

FY 2020 Capital Improvement Program

Planning Commission Questions

February 28, 2019

1. Can the Workshop be posted on Channel 16 immediately following March 13th meeting?
Can the Workshop be posted on Facebook as an additional way to involve and allow for public comment on the CIP?

The March 13 Planning Commission Meeting was posted online by noon on March 14. The Office of Public Affairs planned to notify the public about the meeting on Facebook and Twitter with a link to the video.

2. Is there a list of County facilities with the most maintenance challenges?

Yes, the Facilities Management Department has previously published a list of the facilities with the most intensive maintenance requirements. In general, these facilities are assessed for potential renovation. Attachment 1 was provided to the Board of Supervisors as part of the Lines of Business Review. This list is one factor in determining funding for facilities. Since the attached list was published, many of these facilities have been recommended for renovation. For example, the Massey building is funded for demolition, the 4 shelters have been approved by the voters for renovation, renovations have been completed at the Burkholder Building, Lorton Volunteer Fire Station has been renovated, and the Adult Detention Center was approved for renovation as part of the fall 2018 Bond Referendum.

3. Does the Parks have a separate CIP that provides additional detail?

Attachment 2 is the Park Authority's internal CIP execution schedule for individual projects funded by the 2016 Park Bond as approved by the Park Authority Board. In addition, the following link to the Parks Needs Assessment provides longer range future plans: <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/parkscount>. The CIP recommendations included in the 2016 Needs Assessment are very broad and general. Staff will then drill down into individual park projects when preparing for a Park Bond.

4. Does the Data Center project include Public Safety and video data storage?

Yes, Public Safety data is processed in the Government Center data center. It should be noted that there are "data rooms" in the new Public Safety Building and at PSTOC. The Public Safety building data rooms have several small specialized public safety-related systems. The CAD system is primarily at PSTOC. However, the vast majority of public safety systems reside in the Government Center data center. The in-car video data resides in the Government Center data center as well. The move of the data center off site is a project under consideration for funding as part of the *FY 2019 Third Quarter Review*. If approved, funding will provide for network hardware and equipment to facilitate the move of the primary data center location to Ashburn, as well as moving, stand-up, cage build out, electrical, and other related relocation costs. The anticipated transition of the core data center to the new prime site is anticipated to occur in late CY 2019. This move gives County-owned space back for other needs and reduces cost of utility consumption and IT environment needs in the Government Center.

March 13, 2019 (CIP Workshop)

5. Provide a consolidated needs list of County and School facilities.

The County Board and the School Board have been discussing better coordination between the County and School staff regarding facility needs. County and School staff will be working to develop an approach to this going forward.

6. Please clarify safety hazard with regards to Electrical and HVAC replacements proposed at the Government Center.

The term Safety Hazard regarding infrastructure replacement and upgrade projects generally refers to the safety of the maintenance crews. In the case of the HVAC and electrical projects at the Government Center, the equipment is old and unreliable and can create a safety exposure for the maintenance crews working on the equipment. There is no safety concern for building occupants. Some projects are deemed safety hazards because in the event of their failure, the building may have to be evacuated or closed. Staff will work to clarify this phrasing in future CIP documents.

7. How many properties are now eligible for the Park Authority's Resident Curator Program?

There are 26 properties identified for the Park Authority's Resident Curator Program. Two leased sites, four which are currently in the administrative process and 20 more eligible properties identified for the future.

8. Why are the McLean and Reston Community Centers listed distinctly in HHS section?

The Reston Community Center (RCC) creates leisure, cultural and educational experiences to enhance the quality of life for all people living and working in Reston by providing a broad range of programs in arts, aquatics, enrichment, recreation and life-long learning. The operations for RCC are supported by revenues from a special property tax collected on all residential and commercial properties within Small District 5. The Small District 5 tax rate is \$0.047 per \$100 of assessed property value.

The mission of the McLean Community Center (MCC) is to provide a sense of community by undertaking programs; assisting community organizations; and furnishing facilities for civic, cultural, educational, recreational, and social activities apportioned fairly to all residents of Small District 1A, Dranesville. The Small District 1A, tax rate is \$0.023 per \$100 of assessed real property value.

