information on the proposed additional language in line 399 on page 10, lines 401 through 403 on page 11 (new Recommendation Number 18), and lines 415 through 417 on page 11 (new paragraph under Recommendation Number 19).

In reply to a question from Mr. Turner, Ms. Byron said she assumed that the proposed Tysons-wide Service District would include both existing and future condominium owners given equal taxation issues.

Answering another question from Mr. Turner, Chairman Alcorn explained that the amount that the residential property owners would be paying toward the Tysons-wide Service District would help fund the public share. He stated that approximately 90 percent of the Service District would be derived from the private sector/developer sources (based on non-residential property owners comprising 90 percent of the total assessed value of properties in Tysons). He said he did not think that the inclusion of residential properties within the Service District would have a material effect on the private sector share.

In response to a question from Mr. Zetts, Chairman Alcorn cited Recommendation Number 18 (lines 401-403, page 11), "Funding from the revenues generated from the Service District to

UNAPPROVED

construct Road Improvements should be prioritized based upon the greatest benefit to the residents and landowners in Tysons." He said the residential property owner portion of the Service District funding could be used to provide support for access and intersection improvements in Tysons. He noted that in 40 years it was anticipated that commercial properties would make up approximately 65 percent of the total assessed value of properties in Tysons; therefore, this percentage of the Service District revenues should help fund the private sector/developer share at that time.

Commissioner Lawrence called attention to the language under Recommendations Number 19, "The Planning Commission further recommends the Board consider seeking legislation that would permit residential property to be exempt from inclusion within a service district" (lines 415-417, page 11), and asked whether the Board of Supervisors could establish a differential rate for residential properties within a service district. In response, Scott Sizer, Revitalization Program Manager, OCR, said he thought that current legislation addressed this issue.

Chairman Alcorn commented that the Committee was trying to determine how to implement a policy framework outlining various revenue sources and funding for projects in each of the following categories: 1) Grid of Streets, 2) Neighborhood and Access Improvements, 3) Tysons-wide Road Improvements, and 4) Transit Improvements. He added that the policy would have to account for the fact that some of the potential revenue sources did not fit completely into a single category.

Replying to a question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Byron said that the language at the end of Recommendation Number 19 (lines 415 through 417, page 11) would be revised to read, "The Planning Commission recommends the Board consider seeking legislation that would permit residential property to be exempt from inclusion within a service district or establish a differential rate for residential properties within a service district."

Chairman Alcorn called for additional comments or questions from members of the audience.

Brian Gordon, Vice President, Government Affairs, Virginia, Apartment and Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington, noted that his association had considered the strawman proposal. He expressed concern that tenants of multi-family residential rental units would be subjected to the Tysons-wide Service District tax without benefitting from the appreciated value of their asset like owners of single-family homes or condominiums. He also questioned whether localities in Virginia were permitted by the General Assembly to establish a differential rate of taxation.

In response to a comment by Mr. Whitfield, Chairman Alcorn explained that the policy delineated that 10 percent of the cost to construct the improvements that occur inside of Tysons would be funded by State, Federal, Regional, and Countywide funding sources. He said he believed that Tysons-wide Service District funds generated from residential property owners should count toward this public funding contribution.

UNAPPROVED

In reply to a comment by Ms. Horn, Commissioner Lawrence noted that Recommendation Number 20 on page 11 cited an example of a direct benefit to the residential landowners in Tysons as capital infrastructure such as improved sidewalks and trails. He said he agreed that the strawman should provide examples of benefits to the property owners in Tysons.

Answering questions from Mr. Zetts, Ms. Byron pointed out that the "crosswalk" analysis would organize the Tysons-wide road projects in prioritization order. She said an open public process would assess which Tysons-wide road improvements should be considered the "greatest benefit" to the residents and landowners in Tysons, but the Board of Supervisors would ultimately make the final decision.

Ms. Byron suggested combining Recommendation Numbers 18 and 20 because she thought that they were redundant. Chairman Alcorn said this modification should be considered by staff.

Commissioner Hart said he believed that Recommendation Number 18 would not undercut the annual CIP process.

Commissioner Hurley recommended changing "road clubs" to "road funds" in line 441 on page 11 and "road club" to "road fund" in line 446 on page 12.

Ms. Byron explained that staff supported removing the proposed additional language in lines 447 through 451 on page 12 of the strawman because staff believed it was preferable to follow the existing process of accepting road fund contributions at the time of building permit issuance. A discussion ensued among meeting attendees and Ms. Byron regarding whether the Board of Supervisors should consider permitting some of the Tysons Road Fund payment to be made at the time of issuance of the first Residential Use Permit (RUP) or Non-RUP for a building. Commissioner Hart suggested removing this language, noting that the Board could consider this option but it should not be part of the Planning Commission's recommendation. Commissioner Lawrence also suggested that "perming" be corrected to "permit" in line 450 on page 12.

Ms. Byron described the additional modifications on page 12 of the strawman.

Referring to the new language in lines 479 through 483 under the "Transportation Finding Monitoring and Review" heading on the bottom of page 12, Commissioner Lawrence said that the annual budget and CIP processes also identified specific projects and included funding sources on a project-by-project basis. Ms. Byron concurred with this assessment.

Mr. Fleury stated that the determination of "specific transportation improvements beyond those needed to support the requested development" (lines 461-462, page 12) should be based on the site-specific TIA as opposed to the CTIA. Commissioner Hart recommended adding the following language: "as determined by the traffic impact analysis submitted with the application" at the end of line 462, consistent with his revision proposed earlier to line 156 under bullet b on page 5 of the strawman.

UNAPPROVED

Ms. Byron explained that the revisions proposed to Recommendation Number 22 on pages 13 through 14 of the strawman were intended to capture some of the Committee discussions held so far about reviewing the funding plan.

Per a suggestion by Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Byron agreed to delete "available under the Plan" at the end of the sentence in line 513 on page 13.

Commissioner Hart recommended that the language in lines 522 through 523 under Recommendation Number 22 on the bottom of page 13 be amended to read, "The Board review on at least a five-year basis, or more frequently if warranted by circumstances and events…."

Ms. Horn suggested that Recommendation Number 22 be refined to clarify that another purpose of the review should be to determine that the pace of the transportation improvements and the pace of residential and non-residential development were proceeding substantially in tandem, as set forth in the Plan.

Ms. Byron reviewed the proposed new Recommendation Number 23 (lines 533-535) on page 14 of the strawman: "The Board should consider the financial benefits of Tysons when making Countywide funding decisions, with an emphasis on providing a 'fair share' return to Tysons." She commented that because Tysons had contributed significant revenues for the County, the County should invest back in Tysons. Meeting attendees and Commissioners discussed whether the phrase, "with an emphasis on providing a 'fair share' return to Tysons," should be removed from this recommendation. They also provided their interpretations of the meaning behind this phrase.

Ms. Horn suggested modifying "financial benefits of Tysons" to read, "financial benefits of growth in Tysons" in line 533 on page 14.

Christian Deschauer, Director of Government Relations, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, said an open discussion should commence regarding what was considered a "fair share" return to the businesses and landowners in Tysons that had been paying C&I taxes over the years.

Thomas Cranmer, First Vice President, Fairfax County Taxpayers Alliance, recommended that the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce provide a written analysis of why Northern Virginia should get any specific share.

Mr. Deschauer explained that because the Tysons businesses and landowners had been paying a significant portion of the C&I taxes that were used to fund transportation projects throughout the County, a small percentage of those revenues should be dedicated to improvements in Tysons. He noted that this approach would benefit the entire County. Commissioner Migliaccio said he agreed with this assessment, but pointed out that transportation improvements should be focused on places that were highly populated. He expressed support for deleting the phrase, "with an emphasis on providing a 'fair share' return to Tysons," because the Board of Supervisors should not have to debate this issue.

UNAPPROVED

Ms. Byron pointed out that Recommendation Number 23 would be revised to read, "The Board should consider the financial benefits of growth in Tysons when making Countywide funding decisions."

Chairman Alcorn reviewed his calculations for the estimated capital costs to complete the planned Tysons improvements over the next 40 years, as follows:

Private sector share

- $506 million: Tysons-wide road improvements both inside and outside of Tysons
- $561million: On-site portions of the grid of streets
- $304 million: Off-site portions of the grid of streets
- Total: $1.371 billion

Public sector share

- $77 million: Neighborhood and access improvements
- $155 million: Transit capital costs
- $701 million: Tysons-wide road improvements both inside and outside of Tysons
- Total: $933 million

Chairman Alcorn explained that based on these numbers, in a worst-case scenario, the County taxpayers would be liable for 40.5 percent of the total public share for the Tysons capital costs and Table 7 projects. He pointed out that none of the Table 7 improvements attributed to more than half of the Tysons traffic while some accounted for a small fraction. He requested that staff consider the best-, most likely-, and worst-case estimates for only County funding sources. Chairman Alcorn said these estimates could help develop goals or metrics for pursuing certain amounts from Federal and State funding sources over a particular period of years.

Ms. Horn emphasized the importance of evaluating all of the roads in Tysons and Table 7 improvements to ensure that they provide the necessary road structure to support transporting people to and from Tysons, especially given the substantial increase in density.

Referring to the possible exemption of residential property from the Tysons-wide Service District, Mr. Zetts asked whether staff could assess the portion of anticipated 42,000 additional dwelling units over the next 40 years, as called for by the Tysons Plan, would contribute toward the Service District. Ms. Byron replied that this assessment would depend on the number of economy rental units versus condominiums. Mr. Zetts said this could potentially generate a great deal of revenue.

Ms. Byron stated that the last issue covered in the strawman was the Initial Development Level (IDL), as depicted on pages 15 through 17. She noted that staff had spent considerable time examining the alternatives and public input. She said staff believed it would be appropriate to raise the current IDL of 45 million square feet of office use to 60 million square feet of office use to correspond to the GMU 2050 High Forecast, which was consistent with the financing plan.

UNAPPROVED

Commissioner Hart suggested revising Recommendation Number 26 (lines 657-660, page 17) to indicate that the next Tysons-wide Plan amendment should allow for the consideration of a change to the current IDL.

Referencing Criteria b, "Market demand for office space, as demonstrated by new building construction, vacancy rates, and revised forecasts," in lines 632 through 633 on page 16, Mr. Cranmer pointed out that the vacancy rate for office space in Tysons was 17 percent. He said the vast amount of office space currently available outside the Beltway in Northern Virginia and large projects in nearby towns and jurisdictions created an intensively competitive situation for Tysons. He also noted that the cost of office space per square foot in Tysons was considerably higher than in nearby Loudoun County, thereby making Tysons uncompetitive. Mr. Cranmer questioned why any public money should be used to support Tysons redevelopment. He noted that the planned Route 7 widening from the Dulles Toll Road to Reston Avenue was critical to the proper functioning of Tysons. He pointed out that the strawman proposal had failed to address the prioritization of the Tysons-wide road projects, timing of these projects, and financing of the estimated $300 million to construct the Route 7 widening project.

Chairman Alcorn explained to Mr. Cranmer that the "crosswalk" analysis would address the prioritization, timing, and financing of the Table 7 improvements.

Mr. Zetts spoke in support of retaining the current IDL of 45 million square feet of total office development in the Tysons Plan until there was a demonstrated need to consider increasing it as part of a Plan amendment.

Commissioner Lawrence stated that the next Tysons Plan amendment process should entail a comprehensive assessment of the current paradigm for office space, which might reveal a reduction in the number of square feet per employee due to an increase in teleworking and other factors. He noted that such a trend would not cause concern about exceeding the current IDL.

Ms. Parks said she supported deleting the IDL entirely because it did not account for the negotiation process between rezoning applicants and County staff to guarantee adequate and appropriate mitigation of all the transportation impacts and the typical dips and rises in the level of development. She commented that the IDL would arbitrarily limit the County for no real reason because implementation of the proposed funding plan would support the completion of the necessary transportation improvements.

Mr. Turner pointed out that the large size of the pending land-use applications in Tysons were due to parcel consolidation of at least 20 acres within a transit-oriented development (TOD) area. He explained that the IDL was originally established to ensure that financing for transportation improvements was keeping up with the pace of development. He said implementation of this financing plan would eliminate this concern and the need for an IDL.

UNAPPROVED

Ms. Horn said she agreed with Commissioner Lawrence's earlier remarks, noting that the IDL issue needed to be addressed through the full Plan amendment process involving participation from the entire community. She suggested that Recommendation Number 26 be deleted as it was currently written because it would circumvent the Plan amendment process or amended to include the caveat that the current IDL be maintained until a demonstrated need warranted consideration of a change to it in the form of a Plan amendment.

In agreement with Mr. Turner's earlier remarks, Mr. Zetts acknowledged that large-scale parcel consolidations were needed to provide greater connectivity and consistency with the Tysons Plan. He explained that the number of Final Development Plans, not Conceptual Development Plans, would help demonstrate the market demand for office space and related need to change the IDL. Commissioner Lawrence said he concurred with this statement.

In response to additional comments by meeting attendees, Ms. Byron suggested that Recommendation Number 26 be amended to read, "The Board direct staff to incorporate within the next Tysons-wide Plan amendment consideration of a change to the current IDL of 45 million square feet of office use."

Replying to a question from Mr. Turner, Ms. Byron explained that if the Board of Supervisors expressed support to change the IDL, such a change would have to be considered through the Plan amendment process.

