



County of Fairfax, Virginia

To protect and enrich the quality of life for the people, neighborhoods and diverse communities of Fairfax County

SUMMARY OF STAFF RESPONSES

December 11, 2018

Note: For reference, County Staff's March response letter, RA November letter, RA November work session notes, and CPR November email are provided as the first four attachments to this Summary document.

Reston Association (RA) Letter, November 28, 2018

RA Point 1 – Initiate an amendment to the Reston Plan to add back an overall residential population cap for the Planned Community. The overall population cap should be inserted into the Plan text and shown on the Land Use Map. This overall population cap should include planned Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Work Force housing (WFHs), since the Comprehensive Plan must provide for the physical and social infrastructure needs of these new Restonians.

Staff Response:

Staff continues to support the inclusion of a future population target as part of the vision for Reston as was done in the Plan for Tysons. In our view, this target should not be referred to as a cap, but as an articulation of the future vision for Reston's growth. The Master Plan describes a vision and sets goals; a population target would be consistent in this context. Estimates of future development in Reston do not, and would not, exclude affordable and workforce units. Since the jobs to housing balance is an important element of the Reston Plan, consideration should also be given to including a future employment target.

Staff continues to recommend that the future population number be considered a target rather than a "cap" as proposed by RA because there is no way to enforce a cap on population. While the PRC district has a maximum population measure, the other zoning districts used in Reston do not, so an overall population cap cannot be implemented through the zoning ordinance. That said, the proposed monitoring program will track new residential development and provide a way for RA and the community to monitor and understand the pace of growth and how it relates to the targets that are proposed to be added to the Reston Master Plan. Staff has begun to explore how these targets might be generated and incorporated into the plan monitoring program that the community has requested.

Staff supports consideration of the future population (and employment) target(s) as part of an editorial Plan amendment for Reston.

See also CPR Point 22.

RA Point 2 – Provide a clear statement from the County that Reston Village Centers (other than Lake Anne and Tall Oaks) are currently planned to only reflect the land uses that are there today.

Staff Response:

The adopted Reston Master Plan is very clear that each Village Center was planned recognizing the potential for future redevelopment. In discussions with the community, staff has agreed to clarify the Plan to make clear that this redevelopment is only appropriate for the existing non-residential and mixed use areas. As written, the plan indicates that “Each village center consists of a non-residential mixed use area and adjacent residential areas. The focus of redevelopment should be in the non-residential mixed use areas . . .” These adjacent residential areas are stable residential neighborhoods and are not targets for future redevelopment. While this is implied by the current text, the guidance could be strengthened and clarified to indicate that these areas are not the focus of redevelopment.

We have also adjusted the residential development potential for North Point, Hunters Woods and South Lakes Village Centers to reflect a density of 50 dwelling units per acre only on the existing non-residential and mixed use areas. As a result of this adjustment the future residential potential of these three village centers was reduced by 884 units, down to 3,365 units. The redevelopment potential for Lake Anne and Tall Oaks is based on the recently approved development applications. Staff supports clarifying language regarding the extent of village center redevelopment as part of an editorial Plan amendment for Reston.

RA is correct in noting that the Phase II Comprehensive Plan Staff Report has text that indicates that redevelopment of a Village Center should only be considered in the context of a Plan amendment. However, this provision was changed by the Planning Commission in their recommendation to the Board of Supervisors and the adopted text has no such requirement.

RA Point 3 – Similar to the Tysons Plan, initiate an amendment to the Reston Plan which requires periodic Plan updates ("Report Card" provisions), whereby County Staff, at least every five (5) years, is to:

- a. Determine how the pace of development compares to the provision of all supporting infrastructure (public and private), evaluating whether their implementation is balanced and, accordingly, whether plan corrections are needed.
- b. Provide updates in the Plan that identify and list new supporting infrastructure that has been built and new binding commitments for the provision of additional infrastructure.
- c. Conduct an updated transportation operations analysis for Reston to determine whether the existing and planned development in Reston is properly balanced with the provision of transportation infrastructure.

If commensurate planned infrastructure can no longer be provided, then the level of residential development must be reduced to maintain the balance between land use and infrastructure.

Staff Response:

Infrastructure is evaluated as each zoning case comes forward, in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, staff has been monitoring the implementation of the Reston Plan and is agreeable to compiling and publishing progress, in a manner similar to the Annual Tysons Report. Since RA has been very active in communicating information regarding development activities in Reston, we would like to work closely with RA in developing a monitoring program.

