

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
SCHOOLS COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 2019**

PRESENT: Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large, Chairman
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District, Vice Chairman
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District
Donté Tanner, Sully District

ABSENT: None

OTHERS: Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
Mary D. Cortina, Commissioner At-Large
Jacob Caporaletti, Clerk, Planning Commission
Jill Cooper, Director, Planning Commission
Marianne Gardner, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and
Zoning (DPZ)
Michelle Stahlhut, PD, DPZ
David Stinson, PD, DPZ
Sandy Evans, Fairfax County School Board, Fairfax County Public Schools
(FCPS)
Dalia Palchik, Fairfax County School Board, FCPS

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Schools Committee Policy Research – Existing Policies
- B. Schools Committee Policy Research – Utilization of Existing Facilities
- C. Schools Committee Policy Research – Use of County owned vacant and underutilized property for facilities and programs
- D. Schools Committee Policy Research – Collocation of Facilities
- E. Schools Committee Policy Research – School Proffers
- F. Schools Committee Policy Research – Capital Improvement Program Recommendations
- G. Schools Committee Policy Research – Long Range Student Population Forecasting
- H. Proposed Amendment to Comprehensive Plan – Economic Development Policy Draft
- I. Fairfax County Public School Student Membership Projections Process

//

Chairman Timothy J. Sargeant called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Chairman Sargeant announced that the purpose of the work session was to review the existing language in the Comprehensive Plan for school facilities, as amended through July 25, 2017, and discuss the changes recommended by staff from the Department of Planning and Zoning and the Fairfax County School Board.

//

David Stinson, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), explained that staff had compiled a list of recommended revisions to the Comprehensive Plan's public facilities sections to reflect their previous discussions with the Schools Committee. He then indicated that those revisions were articulated within Attachments A through H. Mr. Stinson reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment A, Existing Policies. A discussion ensued between Mr. Stinson; Sandy Evans, Fairfax County School Board (FCSB), Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS); Dalia Palchik, FCSB, FCPS; Marianne Gardner, PD, DPZ; Michelle Stahlhut, PD, DPZ; and multiple Committee members wherein in the following issues were highlighted:

- The definition of flexible education space;
- The intent of the suggested modifications;
- The potential uses for areas designated as flexible education space; and
- The possible implementation of flexible education spaces within revitalization areas.

Mr. Stinson reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment B, Utilization of Existing Facilities. A discussion ensued between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The prioritization of utilizing space within school facilities for educational activities;
- The usage of school facilities for after school programs, such as School Age Child Care;
- The process for managing space within a school facility;
- The limited availability of space within certain school facilities;
- The impact that additional use of school facilities would incur on overcrowded schools;
- The flexibility provided by the proposed language;
- The impact of redistricting on the proposed recommendations and land usage throughout the County;
- The scope of the Comprehensive Plan regarding FCPS policies on school district boundaries;
- The role of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) in determining the usage of school facilities;
- The interpretations of the revised language, as determined by the County Attorney;
- The potential impact on the permitting process for the usage of educational facilities;
- The application of Objective 11, policy g, that retained the language favoring the utilization of sites prior to the construction of a planned FCPS facility;
- The opportunities to utilize shared parking arrangement between schools and other neighboring facilities;

- The impact of the proposed language on the ability for a school facility to secure funding and implement additional site improvements;

Chairman Sargeant suggested that staff submit the proposed recommendations to the Comprehensive Plan to the Office of the County Attorney for review and provide the Committee feedback on the scope and application of the language.

Mr. Stinson reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment C, Use of County owned vacant and underutilized property for facilities and programs. A discussion ensued between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The process for transferring County-owned property to FCPS;
- The existing inventory of County-owned property and the sites that might be appropriate for usage by FCPS;
- The existing County-owned properties that were scheduled to be vacated;
- The ability for FCPS to exercise the first right of refusal;
- The criteria for requiring a public hearing to approve the transference of County-owned property to FCPS;
- The process for notifying FCPS on the availability of County-owned property for transference;
- The role of the Board of Supervisors in authorizing a transference of County-owned property for other uses; and
- The possibility of utilizing land-swaps between the County and FCPS.