Following a discussion among Commissioners regarding the fundamental purpose of the IDL, Commissioner Hart noted that the IDL was not a legal impediment to approval of land-use applications.

Meeting attendees discussed recent and anticipated trends in office development.

Ms. Byron noted that staff would produce a Draft Strawman III document that integrated all comments and suggestions received thus far. (*Note: This document was published on August 15, 2012 and available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning/tysons_docs/081512tysonsstrawman3.pdf*.)

//

Chairman Alcorn announced that the next Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, August 2, 2012, was cancelled. He said the meeting would be rescheduled for the first Wednesday or Thursday after Labor Day in September (*Note: The meeting was subsequently scheduled for Thursday, September 6, 2012, at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Rooms 9/10 of the Fairfax County Government Center*).

//

UNAPPROVED

The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.
Walter L. Alcorn, Chairman

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

Minutes by: Kara A. DeArrastia

Approved on:

_____

Kara A. DeArrastia, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

UNAPPROVED

Update on Planning Commission Discussions

Process

- Planning Commission Tysons Committee (PCTC) has met **22** times since **May, 2011**
- **Walter Alcorn** (At-Large) is PCTC Chairman; was also Chair during Tysons Plan Amendment
- **Five issues** related to Tysons currently under review; **Financing Transportation Infrastructure**, **Interim Commuter Parking**, **Affordable Housing Policy** (Countywide), **TOD Walking Distance Policy** (Countywide), and **Initial Development Level** (IDL)
- PCTC posted a preliminary set of recommendations (**Strawman**) for public review on **June 13th** Received public input on Strawman on June 21st, and discussed among PCTC members on June 26th
- Revised set of recommendations (**Strawman II**) is tentatively scheduled to be posted on **July 18th** and discussed at PCTC on July 24th
- It is expected, PCTC will provide recommendations to **Planning Commission for approval** in **September**. The Planning Commission will endorse and forward to BOS
- BOS will receive recommendations either at **September 18th** BOS Transportation Committee meeting or at BOS Revitalization Committee meeting on **October 2nd**

Funding Infrastructure

- **Total** of **$3,038,000,000** (all $s are 2012 $s) in **transportation funding** needs identified **between 2013 and 2050**.
- Four Categories of funding;
    1. **Grid of Streets** – proposed **privately** funded ($865,000,000)
        - **In-Kind construction** ($561,000,000)
        - **Tysons Road Fund** to fund remainder ($304,000,000); recommend $1,000 per res. unit and $6.44 per non-res sq.ft.
    2. **Neighborhood and Access Improvements** – proposed **public** funded ($77,000,000)
        - Spot intersection improvements
        - Trail/sidewalk/access improvements to Metro Stations
    3. **Transit** – proposed **public** funded ($889,000,000)
        - Circulator service and expanded local and regional bus routes
            - $155,000,000 in new capital costs
            - $734,000,000 in new operating costs (2013-2050)
    4. **Tysons-wide Road Improvements** – proposed **shared** responsibility ($1,207,000,000)
        - Larger improvement projects (also referred to as Table 7)
            - New ramps, new roads, and widening existing roads.
        - PCTC recommends keeping all Table 7 projects
        - Funding responsibility split between inside and outside of Tysons projects
        - **Public** funding estimated at **$701,000,000,** primarily for projects outside of Tysons. Sourced from state, federal, regional and County sources.
            - **Develop a public funding cost/schedule** for how federal, state, regional, and County funds could be allocated to support construction program (**DOT and DMB**, with support from PFM, are currently **preparing** to **present** to PCTC in **August**. Will take into account anticipated revenues, bonding and construction schedule.)

- **Private** funding primarily for projects inside Tysons, estimated at **$506,000,000**. To be funded in the following way:
    - **$253,000,000** (50%) to come from a Tysons-wide tax district.
        - Service District solution would need BOS approval. No petition needed, would include all properties within boundary (including residential owned).
        - Implement effective Dec. 31, 2012, allowing full collection in 2013.
        - 10% of revenue should go toward benefit of residential owners (proportion of existing tax district). BOS policy.
    - **$253,000,000** (50%) to come from properties seeking redevelopment through:
        - Proffers to additional Tysons Road Fund, $1,000 per res. unit and $5.63 per non-res sq.ft.,
        - Proffers to in-kind construction or funding of specific Table 7 improvement,
        - Potential additional smaller tax district (Transportation Improvement District),
        - Dedicated revenue from parking fees or parking district.

- Monitor on a five year basis (in addition to annual Tysons Report, budget, and CIP processes). Focus on ensuring funding spent efficiently, appropriately, and linked with development occurring.

<u>Interim Parking</u>

- Issue a Request for Interest (RFI) for private owners to provide interim parking at Tysons metro stations

<u>Non-Residential Contributions to Affordable Housing Outside of Tysons</u>

- Additional discussion to be undertaken by PC and public outreach prior to making recommendation

<u>TOD Walking Distance Policy</u>

- Separate update to Policy Plan on TOD forthcoming

<u>Interim Development Level</u>

- Increase current IDL from 45 million sq.ft. to 60 million sq.ft. reflecting change from 2030 to 2050 for funding plan.

The document that follows is the updated "strawman" document integrating comments received at the public input session on June 21st and Committee discussions on June 26th.

Draft Strawman II
July 18, 2012

Planning Commission Tysons Committee
Recommendations to the Board on Certain Tysons-related Activities

At its meeting on March 29, 2011, the Board of Supervisors ("the Board") requested that the Planning Commission, working with staff, develop an inclusive process to address Tysons Follow-On Motion #1, related to financing infrastructure; Follow-On Motion #14, related to options for providing commuter parking at Metrorail stations on an interim basis; Follow-On Motion #17 related to affordable housing contributions from non-residential developments and refinement of the County policy on walking distances in Transit Oriented Developments (TODs); and the Initial Development Level (IDL) set forth in the Comprehensive Plan ("the Plan"), given the number of rezoning applications that have been submitted.

To address these issues, the Planning Commission reconstituted its Tysons Committee ("the Committee"), which is chaired by At-Large Commissioner Walter Alcorn. The Committee adopted an inclusive process, which included 22 meetings over a period of fourteen months. During its deliberations, the Committee sought information and input from all stakeholders. Based upon that, the Committee developed recommendations regarding the issues identified by the Board; these recommendations were then approved by the Planning Commission on XXX, 2012, by a vote of XXX ~~and forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration~~.

The Planning Commission is pleased to forward this report of its recommendations to the Board.

Follow on Motion #1 – Financing Infrastructure.

The Plan links development to the timely provision of the infrastructure needed to support it, and provides general strategies for phasing developments in order to achieve a sustainable balance ~~with~~ between development and infrastructure and public facilities throughout Tysons. Prior to investigating potential transportation infrastructure financing options, the Committee undertook a discussion among Committee members, staff, and members of the community attending Committee meetings that confirmed that the transportation improvements contained in Table 7 of the Plan (Attachment 1) are still

valid for planning purposes. The Committee then affirmed via a working consensus that the Plan's recommendations for the provision of the necessary transportation improvements and for transit operating costs should rely on multiple funding sources, including those both from the public and private sectors; that the overall funding plan should be reliable, timely, bondable as appropriate, and sufficient; and, that each element of the funding plan should be legally sustainable.

While the staff had provided an initial proposal to fund 20 years of transportation improvements, by the time that the ~~Tysons~~ Committee began its deliberations, the County had received development proposals that exceeded the projected 2030 level of development, based upon the 2008 George Mason University's estimate~~s~~ of growth. As a result, the Committee felt it was important to extend the funding and transportation improvements horizon from 2030 to 2050. This horizon year change also addresses concerns associated with the Initial Development Level element of the Plan, as discussed below, by looking at funding and improvements beyond 2030.

The Planning Commission's recommendations set forth below are based upon a goal of developing a comprehensive solution for funding the set of infrastructure improvements identified in the Plan ~~identified~~ to support the 113 million square feet of development anticipated to occur by 2050; the need for a funding plan that allows for flexibility in funding options and sources, as well as for adjustments to be made based upon pace of development; and, the need to provide a reliable funding mechanism that implements the visionary plan. In addition, the Planning Commission recommends that all sources of funding, regardless of whether they are public or private sources, be used in an efficient and effective manner to maximize the use of those resources and to minimize costs to the maximum extent possible. Furthermore, the Planning Commission believes that investing in Tysons is investing in the long term future of Fairfax County and that such an investment benefits the County as a whole.

The Planning Commission's recommendations are set forth below:

State, Federal, and Regional Funding Responsibility

The majority of the existing and future roads in Tysons will be public streets. The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is responsible for maintaining public streets in most counties of the Commonwealth, including those within Fairfax County. The Planning Commission strongly believes that the Commonwealth has a responsibility to provide significant contributions to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the transportation infrastructure in Tysons. It is noted that these funding recommendations do not include costs for maintaining streets that are within the state system, as that responsibility resides with the Commonweath.

Furthermore, the Planning Commission believes that the economic benefits of Tysons to Virginia should be recognized and that Virginia should strengthen its investment in Tysons~~,~~ based on ~~the~~ its economic benefits ~~of Tysons~~ to the Commonwealth.

The Planning Commission also believes that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the provision of infrastructure in Tysons.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends that:

1) All stakeholders in Tysons, including the County, residents, landowners, businesses, and developers~~,~~ engage together in a proactive and concerted effort to lobby and secure funds for Tysons from the state and federal governments, and any regional entities.

Transportation Infrastructure Improvements

The Planning Commission has categorized the infrastructure improvements needed to serve Tysons into four categories: Grid of Streets; Neighborhood Improvements; Transit; and, Tysons-wide Improvements~~; and Transit~~. Each component is addressed separately below.

Grid of Streets

The urban street network described within the Plan is needed to provide convenient connections within Tysons, distribute multi-modal traffic efficiently, and enhance the quality of the network through the use of "complete streets". The Grid of Streets ("the Grid") is comprised generally of Collector, Local, and Service streets that provide site access and circulation within Tysons.

The Plan recommends that the private sector be ~~primarily~~ responsible for on-site improvements, including the Grid and ~~for~~ contributions to the Tysons Road Fund to support the construction of the remaining portions of the Grid.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends the cost for construction of the Grid be ~~primarily~~ the responsibility of the Tysons' landowners/developers.

The Planning Commission recommends that the Grid be implemented through two mechanisms:

2) In-Kind Construction: Landowners/developers who seek to redevelop their properties should construct those portions of the Grid needed to support their development applications. This would include the elements of the Grid that are located within and adjacent to development application areas, as well as off-site links, as determined ~~necessary~~ through the entitlement process to be necessary to support the development.

Staff estimates that the value of these improvements is $561,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

3) Tysons Road ~~Club~~Fund: ~~There will be~~ Important sections of the Grid ~~which~~ are not anticipated to be provided through development applications. Nevertheless, these sections of the Grid are essential to the continuous functioning of Tysons in order to maintain an acceptable level of traffic flow, as well as bus routes, and bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. These sections may be at locations where development ~~most likely will~~may not take place at all, or may not occur in a timely manner. These links are referred to as the "missing links".

Staff estimates that the value of these improvements is $304,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

To fund construction of the "missing links", the Planning Commission recommends that the Board adopt the following changes to the existing Tysons Road ~~Club~~Fund:

a. Designate the primary purpose of the Tysons Road ~~Club~~ Fund as funding the construction of the "missing links";

b. Modify the Tysons Road ~~Club~~ Fund rates to an amount necessary to fund the anticipated cost of the "missing links" in the planned 2050 Grid.

Based on the anticipated need and the anticipated level of development, the Planning Commission recommends that the revised Tysons Road ~~Club~~ Fund rates for 2012 be set at $1,000 per new dwelling unit and $6.44 per square foot of

new non-residential development;

c. ~~Escalate~~ Adjust the Tysons Road ~~Club~~ Fund rates annually consistent with the Code of Virginia and other County road funds~~with construction cost inflation~~;

d. Prioritize projects periodically; and,

e. Evaluate the Tysons Road ~~Club~~ Fund on a periodic basis to ensure that the funding contribution levels are sufficient and that the funding available is being allocated efficiently.

Neighborhood and Access Improvements

Intersection improvements are ~~There is a~~ needed now and in the future ~~to make intersection improvements with~~in Tysons and in the communities adjacent to Tysons. These intersections either currently experience traffic flow problems, or are expected to reach traffic flow problem levels if left unaddressed over the next five to ten years.

The Tysons Metrorail Station Access Management Study (TMSAMS), approved by the Board on May 22, 2012, identified a number of projects necessary in the near term to enhance multimodal access to and from the four new Tysons Metrorail stations and to improve the safety of pedestrian and bicycle access within Tysons. These pedestrian and intersection projects include improvements to sidewalks and walkways, bicycle facilities, trails in the vicinity of Tysons, and crosswalks at specific intersections.

The Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) has developed a Four-Year Plan, covering the Fiscal Years 2013-2016 (Four-Year Plan) that programs current and projected revenues for countywide projects and begins to address long term ~~needs in~~ transportation infrastructure needs. The ~~plan~~ Four-Year Plan includes federal funding for a portion of the TMSAMS recommendations. The Board ~~is expected to consider~~ adopted ~~ion of~~ the Four-Year Plan on July 10, 2012.