Staff has been examining how best to collect data and publish development progress summaries for Reston. Staff will likely recommend (1) an annual monitoring update to provide an at-a-glance summary of 12 months of activity, and (2) a more periodic comprehensive monitoring report that takes a longer view of plans, progress, and possible future activities in the context of the adequacy of supporting infrastructure.

Staff will continue to discuss internally and meet with RA and other community representatives in an effort to agree on the best way to relay information to the Reston community. See also CPR Point 19.

Based on the approved schedule for the County's Site Specific Plan Amendment process to review the Comprehensive Plan, changes to the Reston Plan will be considered in 2020. Progress and monitoring information will be two of many potential inputs for identifying possible areas of change.

Staff recommends that a "current" Reston population estimate be included in monitoring data to assist with understanding how growth is occurring. Staff has considered using a variety of data sources, and while discussions are on-going, is likely to recommend use of the County's Economic, Demographic and Statistical Research Department data. This group generates all current and future population projections annually and authors the periodic demographic reports. The data is standardized and tailored for County use, accepted by all agencies, and would be consistent with data used in other areas of the County. It can also be aggregated to include only Reston. This is important since much of the population data published for Reston (by Census Designated Place or Zip Code) includes a larger area and therefore over estimates Reston's population.

County staff is willing to meet with RA to develop the scope for transportation monitoring and a periodic update of the level of service information for intersections in Reston that accounts for development that has been completed and projected future development. This monitoring and analysis could take many different forms. County staff would like to ensure that such monitoring and analysis addresses the concerns of the RA to the extent possible.

To facilitate this effort, County sent a draft list of intersections to RA on October 23, 2018, and asked RA for feedback on the list, including any additional intersections RA would like to have considered for monitoring and analysis. County staff is awaiting RA's response. A copy of this list of intersections is attached for your reference and consideration (Attachment 5).

Once the list of intersections is agreed upon, County staff can map those intersections and their levels of service as requested and complete the development of a monitoring program.

RA Point 3 also requests a “detailed and comprehensive Transportation Implementation and Monitoring Plan” that includes “a list of all transportation projects identified in the Reston Network Analysis, their estimated timeline and prioritization, and their projected costs and funding sources.” This information was also provided to the RA on October 23, 2018. Copies of those documents are also attached (Attachment 6).

See also CPR Point 19.

RA Point 4 – Request that the Reston Network Advisory Group fully review the current Reston Transportation Network Analysis assumptions and methodology, addressing questions raised by the Reston Community.

Staff Response:

Staff continues to stand behind the methodology and process of the analysis as it was conducted by staff, the Reston Network Advisory Group, and the Stakeholder Group. The Final Report has been published and is available online.

- Page Location: <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/study/reston-network-analysis>
- File Location: <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/sites/transportation/files/assets/documents/pdf/transportation%20projects,%20studies%20and%20plans/reston%20network%20analysis/reston%20network%20analysis%20final%20report%2003282018.pdf>.

The report was developed over a two year period that included significant public input. There has also been additional discussion with RA and CPR subsequent to the completion of the report. However, as stated previously, staff is willing to have additional conversations, if there are questions or any information is unclear.

One additional piece of information requested regarding the Network Analysis was the limits of the seven major corridors included in the analysis. The limits of each of those corridors were provided within the response to RA on October 23, 2018, but they are also shown below. However, as was discussed in our response to RA, these seven roads simply represent the corridors chosen to conduct travel time runs to calibrate and balance the “existing conditions” model. These roadway segments do not directly correlate to the locations or intersections that were evaluated as a part of the Network Analysis, except that some of the intersections evaluated happen to be along these roads. As has been noted previously, the overarching modeling work that was done for the Reston Network Analysis includes corridors within the Transit Station Area (TSA), as well as areas beyond both the boundaries of the TSA and Reston itself. However, these specific seven corridors were roads that were travelled by staff/consultants during the

existing conditions phase of the analysis to understand the travel time on those roadways within those segments. This was done in an effort to have data to use in the existing model to calibrate the model to existing conditions. This is a standard practice in model calibration. Modelers gather information on major roads and calibrate the model to those roads, since those are the roads that have the most impact on the model as a whole. The following provides the list of the seven corridors and their extents as it pertains to the travel time runs conducted for existing model calibration.

- 1) Dulles Toll Road (between Route 28 and Hunter Mill Road)
- 2) Fairfax County Parkway (between Fox Mill Road and Lake Newport Road)
- 3) Sunrise Valley Drive (between Centreville Road and Hunter Mill Road)
- 4) Sunset Hills Road (between Fairfax County Parkway and Hunter Mill Road)
- 5) Reston Parkway (between Lawyers Road and Baron Cameron Avenue)
- 6) Centreville Road (between West Ox Road and Parcher Avenue/Worldgate Drive)
- 7) Wiehle Avenue (between Sunrise Valley Drive and North Shore Drive)

It is important to note that in terms of actual locations evaluated, the Reston Network Analysis documentation provides information on each intersection evaluated, as well as the core study area for the analysis. To date, County staff has not received any feedback on the Reston Network Analysis from the Multimodal Transportation Advisory Committee, but is available to discuss any questions or concerns that the Committee may have.