These two self-supporting Community Centers are included in the Health and Human Services section of the CIP with other Community Centers operated by the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services, such as the Lorton Community Center and the Sully Community Center.

9. Will the land use approval for Route 50 and West Ox Road housing facility expire if no activity commences? If so, is there a way to renew the approval?

A 2232 was approved in 2006 to construct 30 units of temporary magnet housing, a training facility, and parking (both surface and underground due to the size of the parcel). HCD staff contacted DPZ and were advised that the approval will not expire as long as there is no change in the approved use. Given that the current plan is to provide permanent affordable housing without a training facility or underground parking garage, a new land use approval will be required. For the record, the site was used as a gas station and HCD has completed an environmental assessment and cleaned up the site.

10. Snapshot of how Housing is provided and the various funding sources.

The FCRHA and HCD operate four principle affordable housing programs: Rental Assistance Demonstration (formerly, public housing), Housing Choice Voucher, Rental Program, and Bridging Affordability. In addition, affordable housing is created through projects that are implemented via PPEA agreements or by HCD. Resources including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, private equity, and County resources are used to fund those projects. Other sources of affordable housing are the Affordable Dwelling Units and the Workforce Dwelling Units programs, which are provide in conjunction with private developments.

11. Table 7 reference document for Tysons – is there a comparable table for Reston or other areas?

The equivalent would be the projects categorized as “roadway improvements” found In the Reston Funding Plan. This can be found in the Reston Funding Plan project list in the Board Item, in the latest presentations to the Reston Network Analysis Group/Reston Service District Group, or on the Cash Flow that was provided to the RA and Reston Transportation Service District Advisory Board on October 23, 2018. Links to these documents are provided below:

Board Item for the Reston Funding Plan/Public Hearing on February 28, 2017:

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/sites/boardofsupervisors/files/Assets/meeting%20materials/board/2017/feb28-final-board-package.pdf>

Reston Network Analysis: <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/study/reston-network-analysis>

Service District Advisory Board: <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/reston-transportation-advisory-board>

12. Under the county’s revenue sources, Reston is listed under Tysons funding plan. Each of them has funding resources from different sources. For example, Tysons \$3.1 billion listed here – is that spent? Is that the demand over 40-year period?

For Tysons, the \$3.1 billion is the demand over 40 years. For Reston, the estimate is \$2.3 billion and that is also for the life of the funding plan, 40+ years.

13. An amount of \$3.1 billion was an estimate of various publicly funded transportation improvements in the Tysons Area. Is the estimate in today's dollars?

The estimate is not in today's dollars. The \$3.1 billion was developed in 2016 when the Tysons Funding Plan was reduced.

14. Are streetlights included in transportation projects?

In many cases, FCDOT does include funding for streetlights, especially on road widening projects, for example Walney Road, Stringfellow Road, Route 7 in Tysons, and currently discussing Richmond Highway. Fairfax County aims to replace/upgrade streetlights on any project where the streetlights are affected by construction. In the end, many more streetlights are installed by developers vs. FCDOT. FCDOT staff are currently meeting with DPWES staff to discuss ways to improve the process.

In Reston, Streetlights are included in the grid costs.

15. Tysons Transportation Fund. How much has been contributed (by developers) so far and what is the forecast? What are the numbers related to Tysons transportation fund- what's been received, what is anticipated based on the current Comprehensive Plan?

Tysons-wide collections to-date: \$5.45 million, Tysons Grid Collections to-date: \$11.37 million, Service District FY 2018 Actuals were \$7.20 million from real estate tax collections. The proposed forecast in the draft TPP (FY19-25) projects the following: Tysons-wide: \$20.9 million, Tysons Grid: \$21.1 million, Service District: \$61 million from real estate tax collections.

16. Route 28 widening, it was designed for 8 lanes and something legislatively bad happened that instead of 8 they were going to build 6 and leave room for 2 extra lanes to be built later. What happened and how that can it be undone by the next general assembly?