Staff estimates the value of these improvements is $77,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

4) The primary funding responsibilities for these improvements should come from state, federal, regional and County funding sources. These funding sources have traditionally paid for sidewalk, trail, and spot intersection improvements not associated with a particular development. In addition, funds from these ~~funding~~ sources are more likely to be able to be timed to the needed improvements.

Transit

To leverage the investment in the Silver Line Metrorail expansion into Tysons and beyond, to implement the Fairfax County Transit Development Plan, and to create the environment for the type of transit-oriented development envisioned for Tysons, public transportation must serve an increasingly higher percentage of trips to, from, and within Tysons. FCDOT is implementing plans to expand the Metrobus and Fairfax Connector service within Tyson to increase transit access, and is studying implementation of a circulator system within Tysons to aid movement within Tysons, as recommended in the Plan.

Staff estimates the value of these new services ~~this~~ at $~~408~~889,000,000 (in 2012 dollars); which does not include existing bus services or County Metro payments to WMATA that are part of the multi-jurisdictional compact. The estimate consists of $155,000,000 in capital costs and $734,000,000 in operating costs to provide the expanded service from 2013 – 2050.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

~~5) The funding plan address the expanded transit system through 2030, as the system post 2030 is still under study and may change with new technological developments.~~

~~6)~~5) The primary responsibility for funding ~~this~~ the expanded transit service should come from state, federal, regional, and County funding sources. These funding sources have traditionally paid for the capital and operating costs of transit improvements not associated with a particular development. In addition, funds from these ~~funding~~ sources are more likely to be able to be ~~timed~~

~~to~~available when needed for the needed improvements. Funding for new Fairfax Connector services ~~hour operations~~ related to the ~~Fairfax Connector~~ Silver Line ~~routes~~ will be included in the FY2014 Fairfax Connector budget and the Four-Year Plan will address additional transit requirements for Tysons.

~~7)~~6) ~~There may be s~~Some elements of the transit system, including operating costs, transit stop facilities, and rights-of-way ~~area~~ for future transit systems ~~that~~ should be the responsibility of the private sector. These elements should be funded ~~primarily~~ through proffers associated with redevelopment.

~~8)~~7) For the transit service expected to occur after 2030, ~~the Planning Commission recommends that~~ increased participation from the private sector and new funding sources should be explored. For example, owning and operating private jitney services may prove to be economically feasible for the private sector at some point in the future.

Tysons-wide Road Improvements

A number of physical improvements to the roadway and transportation infrastructure are necessary to achieve critical access and egress to Tysons. These improvements are identified in Table 7 of the Plan under the heading of 'Tysons-wide Road Improvements' ~~heading~~. These projects include new access points from the Dulles Toll Road to Tysons, expanded capacity on select primary and minor arterial roads, and the creation of new minor arterial roads to support the Grid.

The Plan recommends that these necessary transportation improvements will need to rely upon public and private sources of funding and makes recommendations as to the types of funding mechanisms that may be appropriate.

The Committee spent a significant portion of its deliberations on the issues related to the Tysons-wide Road Improvements. The deliberations involved understanding each of the specific improvements listed in Table 7, investigating all of the potential funding mechanisms that are currently available under existing legislation, and understanding the relationship between the transportation improvements and the potential funding mechanisms.

The Four-Year Plan includes a number of projects pertinent to Tysons. Studies include: Tysons Corner connections to the Dulles Toll Road; conceptual engineering and design for the Boone Boulevard and Greensboro Drive extensions, and the Grid; the Tysons Corner Circulator Feasibility Study; and the Tysons Corner Transportation and Urban Design Study.

Table 7 roadway projects entirely or partially funded under the Four-Year Plan include: the extension of Jones Branch Drive to inside I-495 (connecting Jones Branch to Route 123); the Route 7 widening from Route 123 to I-495; and the partial acquisition of right-of-way for the Route 7 widening from the Dulles Toll Road to Reston Avenue.

Staff estimates the value of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements at $1,207,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

~~9)~~8) All of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements included in Table 7 should be addressed in the funding plan, as all are needed to support future growth;

~~10)~~9) The Tysons-wide Road Improvements should be separated into two categories - those that occur outside of Tysons and those that occur inside of the Tysons. The Planning Commission believes that splitting these projects into two groups based on their location allows the projects to be funded primarily ~~funded~~ by the groups receiving the greatest benefit of the improvements.

The Planning Commission recognizes that there may be situations where the landowners/developers may be responsible for an improvement outside the boundaries of Tysons. Conversely, there are instances where state, federal, regional, or County funding sources may be responsible for projects inside the boundary of Tysons. As such, the Planning Commission determined that, for the purposes of this recommendation, “primary responsibility” means 90% of the cost associated with the improvements;

~~11)~~10) The Tysons-wide Road Improvements that occur outside of Tysons, should be funded primarily by state, federal, regional, and County funding sources, since the majority of the trips do not result from the redevelopment of Tysons;

~~12)~~11) The Tysons-wide Road Improvements that occur inside of Tysons should be funded primarily from private sector sources, as the majority of the impacts result from the Tysons development and redevelopment;

~~13)~~12) The Board should continue to build upon the Four-Year Transportation Funding ~~Flan~~Plan, which includes ~~initial~~ funding for some of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements;

~~14)~~13) The Board should direct staff to develop a Tysons Transportation Funding Plan to determine initial priorities for the Tysons-wide Road Improvements;

~~15)~~14) The Board should develop a preliminary schedule of construction for the Tysons-wide Road Improvements, based upon the recommendations in Table 7;

~~16)~~15) The Board should direct staff to continue to maximize outside revenue sources to place the responsibility of transportation funding where it more appropriately resides, i.e. with our state and federal funding partners and ~~that~~ FCDOT should continue its current process of acquiring funding from outside sources wherever possible and using the County funding sources as the source of last resort for Tysons-wide Road Improvements.

FCDOT staff routinely reviews federal, state and other funding opportunities to determine which County transportation projects best fit these programs. The planned Tysons-wide Road Improvements are currently included in this evaluation process.

Based upon the foregoing, $701,000,000 (in 2012 dollars) should be provided from state, federal, regional, and County funding sources and $506,000,000 (in 2012 dollars) from the private sector.

The Tysons-wide road improvements will benefit all residents and landowners who live, work, play and shop within Tysons, whether they are

new office workers or long-time residents. Therefore, a portion of the cost of the improvements should be borne by all Tysons landowners.

While the roads will serve everyone accessing Tysons, the Plan includes redevelopment options for certain areas within Tysons that call for substantial additional development value, and thus these redevelopment options add to the need for the Table 7 Tysons-wide Road I~~i~~mprovements. Therefore, a portion of the Tysons-wide R~~r~~oad ~~projects~~ Improvements should be borne by the applicants for proposed new developments, in that they have a Plan development potential that will be enabled by ~~the Tysons-wide road~~such improvements.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends that the funding within the landowner/developer share be allocated in the following manner:

~~17)~~16) Half of the funding ($253,000,000 in 2012 dollars) should be generated by a Tysons-wide tax district, whose boundary would be the same as the Tysons Corner Urban Center. ~~The~~ Most of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements will be contained within this boundary and will serve to benefit the entire community within Tysons.

The Planning Commission strongly encouraged landowners within Tysons to gain the requisite number of signatures to petition the Board to establish a transportation improvement district (TID) to generate the recommended level of revenue for the needed improvements by approximately 2050. The TID revenue mechanism was used to establish the Dulles Phase I Tax District, currently providing funding for Phase I of the Silver Line Metro Extension.

The landowners within Tysons, as represented by the Tysons Partnership, do not believe they are able to provide such a petition to the Board to establish a TID. Therefore, the Planning Commission recommends that the Board establish a Service District for the same purpose.

~~18)~~17) The service district should be established effective January 1, 2013, to allow for a full year of tax revenue to be raised in 2013. Consideration should be given to phasing in the amount of the tax.

18) Funding from the revenues generated from the Service District to construct Road Improvements should be prioritized based upon the greatest benefit to the residents and landowners in Tysons.

~~19)~~

19) Establishment of a Service District including all landowners within the Tysons Corner Urban Center would by law also include residential property owners. These residential property owners are currently exempt from the Dulles Phase I Rail District taxation, but would be subject to this service district. As of January 1, 2012, residential property owners make up approximately 10% of the total assessed value of properties in Tysons.

The Planning Commission further recommends the Board consider seeking legislation that would permit residential property to be exempt from inclusion within a service district.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

20) The Board set a policy to spend approximately 10% of the Service District funding on transportation projects that have a~~n immediate~~ direct benefit ~~of~~ to the residential landowners in Tysons. These may include capital infrastructure such as improved sidewalks and trails, and that such funding should be accelerated to the earlier phases of the construction schedule to best serve existing residents. This funding may also provide support for increased and improved transit services that might be of a particular benefit to the existing and future residents.

21) The remaining half of the funding ($253,000,000 in 2012 dollars) should be funded through those properties seeking redevelopment within Tysons.

The primary method for raising this revenue should ~~either~~ be through a contribution of $~~6.48 per square foot of new non-residential development; or through a contribution of $~~5.63 per square foot of new non-residential development and $1,000 per new residential unit in 2012. This rate should be adjusted annually consistent with the Code of Virginia and other County road clubs.

The previously discussed Tysons Road ~~Club~~ Fund ~~purpose~~ could be expanded to include the construction of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements or an additional funding pool could be established to administer this contribution. Typically such road club contributions are made at the time of issuance of building permits. If the Board implements this funding option, it may wish to consider permitting some of the payment to be made at the time of issuance of the first Residential Use Permit (RUP) or Non-Residential Use Perming (Non-RUP) for the building.

Alternative funding mechanisms, or a combination thereof, could be enacted, as long as they could be applied equitably and reasonably be expected to provide the recommended funding level in a timely manner. Alternative funding mechanisms which could be suitable, and which could be creditable against the contribution amount set forth above, include;

- Proffered in-kind construction of specific transportation improvements beyond those needed to support the requested development;

- Proffered financial contributions to funding specific transportation improvements;

- A second, smaller tax district, such as a Transportation Improvement District, if such is determined to be legally sustainable; and/or

- Revenue from paid parking fees, or a parking district, in which a certain amount of money per space per day is used to fund the transportation improvements.

On June 11, 2012, the Tysons Partnership endorsed this two pronged financing approach with certain caveats (Attachment 2).

Transportation Funding Monitoring and Review

The Planning Commission recognizes that transportation improvements will be monitored and amended on an annual basis as part of the annual budget process and the five-year Capital Improvement Plan processes. These existing processes are important annual reviews that will provide a transparent process with public hearings at both the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

As previously discussed, the Planning Commission recommends the Tysons Transportation Funding Plan include all of the projects anticipated in the Plan to be needed for 113 million square feet of development, as projected by the George Mason University 2008 study, through 2050. This extended planning horizon contains a number of assumptions that will need to be comprehensively monitored over time to ensure that the assumptions made today remain valid in the future.

The project cost estimates and funding levels determined to support construction of the needed improvements will also need to be flexible to provide for changes in future construction costs and to address any funding overruns or shortfalls identified in the future.

The Planning Commission's recommended funding plan assumes that resources will come from a number of sources, as discussed above. These funding mechanisms vary in the amount of funds that they can raise, bonding capacity, total revenue generated, and timing of the delivery of funds. In general, it is expected that the state, federal, regional, and County funding sources will provide the majority of funding for projects early in the construction schedule, due primarily to the bonding and revenue capacity of those sources. The landowner/developer revenue sources are expected to provide funding later in the redevelopment time span to allow those revenue sources to accrue sufficient revenue for "pay as you go" funding, or to build up reserves to leverage other funding options when needed.

Consolidated Transportation Impact Analyses (CTIAs) for the East, Central, and West portions of Tysons have been conducted by the County to determine the combined impact of the current redevelopment proposals and the potential development on parcels with redevelopment options available under the Plan. The CTIA analyses resulted in the identification of several additional transportation projects in the Tysons East area beyond those listed in Table 7, and may result in additional transportation projects in the Tysons Central and Tysons West areas beyond those include in Table 7.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

22) The Board review on a five year basis, or when otherwise warranted by circumstances and events, the pace and location of development, along with the construction schedule and the funding mechanisms ~~on a periodic basis~~ to ensure that the estimated

funding levels are coordinated with the anticipated construction spending and the timing of construction, and that the funding is being spent in an appropriate and efficient manner. This review should be based on the most current data and information available at the time of the review and should include members of the community and the Tysons Partnership;

~~22)~~23) The Board should consider the financial benefits of Tysons when making Countywide funding decisions, with an emphasis on providing a 'fair share' return to Tysons; and, ~~and,~~

~~23)~~24) The level of development tested by the CTIAs exceeds the level of development anticipated, by the George Mason University 2008 study, to occur by 2050. Any additions to Table 7 should be funded by the development that exceeds the 2050 threshold projected by George Mason University in 2008.

Follow on Motion #14 – Interim Commuter Parking

Follow-On Motion #14 directed staff to explore options for providing commuter parking at Metrorail station(s) in Tysons Corner on an interim basis until Tysons development reaches a level where such commuter parking is not practical or desirable.