RA Point 5 – Implement a collaborative mechanism between the Reston Association, the County, the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, the Fairfax County Park Authority, and the Reston Town Center Association, to establish a realistic and detailed plan (for space and funding) to increase the number and capacity of recreational facilities within Reston, in time to serve the new residents.

Staff Response:

Staff continues to evaluate each new proposed development to determine how each project can address the park and recreation recommendations in the Reston Master Plan. The plan recognizes that several entities provide park and recreation facilities and amenities including the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA), the Reston Association, the Reston Community Center, and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NVRPA). County staff worked collectively with these entities to develop the Reston Master Plan recommendations and will continue to collaborate as implementation moves forward.

To date, 26 rezoning applications under the new Reston TSA Plan have been approved by the Board of Supervisors, resulting in commitments to construct 31 acres of new urban park spaces within these new developments, and monetary proffers totaling \$13.5 million to be used towards new athletic field development or improvements/upgrades to existing athletic fields in the greater Reston area. Staff has provided a table (Attachment 7) with information on the parks and recreation-related proffer commitments for each rezoning approval. As discussed in the July

18, 2018 small group meeting on parks and open space, the timing of delivery of proffer commitments including funding is, in all cases, tied to the issuance of occupancy permits for the planned developments. This means the new parks and athletic field improvements will occur incrementally over time as new buildings are constructed and occupied. A map has also been provided (Attachment 8) that shows the location of all the proffered public urban park spaces that will accompany new construction.

The interagency staff team that reviews rezoning applications includes Park Authority staff and works to ensure that developers make appropriate monetary contributions for athletic field development and improvements in the Reston area. In the case of larger developments that, on their own generate the need for a full athletic field, such as Boston Properties and Reston Crescent, staff has negotiated with applicants to either 1) include an athletic field onsite within the development, or 2) provide land and construct new facilities. While no new facilities are under construction at this time, the County's goal is to ensure these larger developments provide the land, funding, and/or construction for new athletic fields in the Reston area as their development occurs.

The County's approach to addressing future park needs through new facilities in the TSAs as well as new and enhanced facilities in the greater Reston area is outlined in the adopted Comprehensive Plan for Reston as follows:

“Diamond and rectangle fields for a wide variety of scheduled and unscheduled sport play for all age groups. As appropriate, fields should have synthetic turf and lights to ensure maximum playing capacity. While land for new fields will be needed, capacity-enhancing upgrades to existing athletic fields is also an option for meeting this need. A goal of adding capacity equivalent to twelve athletic fields serving Reston should be achieved through development contributions of land and/or facilities to meet the needs generated by planned Transit Station Area redevelopment. In addition to provision of new park and school fields within the TSA corridor, enhancements to and redesign of public park, school and Reston Association fields outside the TSA corridor will be necessary to increase capacity to serve increased athletic field needs in Reston. Development contributions to these improvements are expected to offset growth impacts.” (page 39)

The Park Authority has identified redevelopment of Baron Cameron Park as one of the locations for meeting a significant amount of athletic field needs in the Reston area. Towards that end, the Park Authority Board approved a master plan revision for Baron Cameron Park on June 25, 2014. The new master plan allows for improvements and upgrades to the park that will increase playing capacity of its athletic fields to meet the needs of an increasing number of sports participants as the Reston population grows. Park staff has submitted a “2232” application to the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) and has contracted with an engineering firm to prepare documents for a PRC plan submission later this winter. This work is funded, in part, by Reston TSA proffer money received to date. Approval of the 2232 and PRC plan will be followed by development of a full site plan. Construction will be dependent on future funding from the Board of Supervisors and other sources, including additional proffer funds, as they are

made available to the Park Authority. The revised master plan for Baron Cameron Park may be viewed online here:

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/sites/parks/files/assets/documents/plandev/master-plans/baron-cameron-mpr.pdf>

There is the potential for upgrades to other existing County-owned athletic fields at Lake Fairfax Park and South Lakes Drive Park, as well as at selected Reston Association properties through a partnership between Reston Association and the Fairfax County Park Authority. The increase in playing capacity of existing athletic fields will be accomplished using synthetic turf and lights. To address the concerns of some in the community and to further our understanding about exposures to users of synthetic turf fields that use crumb rubber, the County is participating in the on-going Federal Research on Recycled Tire Crumb Used on Playing Fields Study that is being led by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Information on the EPA study can be found at:

https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_report.cfm?Lab=NERL&dirEntryId=340139

Additional information is posted on the County website here:

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/synthetic-turf-fields>.