Mr. Stinson reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment D, Collocation of Facilities. A discussion ensued between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The County's existing policy on collocating facilities on FCPS and County-owned land;
- The adequacy of the recommended modifications to the existing language;
- The policies that the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) utilized for prioritizing the applicants considered for collocating public facilities on existing park sites;
- The instances in which applicants outside the County were granted priority for collocating facilities over FCPS;
- The intent of staff's recommended revisions to the existing policy; and
- The extent that the proposed revisions encouraged coordination between FCPS and the FCPA on issues of collocation.

Mr. Stinson reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment E, School Proffers. A discussion ensued between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The current status of legislation regarding proffers in the Virginia General Assembly;
- The extent to which the proposed modifications reflected the County's policy for school proffers;
- The flexibility of the formula utilized to determine student generation rates;
- The differences in student generation rates for certain areas of the County;
- The process for determining appropriate formulas for calculating student generation rates;
- The timeframe for reviewing and revising the formulas for student generation rates;
- The impact of the proffer legislation on the role of the CIP in improving FCPS facilities;
- The challenges associated with securing sites for FCPS facilities without proffer contributions;
- The methods for encouraging applicants to include school contributions within their proffers;
- The verbiage utilized in the recommended modifications;
- The impact of the proposed language on efforts to encourage the inclusion of affordable dwelling units (ADU) within mixed-use developments;
- The County's efforts to encourage the utilization of vacant commercial space for FCPS facilities through proffered contributions;
- The role of proffers in permitting the consolidation of neighboring developments;
- The scope, verbiage, applicability of the proposed language for encouraging applicants to proffer buildings or land for FCPS facilities;
- The impact that efforts to encourage ADU contributions incurred on school contributions;
- The extent to which the formulas for calculating student generation rates were impacted by the inclusion of ADUs;
- The limited availability of land that could accommodate school facilities;
- The alternative methods for securing proffered contributions to offset the impact of further development on FCPS facilities; and
- The impact of the County's policies regarding proffer contributions on economic development.

//

The Committee went into recess at 10:54 a.m. and reconvened at 11:03 a.m.

//

There was a discussion between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members on the suggested modifications to the Comprehensive Plan policy language regarding school facilities during their review of Attachments A through E wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The extent to which the language remained consistent with provisions articulated by the State of Virginia;
- The extent to which the language encouraged opportunities to implement school facilities on both available land and within vacant buildings;

- The impact of the revised language on the County's policies for encouraging affordable housing contributions;
- The process for modifying the formulas for determining student generation rates and proffered school contributions; and
- The impact of senior living developments on school contributions.

Mr. Stinson reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment F, Capital Improvement Program Recommendations. A discussion ensued between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The sentence structure and verbiage of the suggested modifications;
- The intent of the suggested modifications;
- The sources of funding for school facilities;
- The portion of funding provided by the County compared to funds provided by proffered commitments from applicants;
- The usage of school facilities for activities other than traditional education services;
- The fee structure for utilizing school facilities for non-educational purposes; and
- The impact of fee increases on other public facilities, such as libraries.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment H, Economic Development Policy Draft. A discussion ensued between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The existing language of Objective 2 compared to the proposed modifications;
- The efforts by staff and the Committee to broaden the concept of education to reflect a diverse range of educational services;
- The changing trends in the needs and demand for educational services;
- The efforts to utilize education services to address issues relating to poverty;
- The grammar and sentence structure of Policies a through d;
- The extent to which the modified language accommodated private and non-profit education services;
- The extent that the modified language promoted greater accessibility to education services;
- The timeframe for finalizing the modified language for Objective 2; and
- The opportunities to submit subsequent modifications to the language prior to future Committee meetings.

Commissioner Cortina reviewed the suggested modifications articulated in Attachment G, Long Range Student Population Forecasting. A discussion ensued between DPZ staff, FCPS staff, and multiple Committee members wherein the following issues were highlighted:

- The current data regarding student population forecasts, as articulated in the CIP and rendered in maps generated by Fairfax County Geotechnical Information Systems;

- The challenges and constraints associated with calculating future student populations;
- The areas of the County that had been subject to greater student population growth;
- The utility and adequacy of the data regarding student population forecasts by future elected officials; and
- The impact of planned development in neighboring jurisdictions on County demographics and student population growth.