The 2018 General Assembly took a major step forward by providing \$154 million annually in funding, as well as governance reforms, to address WMATA's efforts to enhance the safety, security, and efficiency of the system and its riders. However, the legislation that was enacted addressed WMATA funding needs at the expense of other significant projects throughout the region by diverting existing funding from the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) and localities to WMATA, reducing funding available for other critical transportation projects in Northern Virginia by \$102 million per year. As a result, the County will be unable to fund any additional transportation projects in the foreseeable future, and regional transportation funding included in NVTA's recently adopted Six Year Program provides approximately \$300 million less than anticipated for a region that remains one of the most congested in the nation. Several County projects that received partial or no funding in NVTA's program, but may have received funds had this revenue been available, include: Route 28 Widening from Route 29 to the Prince William County line, Route 28 Widening northbound from Route 50 to McLearn Road, Rock Hill Road Bridge, Shirley Gate Road Extension, Soapstone Drive Extension, and Frontier Drive Extension. Similar impacts will continue in future years if the funding diversion remains in place.

17. Out of \$154 million, what happened to the rest? Is the WMATA deficit problem likely to happen again? What is the fix to put it back?

The \$154 million annually is being used to address WMATA's capital needs to enhance the safety, security, and efficiency of the system and its riders. However, as noted above, a significant portion (\$102 million/ year) of the funding was diverted from the NVT and localities to WMATA, reducing funding available for other critical transportation projects in Northern Virginia. Efforts to address the diversion of funds must be taken by the General Assembly and the County strongly supports efforts to mitigate such impacts to ensure that transportation projects continue to move forward in Northern Virginia after decades of state underfunding.

18. They have taken out the intersection at Baron Cameron Avenue and Route 7. Another example of where they ended up cutting funding.

The Route 7 Corridor Improvements Project will improve Route 7 between Reston Avenue and Jarrett Valley Drive and includes widening of Route 7 from four to six lanes with intersection improvements and adding a shared-use path on both sides of the roadway. VDOT bid the project, and the low-price proposal received in March 2018 was \$278 million. This was \$95 million above the anticipated price proposal and was due to issues such as a competitive market for construction resources (multiple, ongoing, large scale projects in Northern Virginia); high risk attributable to significant number of complex utility relocations, and over 230 property transactions for the right-of-way. To address the increase, the decision was made to replace the half interchange at Baron Cameron Avenue with an improvement of the existing at-grade intersection to include a triple left turn from Route 7 westbound. Additional funds were also provided by both Fairfax County and the Commonwealth to make up the remainder of the difference (approximately \$40 million by each).

A couple of intersection projects have been added to the Reston Funding Plan, Fairfax County Parkway at Sunrise Valley Drive Interim Improvement and Baron Cameron at Reston Parkway is going to the Reston Transportation Service District Advisory Board (RTSDAB) for a funding recommendation 3/25.

19. How much of the \$2.7 billion is for metro in Reston?

The \$2.7 billion that is in the CIP is not for the Silver Line project, but it supports all the other improvements in the Reston area (HMSAMS, RMGA, Comp Plan etc). There is a significant funding need for all the improvements in the Dulles Corridor outside of the rail project.

20. Lorton Co-location percentage of space saved based on co-location proposal:

The entire property is approximately seven acres. The existing park, as defined by the path around the open grass area, is approximately 1.9 acres. Based on the site plan, the park area will be approximately 1.7 acres after the entire project is complete, reducing the current size by approximately 0.2 acres, or about 10%. The park and green space is being maximized by positioning the building as close to Richmond Highway as possible. The County is working closely with the County's urban foresters to determine which trees to preserve, including the white oak behind the existing LCAC, among others. The trail system is being maintained and the park area enhanced by a new playground, outdoor exercise equipment, benches, and picnic tables.



21. Fire Department Questions:

See Attachment 3.