To complete this task, FCDOT produced an inventory of potential sites that could accommodate such parking. Subsequent to developing the inventory, staff contacted the owners of these sites to gauge interest in providing interim parking and investigated the zoning regulations governing the provision of commercial parking. In most cases, a commuter parking agreement, approved by the Board, would be required to allow commercial parking. Such an agreement can contain any terms the Board deems appropriate and ~~is~~ that are agreed ~~to~~ upon by all parties.

Although a handful of property owners expressed initial interest when contacted, staff ultimately exhausted all identified possibilities with no property owners willing to move forward.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

~~24)~~25) A formal Tysons Corner Interim Parking Request for Interest (RFI) be issued and sent to all property owners proximate to the Metro stations;

~~25)~~26) The RFI include the target requirements and necessary steps for property owners to obtain interim parking agreements with Fairfax County and be released no later than 12 months before the scheduled opening of the Metro stations; and,

~~26)~~27) If an interim parking location is identified, that signage is posted at the location clearly indicating the interim status of the parking.

Follow on Motion #17a – Affordable Housing Policy.

This motion asked that the Planning Commission examine modifying the Policy Plan to incorporate a policy supporting a non-residential contribution to affordable housing similar to the recommendation in the Tysons Plan. Since this proposed policy will be applicable countywide, the effort will take more time and require extensive public outreach before a recommendation can be made by the Planning Commission.

Follow on Motion #17b – TOD Walking Distance Policy

Under separate cover, the Planning Commission will forward to the Board a proposed revision to the Policy Plan that would amend the County's Guidelines for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and request that the amendment be authorized for public hearing. To reflect elements of the Tysons Plan, this proposed amendment would refine the description of walking distance, as it relates to transit proximity.

Board Motion –Initial Development ~~Level (~~Level (IDL)

The Plan recommends that an Initial Development Level (IDL) of 45 million square feet of total office development built and approved within Tysons should ~~not~~ be ~~exceeded~~ set in order to implement the first 20 year increment of growth. Office uses were the trigger for the IDL due to their being the majority of existing uses and having high peak period vehicle trip generation characteristics. There is currently approximately 27 million square feet of office use in Tysons and another 6.5 million square feet of approved but unbuilt office use. The applications in Tysons that are currently under review represent a potential additional 15.2 million square feet of office use.

~~The list below reflects the current and proposed amount of total office development within Tysons, as of March 25, 2012 for existing and approved/proposed Conceptual Development Plans (CDP) and Final Development Plans (FDP);~~

~~**Existing Built Office Gross Floor Area (GFA)**~~	~~**26,812,000 sq.ft.**~~
~~**Unbuilt Office GFA Approved through Rezoning Process**~~	~~**6,418,089 sq.ft. (CDP)**~~ ~~6,110,689 sq.ft. (FDP)~~
~~**Proposed Net New Office GFA Under Review**~~	~~**15,191,648 sq.ft. (CDP)**~~ ~~797,347 sq.ft. (FDP)~~
~~**Total Built Office GFA and Approvals/Submissions**~~	~~**48,421,737 sq.ft. (CDP)**~~ ~~33,720,036 sq.ft. (FDP)~~

If all of the current applications under review were approved with their current entitlement requests and the IDL were calculated using the development levels shown on the Conceptual Development Plans (CDP), the Plan IDL level of 45 million square feet of total office development would be exceeded by approximately 3.4 million square feet, or approximately 8 percent. However, based on the development levels shown on the Final Development Plans (FDP) that have been approved or submitted, there would be over 11 million square feet of office development remaining before IDL is reached.

The Plan recommends that the following criteria be considered when determining an increase in the IDL for office uses:

a) Progress achieved toward the realization of the vision for Tysons;

b) Market demand for office space, as demonstrated by new building construction, vacancy rates, and revised forecasts;

c) Balance between land use and transportation, including provision of infrastructure and achievement of vehicle trip reduction levels identified for the year 2030 and TDM performance that exceeds the targets outlined in Table 5 in the Transportation section; and

d) Funding arrangements for transportation improvements and progress, so that timely completion of improvements for the period beyond 2030 can confidently be expected.

The current applications represent development well beyond the 2030 time period used to set the IDL. To address this issue, the Commission has proposed a funding recommendation that, if implemented, would provide for the timely completion of all of

the currently identified transportation improvements for the 2050 time period. Implementing the proposed funding solution would result in a circumstance where limiting office development to the 2030 level~~, or determining if the IDL should be linked to the amount of office use approved at the CDP or FDP,~~ would no longer be necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

As the Planning Commission's recommendations for financing infrastructure (identified above) addresses the increment beyond 2030 to the 2050 time period, the Planning Commission recommends:

26) The Board direct staff to incorporate within the next Tysons-wide plan amendment text to change ~~increase or remove~~ the current IDL of 45 million square feet of office use to 60 million square feet of office use to correspond to the GMU 2050 High Forecast.

Attachments:

1 - Table 7 Improvements

2 – Tysons Partnership Letter to Tysons Committee, June 12~~1~~, 2012 / Annotated June 14

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning/tysons_docs/061212tysonspartnershipletter.pdf

3 – Web link to 2011 Planning Commission Tysons Committee Minutes;

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning/2011tysonspresentations.htm

4 – Web link to 2012 Planning Commission Tysons Committee Minutes

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning/2012tysonspresentations.htm

The document that follows is the updated "strawman" document integrating comments received at the public input session on June 21st and Committee discussions on June 26th.

Draft Strawman II
July 18, 2012

Planning Commission Tysons Committee
Recommendations to the Board on Certain Tysons-related Activities

At its meeting on March 29, 2011, the Board of Supervisors ("the Board") requested that the Planning Commission, working with staff, develop an inclusive process to address Tysons Follow-On Motion #1, related to financing infrastructure; Follow-On Motion #14, related to options for providing commuter parking at Metrorail stations on an interim basis; Follow-On Motion #17 related to affordable housing contributions from non-residential developments and refinement of the County policy on walking distances in Transit Oriented Developments (TODs); and the Initial Development Level (IDL) set forth in the Comprehensive Plan ("the Plan"), given the number of rezoning applications that have been submitted.

To address these issues, the Planning Commission reconstituted its Tysons Committee ("the Committee"), which is chaired by At-Large Commissioner Walter Alcorn. The Committee adopted an inclusive process, which included 22 meetings over a period of fourteen months. During its deliberations, the Committee sought information and input from all stakeholders. Based upon that, the Committee developed recommendations regarding the issues identified by the Board; these recommendations were then approved by the Planning Commission on XXX, 2012, by a vote of XXX.

The Planning Commission is pleased to forward this report of its recommendations to the Board.

Follow on Motion #1 – Financing Infrastructure.

The Plan links development to the timely provision of the infrastructure needed to support it, and provides general strategies for phasing developments in order to achieve a sustainable balance between development and infrastructure and public facilities throughout Tysons. Prior to investigating potential transportation infrastructure financing options, the Committee undertook a discussion among Committee members, staff, and members of the community attending Committee meetings that confirmed that the transportation improvements contained in Table 7 of the Plan (Attachment 1) are still valid for planning purposes. The Committee then affirmed via a working consensus that

the Plan's recommendations for the provision of the necessary transportation improvements and for transit operating costs should rely on multiple funding sources, including those both from the public and private sectors; that the overall funding plan should be reliable, timely, bondable as appropriate, and sufficient; and, that each element of the funding plan should be legally sustainable.

While the staff had provided an initial proposal to fund 20 years of transportation improvements, by the time that the Committee began its deliberations, the County had received development proposals that exceeded the projected 2030 level of development, based upon the 2008 George Mason University's estimate~~s~~ of growth. As a result, the Committee felt it was important to extend the funding and transportation improvements horizon from 2030 to 2050. This horizon year change also addresses concerns associated with the Initial Development Level element of the Plan, as discussed below, by looking at funding and improvements beyond 2030.

The Planning Commission's recommendations set forth below are based upon a goal of developing a comprehensive solution for funding the set of infrastructure improvements identified in the Plan to support the 113 million square feet of development anticipated to occur by 2050; the need for a funding plan that allows for flexibility in funding options and sources, as well as for adjustments to be made based upon pace of development; and, the need to provide a reliable funding mechanism that implements the visionary plan. In addition, the Planning Commission recommends that all sources of funding, regardless of whether they are public or private sources, be used in an efficient and effective manner to maximize the use of those resources and to minimize costs to the maximum extent possible. Furthermore, the Planning Commission believes that investing in Tysons is investing in the long term future of Fairfax County and that such an investment benefits the County as a whole.

The Planning Commission's recommendations are set forth below:

<u>State, Federal, and Regional Funding Responsibility</u>

The majority of the existing and future roads in Tysons will be public streets. The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is responsible for maintaining public streets in most counties of the Commonwealth, including those within Fairfax County. The Planning Commission strongly believes that the Commonwealth has a responsibility to provide significant contributions to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the transportation infrastructure in Tysons. It is noted that these funding recommendations do not include costs for maintaining streets that are within the state system, as that responsibility resides with the Commonweath.

Furthermore, the Planning Commission believes that the economic benefits of Tysons to Virginia should be recognized and that Virginia should strengthen its investment in Tysons~~,~~ based on its economic benefits to the Commonwealth.

The Planning Commission also believes that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the provision of infrastructure in Tysons.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends that:

1) All stakeholders in Tysons, including the County, residents, landowners, businesses, and developers engage together in a proactive and concerted effort to lobby and secure funds for Tysons from the state and federal governments, and any regional entities.

Transportation Infrastructure Improvements

The Planning Commission has categorized the infrastructure improvements needed to serve Tysons into four categories: Grid of Streets; Neighborhood Improvements; Transit; and, Tysons-wide Improvements. Each component is addressed separately below.

Grid of Streets

The urban street network described within the Plan is needed to provide convenient connections within Tysons, distribute multi-modal traffic efficiently, and enhance the quality of the network through the use of "complete streets". The Grid of Streets ("the Grid") is comprised generally of Collector, Local, and Service streets that provide site access and circulation within Tysons.

The Plan recommends that the private sector be responsible for on-site improvements, including the Grid and contributions to the Tysons Road Fund to support the construction of the remaining portions of the Grid.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends the cost for construction of the Grid be the responsibility of the Tysons' landowners/developers. The Planning Commission recommends that the Grid be implemented through two mechanisms:

2) In-Kind Construction: Landowners/developers who seek to redevelop their properties should construct those portions of the Grid needed to support their development applications. This would include the elements of the Grid that are located within and adjacent to development application areas, as well as off-site links, as determined through the entitlement process to be necessary to support the development.

Staff estimates that the value of these improvements is $561,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

3) Tysons Road Fund: Important sections of the Grid are not anticipated to be provided through development applications. Nevertheless, these sections of the Grid are essential to the continuous functioning of Tysons in order to maintain an acceptable level of traffic flow, as well as bus routes, and bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. These sections may be at locations where development may not take place at all, or may not occur in a timely manner. These links are referred to as the “missing links”.

Staff estimates that the value of these improvements is $304,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

To fund construction of the “missing links”, the Planning Commission recommends that the Board adopt the following changes to the existing Tysons Road Fund:

a. Designate the primary purpose of the Tysons Road Fund as funding the construction of the “missing links”;

b. Modify the Tysons Road Fund rates to an amount necessary to fund the anticipated cost of the “missing links” in the planned 2050 Grid.

   Based on the anticipated need and the anticipated level of development, the Planning Commission recommends that the revised Tysons Road Fund rates for 2012 be set at $1,000 per new dwelling unit and $6.44 per square foot of new non-residential development;

c. Adjust the Tysons Road Fund rates annually consistent with the Code of Virginia and other County road funds;

d. Prioritize projects periodically; and,

e. Evaluate the Tysons Road Fund on a periodic basis to ensure that the funding contribution levels are sufficient and that the funding available is being allocated efficiently.

Neighborhood and Access Improvements

Intersection improvements are needed now and in the future in Tysons and in the communities adjacent to Tysons. These intersections either currently experience traffic flow problems, or are expected to reach traffic flow problem levels if left unaddressed over the next five to ten years.

The Tysons Metrorail Station Access Management Study (TMSAMS), approved by the Board on May 22, 2012, identified a number of projects necessary in the near term to enhance multimodal access to and from the four new Tysons Metrorail stations and to improve the safety of pedestrian and bicycle access within Tysons. These pedestrian and intersection projects include improvements to sidewalks and walkways, bicycle facilities, trails in the vicinity of Tysons, and crosswalks at specific intersections.

The Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) has developed a Four-Year Plan, covering the Fiscal Years 2013-2016 (Four-Year Plan) that programs current and projected revenues for countywide projects and begins to address long term transportation infrastructure needs. The Four-Year Plan includes federal funding for a portion of the TMSAMS recommendations. The Board adopted the Four-Year Plan on July 10, 2012.

Staff estimates the value of these improvements is $77,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

4) The primary funding responsibilities for these improvements should come from state, federal, regional and County funding sources. These funding sources have traditionally paid for sidewalk, trail, and spot intersection improvements not associated with a particular development. In addition, funds from these sources are more likely to be able to be timed to the needed improvements.