//

Commissioner Sargeant MOVED THAT THE SCHOOLS COMMITTEE ADJOURN.

Commissioner Tanner seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 8-0.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 12:09 p.m.

Timothy J. Sargeant, 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: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved: December 10, 2019



Jacob Caporaletti, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE

POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Existing Policies

FAIRFAX COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, 2017 Edition, Public Facilities, Amended through 7-25-2017, pages 5-9

Objective 6: Acquire sites for schools or educational facilities through negotiation, dedication, or condemnation. This may include the siting of schools or facilities in high density areas or on parcels of limited size.

Policy a. Place schools on parcels meeting the optimum number of general locational criteria. Sites should be evaluated by the following factors:

- Safe and convenient accessibility to pedestrian and road networks, and transit where available.
- Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) to accommodate expansion, when the school is originally sized below the maximum efficiency standard for that type of school.
- Compatibility with adjoining planned and existing development and with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Aesthetically pleasing physical qualities with appropriate engineering features (e.g. soils, topography).
- Proximity to other public facilities, such as police and fire and rescue services, public parks and libraries.

Policy b. Locate school sites, when situated in areas conducive to pedestrian traffic, to take advantage of maximum walking distances of one mile for elementary schools and one and a half miles for middle schools, high schools, and secondary schools.

Policy c. Locate middle schools, high schools, and secondary schools, and when possible, elementary schools, where they can be served by public water and sewer. When elementary schools must be located in non-sewered areas in order to serve their target student population, well and septic can be utilized if no other alternative is available.

Policy d. Acquire school sites, when land dedications cannot be obtained, as far in advance of construction as possible, to ensure availability of both the preferred location and the necessary site features. Plan for acquisitions through the Capital Improvement Program.

Policy e. Encourage site dedications which provide sufficient F.A.R. to meet locational criteria.

Policy f. Coordinate the acquisition and design of the site's active recreation areas with the Fairfax County Park Authority and other agencies. This will ensure maximum opportunities for co-location and efficient use of recreational and other facilities.

Policy g. As part of the development and redevelopment process, encourage commitments for

school renovations and additional capacity where permissible.

Objective 7: Distribute administration and maintenance facilities to conveniently serve the areas they support where feasible.

Policy a. Locate Area Administration buildings in the school areas they are intended to serve.

Policy b. Locate maintenance and operation facilities to afford greater convenience, efficiency and reduction of travel time.

Character and Extent

Objective 8: Locate schools on sites which meet or exceed minimum state size guidelines where feasible.

Policy a. Ensure that minimum site size conforms to the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance F.A.R. requirements. This may result in the acquisition of sites that do not conform to the state suggested guidelines.

Objective 9: Design schools and educational facilities to allow for optimal site utilization while providing optimum service to, and compatibility with, the local community.

Policy a. Design schools to maximize a site's utility, while providing for safety and aesthetics. Provide for possible future expansion and allow for efficient flow of traffic. Provide adequate stacking space and circulation for school buses, student drop off, and offstreet parking, as required. The impact of school traffic on local road networks should, to the extent possible, be minimized.

Policy b. Design and construct schools with appreciation for, and attention to, environmentally sensitive lands.

Policy c. Locate schools in relation to residential or mixed-use areas, the road network, traffic patterns and transit where available to optimize the resulting safety and convenience for students, residents, and commuters. When possible, elementary schools should be located in, or on the periphery of, residential or mixed-use areas to ensure proximity and convenience for students and the local community.

Policy d. Provide for compatibility between schools and adjacent properties with appropriate screening and fencing, in accordance with the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. When designing and constructing schools, preserve as much mature natural vegetation as possible.

Policy e. Design buildings for educational purposes so that intensity and character are compatible with surrounding planned and existing development.

Policy f. Consider Area Plan design guidelines, as appropriate, for schools and buildings for educational purposes.