RA Point 6 – Initiate an amendment to the Reston Plan to add clearer and more assertive statements throughout the Plan, that infrastructure capacity must be increased at the same time as new development occurs, rather than lag decades behind.

Staff Response:

As described in staff's March 2018 letter, the plan indicates that the provision of future facilities will need to be coordinated with the rate at which planned development occurs. Staff feels the existing plan guidance is appropriate and that what is needed at this time is the development of the phasing plan referenced in the adopted plan.

In correspondence provided to Reston Association on October 23, 2018, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) staff provided draft project timelines for the large roadway projects included in the Reston Phase I Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The draft timelines (see Attachment 6) are based on standard project delivery schedules for the particular type of projects and will be refined as the projects are scoped and designed. These timelines will also change based on the future changes in priorities to reflect the actual rate and location of new development in Reston.

Also included in the October 23 correspondence was a draft cash flow schematic for all of the roadway and intersection projects included in the Reston Phase I Comprehensive Plan Amendment, as well as a cash flow for the grid of streets segments that will be built by the County. This draft cash flow (see Attachment 9) is balanced over the 45 year period. However, as discussed at the small group meetings, this cash flow will be updated regularly and will change as costs, revenues and priorities are adjusted over the 45 years. The roadway project cash

flows are based on the three tiered priorities that were included in the Reston Transportation Strategy document dated, July 9, 2018.

Ultimately, the order in which all of these projects are developed will depend on the rate and location of development around the three Transit Station Areas. Adjustments in the priority of projects will likely be made periodically during the 45 year timeframe. This cash flow does not include information about two major projects that will affect traffic in Reston. These are the Metrorail Silver Line Project (\$6 billion) and the widening of Route 7 from Reston Avenue to Jarrett Valley Drive (\$314 million). Both projects are currently fully funded and construction contracts have been executed.

As described in the October 23 correspondence, staff would welcome any feedback that RA or CPR have on the order of the roadway projects and the intersection improvements.

See also RA Point 6, RA Point 7, and CPR Point 15.

RA Point 7 – Direct County Staff to collaborate with Public Schools staff and the Reston community to establish a realistic plan for the provision of increased school capacity in Reston in time to serve the increase in population.

Staff Response:

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) staff has been collaborating with RA, responding to questions and attending meetings, and will continue to do so. FCPS staff has explained their work process, core work, and willingness to allocate additional staff time to what may be resource-intensive questions as staffing and priorities allow.

FCPS staff has also shared that the South Lakes Pyramid, which includes the high school and its feeder schools, is projected to have surplus capacity for the foreseeable future (approximately 25 years). It is the only pyramid of 24 total pyramids in the County that staff is comfortable placing in that category. Further commitments in this long term planning range (20+ years) are outside the scope of FCPS practice.

RA Point 8 – Initiate an amendment to the Reston Plan to remove the "grid of streets" road connection between American Dream Way and Isaac Newton Square, because it would adversely impact environmentally sensitive areas and the Hidden Creek Golf Course.

Staff Response:

This connection was included as part of the development of the Comprehensive Plan master planning process and staff continues to believe the connection is important to provide needed connectivity and congestion relief. As previously stated, there are no immediate plans to initiate design work on this road. However, in the event that this road connection is advanced to the design stage, either as part of private redevelopment or as part of a public project, there will

be many opportunities for the community to have input into the process and provide feedback. Staff believes that engineering solutions exist to allow a future road connection in this approximate location to be made without adversely impacting environmentally sensitive areas and the Hidden Creek Golf Course.

Since this road connection is shown on various figures depicting recommended transportation improvements, its removal is not something that could be considered as part of an editorial or clarifying amendment or the proposed zoning ordinance amendment.

RA Point 9 - Initiate an amendment to the Reston Plan to change the "High-Density Multi-Family" land use map category from "50* DU/AC" (i.e. unlimited) to the maximum number of dwellings per acre actually necessary to accommodate the only two parcels in Reston so designated — the Harrison Apartments and a portion of the Charter Oaks Apartments.

Staff Response:

Staff has agreed that this category was not intended to suggest unlimited density and supports clarification as part of an editorial Plan amendment for Reston.