Transit

To leverage the investment in the Silver Line Metrorail expansion into Tysons and beyond, to implement the Fairfax County Transit Development Plan, and to create the environment for the type of transit-oriented development envisioned for Tysons, public transportation must serve an increasingly higher percentage of trips to, from, and within Tysons. FCDOT is implementing plans to expand the Metrobus and Fairfax Connector service within Tyson to increase transit access, and is studying implementation of a circulator system within Tysons to aid movement within Tysons, as recommended in the Plan.

Staff estimates the value of these new services at $889,000,000 (in 2012 dollars); which does not include existing bus services or County Metro payments to WMATA that are part of the multi-jurisdictional compact. The estimate consists of $155,000,000 in capital costs and $734,000,000 in operating costs to provide the expanded service from 2013 – 2050.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

5) The primary responsibility for funding the expanded transit service should come from state, federal, regional, and County funding sources. These funding sources have traditionally paid for the capital and operating costs of transit improvements not associated with a particular development. In addition, funds from these sources are more likely to be able to be available when needed for the needed improvements. Funding for new Fairfax Connector services related to the Silver Line will be included in the FY2014 Fairfax Connector budget and the Four-Year Plan will address additional transit requirements for Tysons.

6) Some elements of the transit system, including operating costs, transit stop facilities, and rights-of-way for future transit systems should be the responsibility of the private sector. These elements should be funded through proffers associated with redevelopment.

7) For the transit service expected to occur after 2030, increased participation from the private sector and new funding sources should be explored. For example, owning and operating private jitney services may prove to be economically feasible for the private sector at some point in the future.

Tysons-wide Road Improvements

A number of physical improvements to the roadway and transportation infrastructure are necessary to achieve critical access and egress to Tysons. These improvements are identified in Table 7 of the Plan under the heading of 'Tysons-wide Road Improvements'. These projects include new access points from the Dulles Toll Road to Tysons, expanded capacity on select primary and minor arterial roads, and the creation of new minor arterial roads to support the Grid.

The Plan recommends that these necessary transportation improvements will need to rely upon public and private sources of funding and makes recommendations as to the types of funding mechanisms that may be appropriate.

The Committee spent a significant portion of its deliberations on the issues related to the Tysons-wide Road Improvements. The deliberations involved understanding each of the specific improvements listed in Table 7, investigating all of the potential funding mechanisms that are currently available under existing legislation, and understanding the relationship between the transportation improvements and the potential funding mechanisms.

The Four-Year Plan includes a number of projects pertinent to Tysons. Studies include: Tysons Corner connections to the Dulles Toll Road; conceptual engineering and design for the Boone Boulevard and Greensboro Drive extensions, and the Grid; the Tysons Corner Circulator Feasibility Study; and the Tysons Corner Transportation and Urban Design Study.

Table 7 roadway projects entirely or partially funded under the Four-Year Plan include: the extension of Jones Branch Drive to inside I-495 (connecting Jones Branch to Route 123); the Route 7 widening from Route 123 to I-495; and the partial acquisition of right-of-way for the Route 7 widening from the Dulles Toll Road to Reston Avenue.

Staff estimates the value of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements at $1,207,000,000 (in 2012 dollars).

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

8) All of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements included in Table 7 should be addressed in the funding plan, as all are needed to support future growth;

9) The Tysons-wide Road Improvements should be separated into two categories - those that occur outside of Tysons and those that occur inside of the Tysons. The Planning Commission believes that splitting these projects into two groups based on their location allows the projects to be funded primarily by the groups receiving the greatest benefit of the improvements.

   The Planning Commission recognizes that there may be situations where the landowners/developers may be responsible for an improvement outside the boundaries of Tysons. Conversely, there are instances where state, federal, regional, or County funding sources may be responsible for projects inside the boundary of Tysons. As such, the Planning Commission determined that, for the purposes of this recommendation, “primary responsibility” means 90% of the cost associated with the improvements;

10) The Tysons-wide Road Improvements that occur outside of Tysons, should be funded primarily by state, federal, regional, and County funding sources, since the majority of the trips do not result from the redevelopment of Tysons;

11) The Tysons-wide Road Improvements that occur inside of Tysons should be funded primarily from private sector sources, as the majority of the impacts result from the Tysons development and redevelopment;

12) The Board should continue to build upon the Four-Year Transportation Funding Plan, which includes funding for some of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements;

13) The Board should direct staff to develop a Tysons Transportation Funding Plan to determine initial priorities for the Tysons-wide Road Improvements;

14) The Board should develop a preliminary schedule of construction for the Tysons-wide Road Improvements, based upon the recommendations in Table 7;

15) The Board should direct staff to continue to maximize outside revenue sources to place the responsibility of transportation funding where it more appropriately resides, i.e. with our state and federal funding partners and FCDOT should continue its current process of acquiring funding from outside sources wherever possible and using the County funding sources as the source of last resort for Tysons-wide Road Improvements.

    FCDOT staff routinely reviews federal, state and other funding opportunities to determine which County transportation projects best fit these programs. The planned Tysons-wide Road Improvements are currently included in this evaluation process.

Based upon the foregoing, $701,000,000 (in 2012 dollars) should be provided from state, federal, regional, and County funding sources and $506,000,000 (in 2012 dollars) from the private sector.

The Tysons-wide road improvements will benefit all residents and landowners who live, work, play and shop within Tysons, whether they are new office workers or long-time residents. Therefore, a portion of the cost of the improvements should be borne by all Tysons landowners.

While the roads will serve everyone accessing Tysons, the Plan includes redevelopment options for certain areas within Tysons that call for substantial additional development value, and thus these redevelopment options add to the need for the Table 7 Tysons-wide Road Improvements. Therefore, a portion of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements should be borne by the applicants for proposed new developments, in that they have a Plan development potential that will be enabled by such improvements.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission recommends that the funding within the landowner/developer share be allocated in the following manner:

16) Half of the funding ($253,000,000 in 2012 dollars) should be generated by a Tysons-wide tax district, whose boundary would be the same as the Tysons Corner Urban Center. Most of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements will be contained within this boundary and will serve to benefit the entire community within Tysons.

    The Planning Commission strongly encouraged landowners within Tysons to gain the requisite number of signatures to petition the Board to establish a transportation improvement district (TID) to generate the recommended level of revenue for the needed improvements by approximately 2050. The TID revenue mechanism was used to establish the Dulles Phase I Tax District, currently providing funding for Phase I of the Silver Line Metro Extension.

    The landowners within Tysons, as represented by the Tysons Partnership, do not believe they are able to provide such a petition to the Board to establish a TID. Therefore, the Planning Commission recommends that the Board establish a Service District for the same purpose.

17) The service district should be established effective January 1, 2013, to allow for a full year of tax revenue to be raised in 2013. Consideration should be given to phasing in the amount of the tax.

18) Funding from the revenues generated from the Service District to construct Road Improvements should be prioritized based upon the greatest benefit to the residents and landowners in Tysons.

19) Establishment of a Service District including all landowners within the Tysons Corner Urban Center would by law also include residential property owners. These residential property owners are currently exempt from the Dulles Phase I Rail District taxation, but would be subject to this service district. As of January 1, 2012, residential property owners make up approximately 10% of the total assessed value of properties in Tysons.

The Planning Commission further recommends the Board consider seeking legislation that would permit residential property to be exempt from inclusion within a service district.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

20) The Board set a policy to spend approximately 10% of the Service District funding on transportation projects that have a direct benefit to the residential landowners in Tysons. These may include capital infrastructure such as improved sidewalks and trails, and that such funding should be accelerated to the earlier phases of the construction schedule to best serve existing residents. This funding may also provide support for increased and improved transit services that might be of a particular benefit to the existing and future residents.

21) The remaining half of the funding ($253,000,000 in 2012 dollars) should be funded through those properties seeking redevelopment within Tysons.

The primary method for raising this revenue should be through a contribution of $5.63 per square foot of new non-residential development and $1,000 per new residential unit in 2012. This rate should be adjusted annually consistent with the Code of Virginia and other County road clubs.

The previously discussed Tysons Road Fund could be expanded to include the construction of the Tysons-wide Road Improvements or an additional funding pool could be established to administer this contribution. Typically such road club contributions are made at the time of issuance of building permits. If the Board implements this funding option, it may wish to consider permitting some of the payment to be made at the time of issuance of the first Residential Use Permit (RUP) or Non-Residential Use Perming (Non-RUP) for the building.

Alternative funding mechanisms, or a combination thereof, could be enacted, as long as they could be applied equitably and reasonably be expected to provide the recommended funding level in a timely manner. Alternative funding mechanisms which could be suitable, and which could be creditable against the contribution

amount set forth above, include;

- Proffered in-kind construction of specific transportation improvements beyond those needed to support the requested development;

- Proffered financial contributions to funding specific transportation improvements;

- A second, smaller tax district, such as a Transportation Improvement District, if such is determined to be legally sustainable; and/or

- Revenue from paid parking fees, or a parking district, in which a certain amount of money per space per day is used to fund the transportation improvements.

On June 11, 2012, the Tysons Partnership endorsed this two pronged financing approach with certain caveats (Attachment 2).

Transportation Funding Monitoring and Review

The Planning Commission recognizes that transportation improvements will be monitored and amended on an annual basis as part of the annual budget process and the five-year Capital Improvement Plan processes. These existing processes are important annual reviews that will provide a transparent process with public hearings at both the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

As previously discussed, the Planning Commission recommends the Tysons Transportation Funding Plan include all of the projects anticipated in the Plan to be needed for 113 million square feet of development, as projected by the George Mason University 2008 study, through 2050. This extended planning horizon contains a number of assumptions that will need to be comprehensively monitored over time to ensure that the assumptions made today remain valid in the future.

The project cost estimates and funding levels determined to support construction of the needed improvements will also need to be flexible to provide for changes in future construction costs and to address any funding overruns or shortfalls identified in the future.

The Planning Commission's recommended funding plan assumes that resources will come from a number of sources, as discussed above. These funding mechanisms vary in the amount of funds that they can raise, bonding capacity, total revenue generated, and timing of the delivery of funds. In general, it is expected that the state, federal, regional, and County funding sources will provide the majority of funding for projects early in the construction schedule, due primarily to the bonding and revenue capacity of those sources. The landowner/developer revenue sources are expected to provide funding later in the redevelopment time span to allow those revenue sources to accrue sufficient revenue for "pay as you go" funding, or to build up reserves to leverage other funding options when needed.

Consolidated Transportation Impact Analyses (CTIAs) for the East, Central, and West portions of Tysons have been conducted by the County to determine the combined impact of the current redevelopment proposals and the potential development on parcels with redevelopment options available under the Plan. The CTIA analyses resulted in the identification of several additional transportation projects in the Tysons East area beyond those listed in Table 7, and may result in additional transportation projects in the Tysons Central and Tysons West areas beyond those include in Table 7.

<u>RECOMMENDATION:</u>
The Planning Commission recommends:

22) The Board review on a five year basis, or when otherwise warranted by circumstances and events, the pace and location of development, along with the construction schedule and the funding mechanisms to ensure that the estimated funding levels are coordinated with the anticipated construction spending and the timing of construction, and that the funding is being spent in an appropriate and efficient manner. This review should be based on the most current data and information available at the time of the review and should include members of the community and the Tysons Partnership;

23) The Board should consider the financial benefits of Tysons when making Countywide funding decisions, with an emphasis on providing a 'fair share' return to Tysons; and,

24) The level of development tested by the CTIAs exceeds the level of development anticipated, by the George Mason University 2008 study, to occur by 2050. Any additions to Table 7 should be funded

by the development that exceeds the 2050 threshold projected by George Mason University in 2008.

Follow on Motion #14 – Interim Commuter Parking

Follow-On Motion #14 directed staff to explore options for providing commuter parking at Metrorail station(s) in Tysons Corner on an interim basis until Tysons development reaches a level where such commuter parking is not practical or desirable.

To complete this task, FCDOT produced an inventory of potential sites that could accommodate such parking. Subsequent to developing the inventory, staff contacted the owners of these sites to gauge interest in providing interim parking and investigated the zoning regulations governing the provision of commercial parking. In most cases, a commuter parking agreement, approved by the Board, would be required to allow commercial parking. Such an agreement can contain any terms the Board deems appropriate and that are agreed upon by all parties.

Although a handful of property owners expressed initial interest when contacted, staff ultimately exhausted all identified possibilities with no property owners willing to move forward.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission recommends:

25) A formal Tysons Corner Interim Parking Request for Interest (RFI) be issued and sent to all property owners proximate to the Metro stations;

26) The RFI include the target requirements and necessary steps for property owners to obtain interim parking agreements with Fairfax County and be released no later than 12 months before the scheduled opening of the Metro stations; and,

27) If an interim parking location is identified, that signage is posted at the location clearly indicating the interim status of the parking.

Follow on Motion #17a – Affordable Housing Policy.

This motion asked that the Planning Commission examine modifying the Policy Plan to incorporate a policy supporting a non-residential contribution to affordable housing similar to the recommendation in the Tysons Plan. Since this proposed policy will be

applicable countywide, the effort will take more time and require extensive public outreach before a recommendation can be made by the Planning Commission.

Follow on Motion #17b – TOD Walking Distance Policy

Under separate cover, the Planning Commission will forward to the Board a proposed revision to the Policy Plan that would amend the County's Guidelines for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and request that the amendment be authorized for public hearing. To reflect elements of the Tysons Plan, this proposed amendment would refine the description of walking distance, as it relates to transit proximity.