22. Former Graham Road elementary school- was it evaluated for community center use?

The Graham Road Elementary School moved into its current building location in the 2012-13 school year. Since that time the building it vacated has been known as the Graham Road Community Building and it continues to house a School Age Child Care (SACC) program, a teen center on the weekends, and the gymnasium is scheduled to community athletic organizations through the county's Department of Neighborhood and Community Services. Additionally, Fairfax County Public Schools maintains the following programs in the building:

- Instructional Services Department, ESOL programming
- Department of Special Services, Transition Support Resource Center
- Instructional Services Department, Family Literacy
- Department of Special Services, Hearing/Vision Impaired program
- Financial Services, Warehouse Operations
- Department of Internet Technology, Computer Imaging Lab
- Department of Special Services, Attendance Officers

23. What does the \$1.8 million for the I-95 Landfill closure project include? Who will maintain the landfill for the next 10-20 years? What are the DEQ requirements and what is our plan?

The \$1.8 million includes placing final capping on a section of the Area Three Lined Landfill (ATLL) and for project related repair and reconstruction of the municipal solid waste (MSW) landfill cap. The MSW cap modifications tie to modernization of the Residential Disposal and Recycling Center. The Fairfax County Solid Waste Management Program will maintain the I-95 Landfill for the foreseeable future. The VA DEQ requires final capping on areas of the landfill that have met final grade in terms of the approved plan.

Schedule for Closure: Parts 1 and 2 of the ATLL Unit, covering an area of 10.4 acres, has already been capped. The County will cap the remainder of the 99.5-acre ATLL Unit in ~nine (9) additional parts as final landfilling grades are reached. The final closure part of the ATLL is anticipated to be complete in 2048.

24. What methane gas is anticipated to be captured from the construction debris landfill?

The Lorton Construction Debris Landfill is operated by a private company, Waste Management. The Lorton Landfill does have a methane gas system with landfill gas wells and a flare. We anticipate the gas system will be operated through the closure period (estimate is 10+ years) as required by VADEQ.

25. Recycling General statement: As of January 1, 2018, China, which up to then had been the world's main recycler of plastic, stopped accepting plastics from abroad. It also clamped down significantly on the receipt of various types of paper for recycling. These decisions have had an enormous impact on various public recycling programs (described by some as "chaos") across the U.S. and around the world.

26. What has been the impact on Fairfax County's recycling programs?

The impacts have been largely financial, with substantial increases in cost due to substantially lower material resale value and much higher material quality specs. Also, higher quality specs have in turn caused regional processors to slow down their work (to recover cleaner products) – this has the effect of reducing available capacity to waste collectors that don't own their own processing facility. It is germane to note that the County collects recyclables from approx. 10% of the County's households – the remainder is collected by the private sector.

27. What is the County currently doing with the materials it collects under its recycling programs?

The County continues to operate the system as it has for many years; single-stream recyclables are delivered under contract to a local processor, who sorts and sells the recovered materials to available markets.

28. Is the County stockpiling any of the recyclable materials it collects? If so, where and at what cost?

All recyclables collected by the County are being delivered to processors (i.e., no stockpiling).

29. Is the County sending recyclable materials to landfills or incinerating them rather than recycling or stockpiling them?

No

30. As a general rule, what is the cost benefit, if any, to the County of its recycling programs?

In the current market the cost for the recycling program (10% is collected in County serviced Sanitary Districts) is more expensive than years past. The idea of recycling is not solely intended to be a financial venture but is also an environmental service. The County program is designed to support recycling in the community to help reduce the amount of waste being converted to energy at the waste to energy facility (Covanta Fairfax) or landfilled. The County's contracted local processor is still able to sell recovered materials in available markets and we are currently assessing/implementing innovative ways to make the economics more viable. A few examples of these are: glass recycling at our I-95 Landfill glass processing plant, improved House Hold Hazardous Waste Recovery (oils, propane and paint), electronic waste recycling and in planning a small generator construction and demolition debris recycling facility at the I66 Transfer Station.

Recycling materials have always been a commodity and the prices on various materials have had major swings over time. It now it appears that the markets have reached a "New Normal" and the programs overall benefits are being reexamined.