Coalition for a Planned Reston (CPR), November 29, 2018

CPR Point 1 – Provide status of County plans to finally build an indoor athletic center in Reston (Hunter Mill is the only district without one. Other districts have had athletic centers for decades).

Staff Response:

The Park Authority completed a review of the RECenter System, FCPA System-wide Sustainability Plan for RECenters, in March 2018. The document can be viewed online, <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/sites/parks/files/assets/documents/administrative/recenter-systemwide-sustainability-plan.pdf>.

The plan identifies the Reston area as the location for a potential new facility. The redevelopment plan for Reston Town Center North Area includes a reservation of 90,000 square feet (SF) for future development of an indoor recreation facility. At this time no funding has been identified for development.

CPR Point 2 – Provide status on exactly where the additional outdoor athletic fields required in the Master Plan will be located.

Staff Response:

See RA Point 5.

CPR Point 3 – Remove from planning documentation and maps the unauthorized and unneeded "Road from Nowhere" that would mar and deface Reston's open space.

Staff Response:

See RA Point 8.

CPR Point 4 – Share information on the safety, cost, and benefit of "turving" and lighting fields. In an interim response on this topic the County speaks of "upgrading Reston Association properties" to partially meet the County's requirements. However, no proposal to or discussion with RA has taken place.

Staff Response:

The County, along with FCPS, formed a task force to look at continued use of synthetic turf for athletic fields in 2013. Synthetic turf increases the capacity of athletic fields, sustaining greater wear and tear than natural surfaces. For example, a full size rectangle field with synthetic turf and lights provides the equivalent playing capacity of 1.6 fields. The task force report can be found at:

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/sites/parks/files/assets/documents/plandev/synthetic-turf-taskforce-report072013.pdf>. Additional information regarding ongoing and County guidance on the use of synthetic turf on playing fields can be found at:

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/synthetic-turf-fields>

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is in the process of a multi-year study on the use of crumb rubber infill for synthetic turf. The County and the Park Authority have participated in field investigation and data gathering as part of the study. The EPA has not issued a final report. You can follow the EPA study at:

<https://www.epa.gov/chemical-research/federal-research-recycled-tire-crumb-used-playing-fields>.

Staff from the Park Authority, RA, Reston Community Center, the Town of Herndon, and NVRPA, collaborated on open space, park and recreation issues extensively along with County staff as part of the Reston Master Plan Special Study Task Force. Park Authority staff continues to work with these groups as part of review of individual re-zoning applications and welcomes the opportunity to work with RA to look at opportunities to upgrade RA park and recreational facilities on a system-wide basis as well as part of individual development plan reviews.

See also RA Point 5.

CPR Point 5 – Provide information on the status of the "Commission to Assess Reston's Athletic Fields." We are unaware of the existence of any such commission.

Staff Response/Question:

Park Authority staff is unfamiliar with the Commission cited. Please provide additional information.

CPR Point 6 – Provide an update on the County's plans for Reston Town Center North, including the required 10 acres of open space.

Staff Response:

The Reston Town Center North redevelopment project is ongoing. Applications (RZ 2017-HM-020, PCA 74-2-113-05, PCA 86-C-121-07) for the public-private partnership were initially submitted June 2017 by Inova Health Care Services and the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County to consolidate the area under a single zoning entitlement with proffer commitments.

The site is 47 acres; Inova owns 45% (21.4 acres) and Fairfax County owns 55% (25.6 acres). The most recent submission proposed a total of 1,828,456 square feet of development for office, hotel, retail, public uses, non-residential uses and up to 3,200 dwelling units. Roadways, streetscape, and park space were shown on that submission. Additional information is available on the LDS site: <http://ldsnet.fairfaxcounty.gov/ldsnet/ZAPSMain.aspx?cde=RZ&seq=4233998>.

Fairfax County and Inova are working in partnership to create a unified redevelopment plan for Reston Town Center North that expands and co-locates existing and new public facilities while creating a mixed use urban development pattern in accordance with adopted Reston Master Plan. A Request for Proposals was released in July 2017 for the southern portion of the Reston Town Center North area. Proposals were received and reviewed but none of the submissions were selected to move forward to further consideration.

Most recently a series of staff and community work sessions have been held with the Reston Design Review Board regarding the application submitted by the County and Inova, the latest of which occurred on November 16, 2018. The grid of connecting streets and the central green shown in the Reston Master Plan are topics of discussion. It is expected that another work session will be scheduled to occur in early 2019. No public hearings for the rezoning actions have been scheduled.

Finally, the Memorandum of Understanding between Fairfax County and Inova references providing 10 acres of open space or a paying financial penalty. However, the continuing rezoning and work sessions process will ultimately determine open spaces for the site.