Board Motion –Initial Development Level (IDL)

The Plan recommends that an Initial Development Level (IDL) of 45 million square feet of total office development built and approved within Tysons should be set in order to implement the first 20 year increment of growth. Office uses were the trigger for the IDL due to their being the majority of existing uses and having high peak period vehicle trip generation characteristics. There is currently approximately 27 million square feet of office use in Tysons and another 6.5 million square feet of approved but unbuilt office use. The applications in Tysons that are currently under review represent a potential additional 15.2 million square feet of office use.

If all of the current applications under review were approved with their current entitlement requests and the IDL were calculated using the development levels shown on the Conceptual Development Plans (CDP), the Plan IDL level of 45 million square feet of total office development would be exceeded by approximately 3.4 million square feet, or approximately 8 percent. However, based on the development levels shown on the Final Development Plans (FDP) that have been approved or submitted, there would be over 11 million square feet of office development remaining before IDL is reached.

The Plan recommends that the following criteria be considered when determining an increase in the IDL for office uses:

a) Progress achieved toward the realization of the vision for Tysons;

b) Market demand for office space, as demonstrated by new building construction, vacancy rates, and revised forecasts;

c) Balance between land use and transportation, including provision of infrastructure and achievement of vehicle trip reduction levels identified for the year 2030 and TDM performance that exceeds the targets outlined in

Table 5 in the Transportation section; and

d) Funding arrangements for transportation improvements and progress, so that timely completion of improvements for the period beyond 2030 can confidently be expected.

The current applications represent development well beyond the 2030 time period used to set the IDL. To address this issue, the Commission has proposed a funding recommendation that, if implemented, would provide for the timely completion of all of the currently identified transportation improvements for the 2050 time period. Implementing the proposed funding solution would result in a circumstance where limiting office development to the 2030 level would no longer be necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

As the Planning Commission's recommendations for financing infrastructure (identified above) addresses the increment beyond 2030 to the 2050 time period, the Planning Commission recommends:

26) The Board direct staff to incorporate within the next Tysons-wide plan amendment text to change the current IDL of 45 million square feet of office use to 60 million square feet of office use to correspond to the GMU 2050 High Forecast.

Attachments:

1 - Table 7 Improvements

2 – Tysons Partnership Letter to Tysons Committee, June 12, 2012 / Annotated June 14
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning/tysons_docs/061212tysonspartnershipletter.pdf

3 – Web link to 2011 Planning Commission Tysons Committee Minutes;
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning/2011tysonspresentations.htm

4 – Web link to 2012 Planning Commission Tysons Committee Minutes
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning/2012tysonspresentations.htm

Attachment D

P.O Box 273
McLean, Virginia 22102
July 23, 2012
Via Email

Tysons Committee
Fairfax County Planning Commission
12000 Government Center Parkway
Fairfax, VA 22035

Dear Members of the Planning Commission Tysons Committee,

On behalf of the McLean Citizens Association (MCA), I wish to express our deep disappointment in Strawman II. It not only fails to address the concerns of the MCA outlined in the June 21 statement that I provided on MCA's behalf, but also increases the risks to Fairfax County residents above the levels in Strawman I and provides no overriding public benefits to warrant this increased exposure. For these reasons, MCA cannot support Strawman II.

Strawman II ignores MCA's fact-based requests and specific recommendations (outlined in the attached June 21 statement) that the Strawman explicitly outline the magnitude of the financial obligations and risks entailed for County taxpayers and provide stronger protections for taxpayers. The County should not make decisions that will affect future residential real estate taxes and revenues available for other county and school programs without first informing residents of the possible effects of these decisions.

Of greatest concern to MCA is that the July 18 Strawman rejects MCA's requests for: (1) a firm commitment that County taxpayers will shoulder no more than 25% of the financial burden for the Tysons transportation infrastructure; (2) explicit Strawman language that ties the pace of development directly to the availability of funding for the required infrastructure; and (3) explicit language that clarifies that, like the public sector, the private sector (landowner/developer community) would be required to fund the full cost of the Table 7 projects for which they are responsible, including cost overruns, debt service (if the County floats bonds for them), and inflation.

Equally troublesome for MCA is that Strawman II would increase the risks for taxpayers by:

1. Proposing that Road Club contributions be reduced and deferred to the time of issuance of the first residential use permit or non-residential use permit rather than made -- as currently -- at the time of issuance of building permits. The consequence of these proposals would appear to be that the County's taxpayers have to front the funds for Road Club projects for at least 2-4 additional years and/or that the transportation improvements lag behind the development and are not available when needed. MCA opposes this

behind the development and are not available when needed. MCA opposes this proposed amendment. We understand the economics behind taxpayer fronting road construction funds, as was done in the Route 28 corridor, but increasing the obligations of taxpayers an extra 2-to-4 years or more is simply unfair.

2. Proposing an increase in the Initial Development Level (IDL) from 45 million sq. ft. to 60 million sq. ft. in the next Tysons-wide plan amendment. MCA opposes any consideration of an increase in IDL at this time as the impact on traffic congestion, quality of life in the surrounding communities and associated financial burden for County taxpayers is unknown. This action would clearly upset the "grand bargain" that brought together divergent interests and enabled broad acceptance of the Comprehensive Plan amendment adopted by the County on June 22, 2010. It is both unfair to the other stakeholders and just plain wrong to alter part of the "deal" in a manner that benefits only some of the stakeholders.

We request that you direct County staff to factor our concerns, as enumerated in the June 21 statement and above, into a revised Strawman and that you defer consideration of forwarding any document to the full Planning Commission until County taxpayers concerns are explicitly addressed.

We look forward to continuing to work with you to achieve a financial plan for Tysons' transportation infrastructure improvements that it is fair and equitable to all stakeholders, including taxpayers throughout Fairfax County. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sally K. Horn

Sally K. Horn
President
McLean Citizens Association

Attachments: As stated

Cc:
Fairfax County Planning Commissioners
Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Edward L. Long Jr.
Barbara Byron

Sally K. Horn
President, McLean Citizens Association

Written Statement to the Planning Commission's Tysons Corner Committee
Regarding Its Strawman Recommendations to the Board on
Certain Tysons-Related Activities
June 21, 2012

I am Sally K. Horn, current President of the McLean Citizens Association, or MCA. MCA is the informal town council for the McLean area of Fairfax County, an area comprising some 26,000 households.

MCA supports an approach to funding Tyson's transportation infrastructure that is open; transparent; and consistent with both the Comprehensive Plan Amendment principles and the numerous MCA resolutions and letters on Tysons Corner's redevelopment as an urban center, including our most recent letter of May 15, 2012. Such an approach will ensure that the substantial costs of building the necessary infrastructure to make Tysons work do not fall disproportionately upon Fairfax County taxpayers but are equitably shared among all stakeholders.

We thank the Commissioners and County staff for their very thoughtful and creative efforts in this regard. Yours has not been an easy task.

There is much in the Strawman Recommendations to the Board on Certain Tysons-Related Activities that we can support.

Our concerns are primarily, although not exclusively, with regard to the treatment of public sector costs. Our principal interest is in protecting County taxpayers from shouldering a disproportionate share of the costs. Our overarching recommendations are:

- First, that the Strawman more explicitly address the magnitude of the financial obligations and risks that Tysons' redevelopment will entail for County taxpayers and provide stronger protections for taxpayers against uncertain and possibly unlimited taxpayer financial obligations for infrastructure to support an urbanizing Tysons; and
- Second, that, prior to deciding the approach for funding Tysons transportation improvements, given the financial stakes involved for all Fairfax County taxpayers, public meetings be held at convenient locations throughout the County to brief County residents on the proposed approach; to hear residents' concerns; and to consider whether

any modifications to the financial strategy might be in order. The meetings should be widely publicized so as to encourage maximum public participation and acceptance of the final plan.

Our specific concerns and recommendations are, as follows:

- Costs should be stated not only in 2012 dollars, but also in 2050 dollars, adjusted for inflation and debt servicing. Providing 2050 cost estimates will better enable taxpayers to gauge the magnitude of their financial obligations over the life of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

- The total potential financial burden expected to be borne by Fairfax County taxpayers needs to be explicitly stated. We, the public, must know the full extent of our possible liability now, and not later. The Strawman should tell us what kind of tax increases we, as County taxpayers, may be facing. Give us a best and worst case estimate, over the next five years, ten years, and for the entire planning horizon, including an estimate that assumes, as does Recommendation16, that only County funding sources may be available.

    a. We taxpayers, just like the Tysons development and landowner community, deserve to know our potential "bottom line" obligation, even if that potential "bottom line" is only the public equivalent of the "soft cap" or "target" that County staff has discussed and the Strawman provides for the Tysons developer community and Tysons landowners.

    b. As you know, in our letter of May 15, MCA specifically requested that County staff and the PCTC disaggregate the expected public contribution into three categories – Fairfax County, Virginia, and Federal. While County staff has expressed concern that such disaggregation might disadvantage the County in securing state or federal funding, that argument holds no water for us, for two reasons:

        i. The strawman calls for all stakeholders, including those within Tysons, to come together to lobby and secure funds for Tysons from state and federal governments, and any regional entities. It is difficult to lobby for funding absent a clear understanding of the consequences of not receiving that funding.
        ii. Recommendation 16 calls for using County funding sources "as a last resort" for "outside Tysons" Tysons Road Improvements should state, federal and/or regional revenue sources not

materialize. A reasonable person, therefore, could assume that the Strawman does envision, in a worst case scenario, that County taxpayers would be liable for all or most of the "public funding." This public sector tab, expressed in 2012 dollars in the Strawman, is $1.186 B, or over 46% of the total tab for Tysons transportation infrastructure improvements. Isn't that statement the equivalent of telling state and federal sources that there is the expectation that we would go it alone, if necessary?

- A potential burden of upwards of 46% of the total tab for the Tysons-related transportation infrastructure, the share that could accrue to Fairfax County taxpayers under Recommendation 16 in a worst case scenario, exceeds that which is fair and equitable. This is particularly so, in light of (1) the relative benefits to the private sector vs. County taxpayers of the increased densities that the Plan permits at Tysons and (2) the actual contribution to the County coffers that has been and is expected to be received from Tysons commercial development, as articulated by Len Wales in a May 8, 2012 meeting with the Tysons Partnership.

    a. MCA's steadfast position continues to be that the contribution of County taxpayers to the development and construction of the required Tysons infrastructure should be limited to no more than 25% of the total cost, just as it has not exceeded 25% for transportation improvements in the Route 28 corridor. Further, based on the Strawman discussion of what are properly state and federal funding responsibilities for County transportation infrastructure projects, the County should strive to make it even lower.

- The current Strawman calls upon County taxpayers to make up for any shortfall in state and/or federal funding of "public sector" projects, "as a last resort." We do not believe that County taxpayers should be expected to shoulder such a potentially significant financial burden.

    a. Recommendation 16 should be revised along the following lines: "County funding sources should not be used as the source of last resort for Tysons-wide Road improvements that are properly and historically a state or federal responsibility."
    b. As MCA stated in our May 15 letter, the financial plan should include an option or options for funding the "public" sector contribution in the event that Virginia state and Federal contributions do not materialize.

c. If the developers and landowners who stand to profit from urbanization of Tysons are unable or otherwise not prepared to increase their contributions to help County taxpayers cover any shortfall in state and federal funds, then development must be adjusted so that it keeps pace with – and does not outpace – the required transportation infrastructure. The MCA consistently has insisted that costs be paired with gains. It is wrong to privatize gain, while making burdens public.
d. We, therefore, request that language along the following lines be added to the Strawman, including at the end of Recommendation 16: "To the extent that funding from state and/or federal sources is not available to meet these responsibilities and the private sector is unwilling or unable to help Fairfax County cover the shortfall, development must be adjusted so that, as called for in the Comprehensive Plan, development keeps pace with – and does not outpace – the acquisition of the transportation infrastructure required to make Tysons urbanization work and to ensure that the massive increases in density permitted in the plan do not overwhelm the transportation network."

- We appreciate the intent behind Recommendation 19 to set aside approximately 10% of the Service District funding on transportation projects to provide for some immediate benefit to the current residential landowners within Tysons. We would note, however, that the examples cited -- improved sidewalks, trails, and transit services -- more properly are considered neighborhood and access improvements and not "within Tysons" Tysons-wide Road Improvements, as those terms are defined in the Strawman.

    a. The Strawman needs to identify the offsets that it would propose so that the "public" funding burden is not increased.
    b. We are concerned that otherwise, sufficient "private" funds would not be available to cover the private sector's share of the "within Tysons" Tysons-wide Road Improvements.

- While the Strawman does not speak to caps, in several meetings, there has been discussion of caps, including both "hard caps" and "soft caps."

    a. To avoid any misunderstanding regarding the nature of both the private and public sector financial commitments, we strongly recommend that language be added to the Strawman that states that the costs outlined in the document are best estimates of the costs of the Table 7 projects that the private and public sectors have committed to complete and that both

the private and public sectors would be expected to cover the entire cost (or their share, in the case of shared projects) of the projects with which they are associated in Table 7. This includes, but is not limited to, debt servicing, cost overruns and increases due to inflation.

b. While MCA strongly opposes setting caps, if caps are to be set, they need to apply equally to both developers/landowners and Fairfax County taxpayers so that funding sources are treated equitably.

- Two of the Tysons Partnership caveats articulated in its June 12 letter that is appended to the Strawman Plan concern MCA: (1) its call for a prohibition on additions to the Table7 inventory of required transportation infrastructure projects, and (2) its call for consideration of a reduction in "proffer requirements."

  a. The support for – or at least acquiescence of – the citizens of Fairfax County, and particularly those in the surrounding communities, to the increased densities approved in the Comprehensive Plan Amendment was predicated upon the commitments offered by Fairfax County – and the developer community when lobbying for the increased densities – of no decrement to the quality of life in the surrounding communities, no increase in traffic congestion, and the availability of necessary amenities within Tysons to enable it to function as a contained urban center.
  b. County staff already has identified additional transportation projects that will be required to fulfill this commitment to the surrounding communities over the planning horizon; the developer community must contribute its fair share to funding those projects. Further, follow-through on the proffers is essential to fulfillment of the commitments made to the surrounding communities related to quality of life and traffic reduction and to help offset non-transportation-related capital costs associated with providing the basic services required by the permitted density, such as schools, libraries, parks, public safety and utilities.
  c. To the extent that necessary road improvements are not forthcoming or proffers are reduced, development also must be scaled back. All too often in the past, we, County residents, have suffered because commitments made by the development community or County were allowed to be ignored. Not so, this time. We expect those commitments to be honored, just as we honor ours as County taxpayers.

- MCA has no objection to the County floating bonds to front money to the developer/landowner community for a portion of the private sector's contribution to the transportation infrastructure requirements, provided that:

    a. The concerns articulated above are satisfactorily addressed;
    b. The public has an input into which projects are advanced money and into the tax rate that is set for the Tysons Service District;
    c. Debt servicing charges and opportunity costs to the County of floating the bonds are included.
    d. The proposed Tysons Tax, or Service, District is implemented in 2013; the tax rate is set at a level such that the Tysons community begins to make contributions immediately to retire its debt to the County; and the County taxpayers are made whole within the shortest amount of time but in any case in less than 40 years.
    e. Until the debt is fully repaid, the County defer consideration or approval of any proposals to increase density beyond the Comprehensive Plan if those proposals would require additional transportation infrastructure to be built and if the private sector requests or needs the County to front funding for the private sector portion of those costs.

- The first recommendation in the Strawman -- for all stakeholders in Tysons to engage together in a proactive and concerted effort to lobby and secure funds for Tysons from the state and federal governments, and any regional entities – lacks the necessary specificity to make it actionable.

    a. The recommendation needs to identify the projects that stakeholders should press for and how they should proceed.
    b. At a minimum, the recommendation should state that the Planning Commission recommends that all stakeholders band together to lobby and secure funds for Tysons from the state and federal governments and any regional entities to cover the costs (identified in Recommendation 16) of projects that are traditionally funded by state, federal and regional entities. Further, it should recommend that the County bring together the key stakeholders to identify and prioritize specific projects to seek funding for and to develop a time-phased plan for that purpose. This should include County staff, the Partnership, the MCA, the town of Vienna, and other appropriate stakeholders.

- The importance of interim parking at one or more of the new Metro stations at Tysons Corner cannot be underscored enough.

a. All of the taxpayers in Fairfax County have shouldered a tremendous financial burden for bringing Metro to Tysons Corner, but the taxpayers in the surrounding communities have borne the lion's share of the inconvenience engendered by the construction of the Metro line through Tysons. Most have been "good soldiers" about the inconveniences, because they expected that once the Metro arrived at Tysons, they would reap the benefit of being able to use it.
b. But, the reality is that without parking at one or more of the stations, the residents of the surrounding communities will not benefit. Public transit, as envisioned in the Strawman, simply will not reach the vast majority of the residents in the surrounding communities of McLean or Great Falls. Instead of receiving a net benefit, these residents and taxpayers will be even further disadvantaged by all the traffic and congestion that the years of construction in and around Tysons will bring.
c. We, therefore, fully support Recommendation #14. The County needs to work more aggressively with the private sector to find interim parking solutions – whether through tax or other incentives that encourage greater private sector interest.

In conclusion, thank you for the opportunity to present MCA's concerns with regard to the draft Strawman Recommendations on Certain Tysons-Related Activities. As I indicated at the outset, we see much to commend in the draft Strawman. We hope you will consider our comments as they are intended: constructive reflections of our concerns and recommendations on how to strengthen the protections for the public and ensure a fair and equitable sharing of Tysons' costs and benefits. And, we ask that you reflect our concerns in your markup and incorporate our recommendations into your submission to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Board Agenda Item
July 10, 2012

ACTION - 6

Approval of the Board's Third Four-Year Transportation Program (FY2013-FY2016)

ISSUE:
Board approval of a list of proposed roadway, spot improvement, pedestrian, bike, and transit projects and associated funding for inclusion as the Board's third Four-Year Transportation Program. Board approval of additional funding allocations for previously approved projects.

RECOMMENDATION:
The County Executive recommends that the Board approve the attached list of proposed roadway, spot improvement, pedestrian, bike, and transit projects included as the FY2013-FY2016 Board Four-Year Transportation Program, and associated funding in the amount of $103.7 million as detailed in Attachment A. It is also recommended that the Board allocate additional funds in the amount of $31.7 million toward previously approved projects, as detailed in Attachment B. Funding in the amount of $937.0 million from various revenue sources will be required to support the Four-Year Transportation Program.

TIMING:
Board approval is requested on July 10, 2012, so that staff can move forward with implementation of projects as expeditiously as possible.

DISCUSSION:
FCDOT staff has reviewed projected revenues for transportation funding in the next four years, FY2013 to FY2016. Projected revenues are comprised of a number of funding sources, including the Commercial & Industrial (C&I) Tax revenues, County General Obligation Bonds for transportation, Economic Development Authority (EDA) bond revenues, Federal Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, and Department of Defense (DOD) Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) grants. Projected funding comes to a total of $937.0 million from these various sources.

The Board has already allocated funding in the amount of $801.6 million, as detailed in Attachment C. Previously approved projects and funding sources include:

- Projects approved by the voters and funded by the 2004 and 2007 County

General Obligation Bonds for transportation;
- Projects approved by the Board on October 19, 2009, and March 29, 2011, and funded by the C&I tax revenues;
- Tysons Roadway projects reflecting the priorities included in the Comprehensive Plan amendment adopted by the Board on June 22, 2010;
- Dulles Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements projects approved by the Board on March 29, 2011; and
- The Tysons Metrorail Station Access Management Study (TMSAMS) projects approved by the Board on May 22, 2012, and funded by RSTP funds.

FCDOT staff met with all of the district Supervisors and their staff to identify possible projects for proposed funding for the next four year period. These meetings occurred from November 2011 through January 2012, and after further review and prioritization, a list of recommended projects was developed. Staff presented this list of projects to the Board at the May 8, 2012, and June 12, 2012, Board Transportation Committee meetings, and at the May 29, 2012, Board Aides meeting. These new projects were selected to provide added capacity, increase safety, provide congestion mitigation, connect missing sidewalk and bicycle links, provide safe access to transit facilities, and offer alternative transportation mode options to commuters.

Following Board approval of the attached project list, staff will undertake detailed scoping of the projects. For some projects, staff can begin design, right-of-way, utility relocation and construction activities for projects with funding that was previously allocated (TMSAMS and Reston Metrorail Access Group). For projects proposed to be funded by the upcoming 2014 Transportation Bond Referendum ($100 million), project implementation will not begin until the referendum is voted on in November 2014. If the referendum is not approved by the voters, staff will amend the attached lists to remove those projects proposed for Bond funding.

In addition to the $937.0 million in projects outlined in the attachments, when County staff reports on progress regarding the Third Four-Year Program, staff will include projects from the previous Four-Year Programs and projects in Fairfax County funded by other external sources, in a biannual, comprehensive report to the Board.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Available revenues for FY2013 to FY2016 total $937.0 million. The Board of Supervisors has previously approved projects and allocated funding in the amount of $801.6 million (Attachment C). Additional funding in the amount of $31.7 million is required to complete several of these projects, which are already in progress (Attachment B). Attachment A identifies a slate of new projects proposed for funding in the next four years, in the amount of $103.7 million.

The Four-Year Transportation Program projects are funded with identified revenues including General Obligation Bonds programmed as part of the Capital Improvement Program. Funding for the program will consist of the following sources: $237 million in RSTP and CMAQ funds anticipated to be received by the County through FY2016; $245 million in existing and proposed County General Obligation (G.O.) and Revenue Bonds; $262 million in County Commercial and Industrial Tax revenues; and $193 million in federal and private sources.

This plan assumes a proposed increase in the Commercial and Industrial Tax revenue rate from 11 cents to 12.5 cents per $100 of assessed value beginning in FY2014. This increase was discussed with the Board during the February 7, 2012, Board retreat and during subsequent budget discussions. The Board is not being asked to take action on this increase at this time. Formal adoption of the FY2014 C&I tax rate will be included in the FY2014 Budget.

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:
Attachment A: Four-Year Program - Proposed Countywide Projects (by Category)
Attachment B: Additional Funding Needed for Previously Approved Projects FY13-FY16
Attachment C: Revenues Previously Allocated to Projects

STAFF:
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
Susan Datta, Chief Financial Officer and Director, Department of Management & Budget
Joe LaHait, Debt Coordinator, DMB
Tom Biesiadny, Director, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
W. Todd Minnix, Chief, Transportation Design Division, FCDOT
Todd Wigglesworth, Section Chief, Coordination and Funding Division, FCDOT
Eric M. Teitelman, Chief, Capital Projects and Operations Division, FCDOT
Karyn L. Moreland, Chief, Capital Projects Section, FCDOT
Ray Johnson, Coordination and Funding Division, FCDOT
Chris Wells, Pedestrian Program Manager, Capital Projects Section, FCDOT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Attachment A - Four-Year Program - Proposed Countywide Projects (by Category)

Route #	Project Name	Project Description	District	Allocated ($mil)	Funding Source
Roadway / Spot Improvements					
620	Braddock Road/Danbury Forest/Wakefield Chape	Construct short-term left-turn lane improvements	BR	$0.050	GOB
620	Braddock Road/Roberts Road	Construct Right Turn Lane from NB Roberts to EB Braddock Rd	BR	$0.850	GOB
I-395	I-395 SB Off-Ramp to Route 236 WB (Ph I)	Enhanced signage/wayfinding	MA	$0.500	GOB
236	Route 236/Beauregard St	Channelize Route 236 WB Left Turn Lane at Beauregard St	MA	$0.050	GOB
7	North Chambliss St/Beauregard St	Eliminate exclusive RTL from N Chambliss to Beauregard	MA	$1.000	GOB
I-395	I-395 SB Off-Ramp to Route 236 WB (Ph II)	Widen Off-Ramp to Two Lanes	MA	$1.000	GOB
236	Route 236/Beauregard St Bus Pullout	Close EB Service Drive and Install Bus Pullout	MA	$0.200	GOB
236	Route 236/Cherokee Ave	Construct NB RTL from Cherokee Ave to EB Route 236	MA	$0.500	GOB
642	Lorton Road/Lorton Station Blvd	Extend WB LTL and convert signal to protected only phasing	MV	$1.200	GOB
642	Lorton Road/Lorton Market Road	Extend WB Left Turn Lane	MV	$0.300	GOB
600	Silverbrook Road @ Southrun Road	Intersection improvements, EB left turn lane	MV	$1.200	GOB
29	Route 29 Widening	From Shirley Gate Road to PW County Line (segments)	SP,BR,SU	$2.830	GOB
XXXX	Jones Branch Drive Connector	Construct roadway connection including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, reservation for transit	PR	$41.100	C&I/RVB/GOB/PROF/RSTP
				$50.780	
Pedestrian Intersection Improvements					
620	Braddock Road/Olley Lane	Intersection improvements	BR	$0.150	GOB
645	Burke Lake Road/Coffer Woods Road	Intersection improvements, and extend sidewalk	BR, SP	$0.400	GOB
5422	Lakepointe Dr/Guinea Rd	Intersection improvements, extend sidewalk on Lakepointe	BR	$0.300	GOB
1155	Highland St/Backlick Rd/Amherst Ave	Intersection Improvements	LE	$0.300	GOB
650	Annandale Road/Graham Road	Intersection improvements	MA	$0.150	GOB
617	Backlick Road/Edsall Road	Intersection improvements	MA	$0.200	GOB
244	Columbia Pike/John Marr Dr	Intersection improvements	MA	$0.150	GOB
244	Columbia Pike/Gallows Road	Intersection improvements	MA	$0.200	GOB
641	Pohick Road/Southrun Road	Intersection improvements, and extend sidewalk	MV	$0.200	GOB
636	Hooes Road/Newington Forest Ave	Intersection improvements, and extend sidewalk	SP, MV	$0.200	GOB
50	Route 50/Sullyfield Circle/Centerview Dr	Intersection improvements	SU	$0.200	GOB
28	Centreville Road/Machen Road	Intersection improvements	SU	$0.150	GOB
	New Pedestrian/Bicycle Funds		CW	$1.000	C&I
				$3.600	
Walkway/Trail/Bicycle					
644	Old Keene Mill Rd Walkway	North side from Carrleigh Pkwy west to existing	BR	$0.100	GOB
710	Wakefield Chapel Rd Walkway	East side from Braddock Rd to Stahlway La	BR	$0.500	GOB
710	Wakefield Chapel Road Bike Lanes	Extend On-Road Bike Lanes from Pulley Ct to NVCC Campus	BR	$0.130	GOB
XXXX	GMU-City-Vienna Metrorail Bike Route	Brand and sign bike route between GMU and Vienna Station	BR	$0.010	GOB
5101	Lake Braddock Drive Road Diet	On-Road Bike Lanes from Burk Road to Rolling Road	BR	$0.040	GOB
XXXX	Burke VRE Connector Ph IV	Trail from VRE Station west to Oak Leather/Lake Barton	BR	$1.200	GOB
XXXX	CCT Pavement Upgrades	Upgrade segments between Rt 236 and Old Keene Mill Rd	BR	$0.200	GOB
123	Dolly Madison Blvd Sidewalk	Dolly Madison Blvd Sidewalk (south side) - Chainbridge Rd	DR	$0.300	GOB
123	Dolly Madison Blvd Sidewalk	South side missing links from Old Dominion Dr to Beverly Ave	DR	$0.400	GOB
695	Kirby Road Sidewalk	Kirby Road Sidewalk - Chesterbrook to east of Chesterbrook ES	DR	$0.300	GOB
1799	North West St Sidewalk	North side from Great Falls St to Brilyn Pl	DR	$0.300	GOB
605	Sunrise Valley Dr Sidewalk	East side from River Birch Rd to Legacy Circle	DR	$0.300	GOB
644	Franconia Road Walkway	North side from Norton Rd to Governor's Pond Cir (west)	LE	$1.100	GOB
613	South Van Dorn St @ Franconia Rd Walkway	Southwest quadrant missing link	LE	$0.400	GOB
600	Silverbrook Road Walkway	South side from Hooes Road to South County HS	MV	$2.300	GOB
652	Burke Road Bike Lanes	On-Road Bike Lanes/Road Diet from Mill Cove Ct to VRE Station	SP	$0.040	GOB
608	West Ox Road Trail	Missing segments from Penderbrook Road to Route 50	SU	$0.995	GOB
608	West Ox Road Trail (proffer)	Missing segments from Penderbrook Road to Route 50	SU	$0.005	PROF
29	Route 29 Trail (proffer)	Missing segments from Stringfellow Road to PW County Line	SU	$0.334	PROF
50	Route 50 Trail	From West Ox Rd to east of Lee Road (missing segments)	SU	$1.400	GOB
				$10.354	
Transit					
xxxx	Rolling Road VRE lot	Expand parking lot	SP, BR	$1.000	CMAQ
xxxx	Fairfax Connector	New Bus Purchases	CW	$3.300	C&I
xxxx	Fairfax Connector	Bus Stop Projects	CW	$4.000	C&I
				$8.300	
				$73.034	