CPR Point 7 – Schedule the County's own proposal to bring "all parties" together to work on land management issues.

Staff Response/Question:

Staff requests clarification of this comment. Countywide, the redevelopment processes afford various opportunities for stakeholder and community input, including but not limited to public hearings. In Reston, additional opportunities are typically afforded through community meetings and consultations with RA and/or the Design Review Board.

If there are specific elements of the process that staff can clarify, please provide additional information.

CPR Point 8 – Clarify specifically which areas of “One Reston” (i.e., including PRC, TSAs and Town Center) are considered "urban" for planning purposes, as the designation impacts the level of services provided.

Staff Response:

For planning purposes, the Reston Transit Station Areas are considered urban rather than suburban. The Reston Master Plan includes a map of the Transit Station Areas on page 93. These areas are planned to redevelop in a more mixed use, urban manner than the remainder of Reston. Village Centers are also areas of mixed use activity, and portions are planned to redevelop consistent with Plan language, see also RA Point 2.

Guidance related to mitigating impacts of mixed use, urban development can also be found in the Plan. For example, the Reston Master Plan describes how the County's Urban Parks Framework applies. Urban Design Guidelines specific to the Reston TSAs have been developed with an Advisory Group and public input (see http://www.fcerevit.org/programs/Reston_Guidelines.html). The County is also in the process of developing urban street standards specific to Reston, a process that was completed for Tysons and Springfield. The street standards developed for Tysons can be found here, as an example: https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/tysons/sites/tysons/files/assets/documents/pdf/transportation/transportation_design_standards_attachment_d.pdf.

CPR Point 9 – Explain the frequent exemptions given to developers when their proposals are not in conformance with the Master Plan. This includes numerous cases where the County's own Planning and Zoning staff have found proposals to be deficient.

Staff Response/Question:

Staff requests additional clarification.

If this point refers to waivers and modifications often requested as part of redevelopment applications, the requests often allow flexibility to be creative in addressing site specific

development issues that planned development zoning districts afford through the design guidelines and other recommendations. The waivers and modifications can, for example, allow applicants to meet Plan goals that might otherwise be precluded by site constraints.

As part of every development application, staff reviews the request against the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff provides a very detailed analysis on how, in staff's opinion, the application is or is not in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan. Over the course of the review, staff works with the applicant to bring their proposal in harmony with the recommendation in the Reston Plan.

If there are specific cases or instances in question, please provide those details.

CPR Point 10 – Schedule the agreed upon meeting between County staff and the community to determine the geographic and demographic inputs to be used to determine the population of One Reston for the purpose of re-establishing a population limit for Reston as a whole.

Staff Response:

After researching several different sources of population data and reporting geographies, staff is in a position to schedule this meeting at a date and time convenient to RA and interested community representatives.

Staff supports clarifying the long-term vision of Reston by including a future population estimate or target for future growth in the Reston Master Plan. Staff believes that a meeting to share a proposed approach for the developing this estimate is appropriate for discussion.

See also RA Point 1.

CPR Point 11 – Explain the dichotomy between the County's density proposals in the Village Centers and the Master Plan's call for any new development to be at an appropriate scale for the neighborhood under consideration.

Staff Response:

In a prior response, staff agreed to a clarification that redevelopment is intended to occur in non-residential mixed use areas, rather than adjacent stable residential areas that are part of the village centers. In addition, the Reston Plan includes Guidelines for Village Center Redevelopment that set forth how transitions to existing uses should be addressed. Each redevelopment proposal will be subject to review by staff and the Reston community where elements such as the size and scale of the proposed development, as well as its relationship to existing residential communities, can be evaluated.

CPR Point 12 – Provide a statement on the County's plans to conform to Virginia law and review the Reston Master Plan Phase I in early 2019 and Phase II in 2020.

Staff Response:

The first phase of the Reston planning process occurred from 2010 through 2014 with new Plan language being adopted in 2015. Due to the time, energy, and community commitment that go into major multi-year land use studies, it is the County's practice not to amend these new plans within the first five years of their adoption. The current North County Site Specific Plan Amendment Process, which includes the Hunter Mill District, excludes Reston for this reason.

Staff continues to support this practice and cannot support changes to land use, density or intensity recommendations in the Reston Master Plan for the Transit Station Areas until after 2019 and for Reston's neighborhoods and village centers until after 2020. This is consistent with Virginia State Law recommending Plan review every 5 years.

As has been previously stated, staff is open to considering changes to the Reston Master Plan that clarify recommendations, correct oversights, or are editorial in nature.