Next Four-Year Program - Proposed Projects (RMAG)

Route #	RMAG ID	Project Name	District	Allocated ($mil)	Funding Source
xxxx	K	Isaac Newton Sq W	HM	$2.234	RSTP
5320	I24	Sunrise Valley Dr/Commerce Pk Dr	HM	$0.054	RSTP
5320	I27	Sunrise Valley Dr/Great Meadow/Centennial	HM	$0.097	RSTP
828	I32	Wiehle Ave/ DTR Ramps	HM	$0.019	RSTP
828	X1	Wiehle Ave @ W&OD Trail (Ph I)	HM	$0.046	RSTP
675	I3	Sunset Hills Rd/Town Center Parkway	HM	$0.200	RSTP
5320	I12	Sunrise Valley Dr/Mercator Dr-USGS	HM	$0.200	RSTP

Route #	Project Name	Project Description	District	Allocated ($mil)	Funding Source
5320	S9	Sunrise Valley Dr-South Side from Glade Dr to Reston Pkwy	HM	$3.882	RSTP
xxxx	S11	Isaac Newton Sq W Walkway	HM	$0.283	RSTP
828	S15, B10	Wiehle Ave Station Walkway/Bikeway	HM	$0.500	RSTP
828	B14	Wiehle Ave @ W&OD Trail (Ph II)	HM	$2.337	RSTP
7414		Town Center Pkwy	HM	$6.148	RSTP
				$16.000	
Next Four-Year Program - Proposed Projects (TMSAMS)					
Route #	**TMSAMS ID**	**Project Name**	**District**	**Allocated ($mil)**	
xxxx	SW #12	Scotts Run Walkway	PR	$2.500	RSTP
123	SW #8	Chain Bridge Road Walkway	PR	$0.750	RSTP
650	SW #16	Gallows Road Walkway	PR	$0.250	RSTP
3402	SW #15	Aline Avenue Walkway	PR	$0.250	RSTP
839	SW #14	Madrillon Road Walkway	PR	$0.250	RSTP
5062	SW #7	Jones Branch Drive Walkway	PR	$0.400	RSTP
7	CW #9	Leesburg Pike/Gosnell/Westpark	HM	$0.250	RSTP
7	CW #8	Leesburg Pike/Spring Hill Road	HM	$0.250	RSTP
7	CW #1	Leesburg Pike/Tyco/Westwood Ctr	HM	$0.250	RSTP
6054	CW #29	Solutions Dr/Greensboro Blvd	PR	$0.050	RSTP
650	CW #17	Gallows Rd/Gallows Branch Rd	PR	$0.250	RSTP
677	CW #15	Old Courthouse Rd/Woodford Rd	PR	$0.200	RSTP
650	CW #19	Gallows Rd/Boone Blvd	PR	$0.150	RSTP
786	CW #18	Boone Blvd/Aline Ave	PR	$0.050	RSTP
6034	CW #31	International Dr/Jones Br/Spring Hill	PR	$0.150	RSTP
6034	CW #30	International Dr/Tysons Blvd	PR	$0.150	RSTP
5061	CW #34	Westpark Dr/Jones Branch Dr	PR	$0.150	RSTP
5457	CW #33	Westbranch Dr/Westpark Dr	PR	$0.100	RSTP
5457	CW #32	Westbranch Dr/Jones Branch Dr	PR	$0.100	RSTP
3543	CW #35	Old Meadow Rd/Old Meadow La	PR	$0.050	RSTP
1074	CW #42	Colonial La/Chain Bridge Rd	PR	$0.050	RSTP
1549	CW #43	Seneca Ave/Chain Bridge Rd	PR	$0.050	RSTP
4018	CW #10	Tyspring St/Gosnell Rd	HM	$0.050	RSTP
8733	CW #11	Raglan Rd/Gosnell Rd	HM	$0.050	RSTP
2736	CW #12	Wall St/Gosnell Rd	HM	$0.050	RSTP
xxxx	TR #D	Vesper Court Trail	HM	$1.000	RSTP
xxxx	TR #A	Ashgrove Lane Trail	HM	$0.500	RSTP
677		Old Courthouse Rd Bike Shoulders	HM	$0.115	RSTP
936		Sandburg St Trail	PR	$0.150	RSTP
695		Idylwood Road Bike Lanes	PR	$1.050	RSTP
xxxx		Pavement Marking Plans	PR	$0.100	RSTP
xxxx		Tysons Wayfinding Signage	PR	$0.100	RSTP
xxxx		Tysons Pavement Markings	PR	$0.015	RSTP
7		Route 7 Shared Use Paths	DR	$4.500	RSTP
xxxx		Construction Reserve	CW	$0.354	RSTP
				$14.684	
TOTAL				**$103.7**	

Attachment B - Additional Funding Needed for Previously Approved Projects FY13-FY16

Project Type/Description	District	Allocated ($mil)	Funding Source
Telegraph Rd Walkway	LE	$ 1.5	GOB
Leesburg Pk/Colvin Run Rd (Pedestrian and Intersection Improvements)	DR	$ 1.3	C&I
Lees Corner Rd Walkway	SU	$ 1.0	C&I
Route 29 Widening (Centreville to Fairfax City)	SP, SU, BR	$ 5.5	GOB/PROF
Lorton Rd Widening (Rt 123 to Silverbrook Rd)	MV	$ 5.1	C&I/GOB/PROF
Giles Run Park Access Roadway	MV	$ 2.8	C&I
Braddock Rd (Rt 123 to Roanoke Dr)	BR	$ 2.5	C&I
Spot Improvement Projects	CW	$ 1.9	C&I/GOB
Rolling Rd Widening (Delong to Fullerton)	MV	$ 0.3	C&I
Other Projects*	CW	$ 9.8	C&I/GOB
Total		**$ 31.7**	

*Includes 57 pedestrian projects, many with significant ROW, utility, and redesign cost increases.

Attachment C - Revenues Previously Allocated to Projects

Project Type/Description	District	Allocated ($mil)	Funding Source
Transit Projects:			
Fairfax Connector Operations Support	CW	$130.314	C&I
Bus Stop Solar Lighting	CW	$1.400	GOB
Fairfax Connector Herndon Garage Renovations	DR	$6.100	GOB
GMU and NVCC Transit Centers	BR	$1.000	C&I/GOB
Stringfellow Park & Ride	SU	$5.500	GOB
I-66/Vienna Metrorail Bus Ramp	PR	$38.540	RSTP
VRE Lorton Platform Extension	MV	$7.420	CMAQ
VRE Rolling Rd Platform Extension	BR	$2.000	CMAQ
Transit Stores	CW	$2.000	CMAQ
Connector Buses - Service Expansion	CW	$3.329	C&I
		$197.603	
Pedestrian, Bike, Bus Stop, Spot Intersection (see consolidated list for breakout):			
Pedestrian	CW	$17.630	C&I/GOB/CMAQ/RSTP
Bicycle Facilities	CW	$3.630	C&I/GOB
Bus Stop Projects	CW	$5.248	C&I/GOB
Spot Intersection Improvements	CW	$13.275	C&I/GOB
BOS Spots	CW	$0.839	C&I
		$40.622	
Roadway Projects:			
Braddock Rd - Rt 123 to Roanoke Dr	BR/SP	$2.500	C&I
Cinder Bed Rd Improvements	MV	$5.300	GOB
Eskridge Rd Extension	PR	$0.010	PROF
Fairfax County Pkwy Safety Improvements	SP, SU, BR	$2.600	GOB
Giles Run Park Access Roadway	MV	$1.800	C&I
Lorton Rd Widening - Rt 123 to Silverbrook Rd	MV	$61.205	C&I/RVB/GOB/PROF
Poplar Tree Rd Improvements	SU	$0.185	GOB/PROF
Route 7 Widening - Rolling Holly Dr to Reston Ave	HM/DR	$0.076	GOB/PROF
Route 29 @ Gallows Rd	PR	$51.472	C&I/RSTP
Route 29 Widening - Centreville to Fairfax City	SP/SU/BR	$11.900	C&I/GOB/PROF
Stringfellow Rd Widening - Fair Lakes Pkwy to Rt 50	SP/SU	$33.378	GOB/PROF
		$170.426	
Dulles Rail/Tysons Corner Projects:			
Tysons Corner Connections to Dulles Toll Rd	DR/HM/PR	$1.244	C&I
Boone Blvd and Greensboro Dr - Conceptual Engrng & Design	PR/HM	$0.800	PROF
Route 7 Widening - Rt 123 to I-495 - Conceptual Engrng & Design	PR	$1.004	PROF
Tysons Corner St Grid - Conceptual Engrng & Design	DR/HM/PR	$2.500	PROF
Tysons Corner Circulator Feasibility Study	DR/HM/PR	$0.500	PROF
Tysons Corner Transp. and Urban Design Study	DR/HM/PR	$0.300	PROF
Route 7 ROW - DTR to Reston Ave	DR/HM	$23.791	GOB
Route 7 Widening - Rt 123 to I-495	PR	$22.000	GOB
		$52.139	
BRAC Related Projects:			
Mulligan Rd and Telegraph Widening - Beulah St to Leaf Rd	LE/MV	$11.130	CMAQ/RSTP/PROF
Telegraph Rd Widening - S Kings Hwy to S Van Dorn St	LE	$7.696	C&I/GOB
Richmond Hwy Widening (preliminary design & NEPA) - Mulligan Rd to Fairfax County Pkwy	MV	$1.747	C&I
Rolling Rd Loop Ramp	SP	$14.000	RSTP
Rolling Rd Widening - Fullerton Rd to Delong Dr	MV	$1.302	C&I/FED
Route 1 Widening - Telegraph Rd to Mount Vernon Highway	MV	$180.000	FED
		$215.875	
Advanced Planning, Design, Land Acquisition of Future Projects:			
Springfield Multi-Use Community Transit Hub	LE	$44.500	C&I/GOB/CMAQ
West Ox Bus Facility - Phase II Expansion	SP	$1.500	C&I
Columbia Pike Streetcar	MA	$27.805	C&I/CMAQ
		$73.805	

Project Type/Description	District	Allocated ($mil)	Funding Source
Project Implementation Support	CW	**$15.547**	C&I
Construction/Grant Match Reserve	CW	**$7.500**	C&I
Debt Service:			
Wiehle Ave Parking Garage Debt Service	CW	$4.145	C&I
EDA bond debt service	CW	$8.000	C&I
Dulles Rail Shortfall Debt Service	CW	$16.000	C&I
		$28.145	
TOTAL		**$801.662**	