CPR Point 13 – Address the need for follow-on discussions concerning storm water management, police and fire coverage and related social services topics.

Staff Response:

DPZ staff will assist in setting up a meeting(s) to discuss these issues. However, questions and topics identified to date have been mostly programmatic in nature and, as such, are not things that are governed by the Reston Master Plan or the PRC zoning district.

CPR Point 14 – Submit written confirmation of the Population-based Countywide Service Level Standard for golf: with a projected Reston population of over 115,200, Reston requires two 18-hole golf courses. (Please see page 22, 2017 Edition of the Policy Plan - Parks and Recreation).

Staff Response:

This comment references a service level standard based on the Park Authority's prior, now superseded, Needs Assessment Study that was completed in 2004. The 2004 Study recommended a service level standard of 1 golf hole per 3,200 people. The Policy Plan (page 22, Appendix, Amended through 3-4-2014) has not yet been updated with the new 2016 Needs Assessment standards, however the standards can be viewed here:

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/sites/parks/files/assets/documents/plandev/parkscount/needs-assessment-plan-050616.pdf>.

The recently completed 2016 Park Authority Needs Assessment includes a recommendation to eliminate a population based service level standard for golf. The Park Authority's Golf Operation is designed to recover its costs for operations, maintenance, and

programming. Little to no General Fund support is provided. Therefore, provision of this facility type is primarily market-based rather than measured by a population.

This change also reflects a nationwide trend of declining golf participation rates. An article from the National Parks and Recreation Association indicates that participation rates are down “20–30 percent from the high-water mark of slightly more than 30 million players to somewhere near 20–23 million current active golfers today. This decrease in participation is across all ages, with the exception of seniors; however, it is especially evident in the 34-and-younger age groups.” The full article is available online: <https://www.nrpa.org/parks-recreation-magazine/2017/january/reintroducing-the-game-of-golf/>. The Washington Post also reported on the decline in this 2015 article: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/03/05/why-america-fell-out-of-love-with-golf/?utm_term=.1988f5b51688.

CPR Point 15 – Provide a status update on changes to the proffer formula for private development and suggestions on how RA, CPR and the broader community can support County efforts.

Staff Response:

Reston, like other special planning areas, is exempt from the 2016 Proffer Bill. As an exempt area, proffers may be obtained from developers to help mitigate the impacts caused by the proposed developments. Proffers are typically received for transportation, schools, parks, etc.

While proffers are voluntary, there are several formulas the County uses to determine the suggested contribution. Examples are provided below.

- **School:** The Fairfax County School Board Office of Facilities Planning Services provides periodic updates to the Board of Supervisors on the School Impact Formula. The per student proffer contribution amount (currently \$12,262) is the same countywide. In addition, they review the ratios of students generated by different unit types to determine the student yield for a development. They provide staff with a memo detailing the expected number of students and requested contribution. Staff has requested and received proffers from all rezoning applications for the requested amount. To date we have \$14.8 million in school contributions proffered.
- **Parks:** Parks currently request a contribution of \$1.72 per SF of new development for athletic fields. If an applicant is providing for a full-size athletic field the contribution is not requested. With few exceptions, applicants have proffered the full amount requested. The formula is based on recent average market value of land in the corridor and typical expense of athletic field improvements. It was assumed the cost of build three new fields at \$32,136,00 and \$13,200,000 to upgrade the equivalent capacity of 9 fields. The \$45,336,00 in field

improvements was assumed on a development of 26.4 million SF. To date we have \$13 million in athletic field contributions proffered and 7 acres for a field. These proffered amounts are not funds that the County has in hand now, but rather are commitments to make payments over time as developments occur and building occupancy permits are issued.

- Road Fund: FCDOT and an advisory group met for three years to establish a road fund that was approved by the Board of Supervisors during a public hearing. The contribution amounts are reviewed yearly by staff, the advisory group and the Board. Currently the amount is \$2,142 per dwelling unit and \$9.80 per non-residential square foot. It is anticipated that this revenue source will generate a total of \$90 million over the next 40 years.
- Affordable Housing: The Comprehensive Plan provides guidance for provision of a contribution for non-residential uses for affordable housing when located in the TOD area at \$3 per SF. To date we have \$18 million in proffered contributions.

All of these proffers are tied to development and are committed to at the time of zoning approval. Delivery of the proffers are typically associated with a set time/date or project construction phase. Proffered amounts are received as the trigger events occur.

CPR Point 16 – Provide data on the expected number of additional students entering the school system using current methodology. Provide data on past reliability of this methodology.

Staff Response:

See RA Point 7.

CPR Point 17 – Report on student utilization of the Connector Bus since the adoption of student passes.

Staff Response:

FCDOT staff recently presented to the Hunter Mill Transportation Advisory Group Committee on this topic. The presentation from this meeting is provided as an attachment (Attachment 10).

CPR Point 18 – Resolve discrepancies between language regarding school capacity provided in the Comprehensive Plan and actual County practice.

Staff Response/Question:

If RA Point 7 does not address this point, staff requests additional clarification.

CPR Point 19 – Develop a comprehensive Transportation Implementation and Monitoring Plan - to include all projects identified in the Reston Network Analysis (RNA) with their estimated prioritization, timeline, projected costs and funding sources.

Staff Response:

See RA Point 3.

Additionally, in correspondence dated October 23, 2018, staff provided a proposed list of intersections in and around Reston that County staff proposes to monitor over time to measure traffic trends. Staff believes this list (Attachment 5) is comprehensive enough to ensure that we can adequately establish information about these trends and provide a basis for future adjustments to the roadway, intersection and grid priorities. In that correspondence, staff asked that community members provide suggestions about other intersections that they believed should be monitored or proposed intersections that do not need to be monitored. After the list of intersections is finalized, staff will produce a map showing the current and projected level of service and will update the map as new information as monitoring continues.

FCDOT proposes to monitor the following transportation parameters for Reston:

- Status and funding for transportation improvements
- Level of service at multiple intersections in and around Reston (as shown in the proposed attached list of intersections)
- Silver Line ridership by station in Reston
- Bus ridership in Reston
- Bicycle infrastructure development
- Reduction of single occupant vehicle trips
- Use of commuter alternatives, such as ridesharing, flex-time and telework
- Attainment of proffered trip reduction goals

As with the intersections list, staff has asked for feedback as to whether or not this list includes the information that CPR and RA believe important to monitor. Staff will consider the suggestions, with data collection efficiency and available resources in mind.

CPR Point 20 – Provide a chart and map of planned intersection improvements.

Staff Response:

See CPR Point 19.

CPR Point 21 – Provide a model of projected traffic impact of any increased density in the “One Reston” region on the non-TSA areas of Reston (like the PRC).

Staff Response:

The Reston Network Analysis looked at more than 100 intersections generally in and around the Reston TSA areas. As was mentioned in earlier responses, staff is willing to discuss a monitoring plan with both RA and CPR. Staff has provided a list of proposed intersections for future analysis and monitoring and is waiting for a response. Ultimately, there will need to be a discussion about what the future monitoring and analysis program should be. Staff is available to have that discussion when RA and CPR are ready.

It should also be noted that as developments are being proposed during the entitlement process, applicants are required to evaluate and then mitigate the proposed and projected impacts associated with their increased density.

CPR Point 22 – Institute the universal adoption of data that includes residents of Affordable Dwelling Units (ADU) and Work Force Housing (WFH) in all computations of population and density.

Staff Response:

Current estimates of future development in Reston include affordable and workforce units. In addition, the proposed means of monitoring and estimating current and future population will include all residents, regardless of housing type in which they reside. As the methodology for the future population estimate is developed and then discussed, staff will keep this concern in mind. See also RA Points 1 and 3.

However, the Zoning Ordinance currently permits bonus units from the provision of ADUs and WDUs to exceed the density restrictions in the Zoning Ordinance. This is consistent with the ADU and WDU policy (currently, cases that provide WDU by condition and not by proffers would not be entitled to a bonus). This method is also consistent with how bonus units related to ADU and WDU are counted in other zoning districts (i.e., PDH, PRM and PDC). Consistent with other zoning districts, the provisions of the PRC district (Sect. 6-308) do not include affordable units in the calculations for maximum density in terms of persons per acre or dwelling units per acre.

CPR Point 23 – Provide periodic updates and information on the provision of needed infrastructure along with development as is done in Tysons.

Staff Response:

See RA Point 3.

Attachments

Attachment 1: March 2018 DPZ response letter

Attachment 2: RA letter dated November 28, 2018

Attachment 3: RA work session notes and staff response references

Summary of Staff Responses

December 11, 2018

Page 19

Attachment 4: CPR email dated November 29, 2018

Attachment 5: Proposed list of intersections to monitor

Attachment 6: Draft project timelines for large roadway projects included in Reston Phase I

Attachment 7: Table of park and recreation-related commitments

Attachment 8: Map of all proffered public urban park spaces

Attachment 9: Draft cash flow for grid of streets segments to be built by the County

Attachment 10: Hunter Mill TAC presentation, Free Student Bus Pass Program Update

Attachment 11: Potential PRC change in persons per acre, November 2018