Policy g. Consider co-location of different levels of education and other types of programs, with the option of shared facilities such as cafeteria, gymnasium, auditorium, library, and administrative offices.

Policy h. Consider co-location of schools with other public uses such as a library or a recreational center.

Objective 10: Consider adaptive reuse of buildings for public schools and educational purposes.

Policy a. Consider properties such as office, commercial, or other buildings for conversion to education facilities.

Policy b. Consider commercial sites to offer programs such as Transitional High Schools, Family and Early Childhood Education Program (FECEP)/Head Start and distance learning. These sites could also provide services to the community.

Policy c. Consider alternative spaces for outdoor recreation, such as converted rooftops and underutilized surface parking lots. Coordinate with the Fairfax County Park Authority or other organizations for efficient use of recreational facilities for both school and community use.

Objective 11: Encourage optimization of existing schools and other facilities, whenever possible and reasonable, to support educational and community objectives.

Policy a. Build additions, when appropriate, to minimize the need for new facilities. Analyze carefully the costs and benefits associated with construction of an addition as compared to a new facility.

Policy b. Consider the expansion of existing school facilities identified on the Comprehensive Plan map as a feature shown of the Comprehensive Plan provided the proposed expansion has received prior approval by a public bond referendum, is included in the county's currently adopted Capital Improvement Program, and does not significantly impact the character of the existing facility and its compatibility with the surrounding area.

Policy c. Provide temporary facilities as required to respond to short term student population accommodation needs.

Policy d. Encourage parity between older and newer schools and facilities through renovation. Apply the same educational specifications used as a guide in the construction of new school facilities for planning the renovation of existing facilities. Consider expected future utilization rates when proposing renovation projects.

Policy e. Continue the practice of serving local communities for scouting, senior citizen programs, and other neighborhood based activities through the use of school facilities. Provide access to school grounds for community use of recreational facilities.

Policy f. Continue the practice of working in collaboration with the Fairfax County Office for Children and other organizations for the provision of space for before and after-school child care services.

Policy g. Continue the practice of allowing the Park Authority and other organizations to utilize sites before school construction begins.

Policy h. Provide space for other public service needs, when possible and reasonable, in underutilized schools.

Policy i. Consider co-location of multiple education facilities on school sites.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- Consider adding Plan language regarding the need for flexible education space utilizing creative design that can be incorporated into activity centers and revitalization areas.
 - (Suggested Plan Language: Identify flexible education space that can be incorporated into activity centers and revitalization areas.)

DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Utilization of Existing Facilities

Research

Existing Policy Plan Language

Objective 11: Encourage optimization of existing schools and other facilities, whenever possible and reasonable, to support educational and community objectives.

- Policy a. Build additions, when appropriate, to minimize the need for new facilities. Analyze carefully the costs and benefits associated with construction of an addition as compared to a new facility.
- Policy b. Consider the expansion of existing school facilities identified on the Comprehensive Plan map as a feature shown of the Comprehensive Plan provided the proposed expansion has received prior approval by a public bond referendum, is included in the county's currently adopted Capital Improvement Program, and does not significantly impact the character of the existing facility and its compatibility with the surrounding area.
- Policy c. Provide temporary facilities as required to respond to short term student population accommodation needs.
- Policy d. Encourage parity between older and newer schools and facilities through renovation. Apply the same educational specifications used as a guide in the construction of new school facilities for planning the renovation of existing facilities. Consider expected future utilization rates when proposing renovation projects.
- Policy e. Continue the practice of serving local communities for scouting, senior citizen programs, and other neighborhood based activities through the use of school facilities. Provide access to school grounds for community use of recreational facilities.
- Policy f. Continue the practice of working in collaboration with the Fairfax County Office for Children and other organizations for the provision of space for before and after-school child care services.
- Policy g. Continue the practice of allowing the Park Authority and other organizations to utilize sites before school construction begins.
- Policy h. Provide space for other public service needs, when possible and reasonable, in underutilized schools.
- Policy i. Consider co-location of multiple education facilities on school sites.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- When appropriate, build additions or redistrict.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Use of County owned vacant and underutilized property for facilities and programs.

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

- County Process for Reallocation or Disposition of County Owned Property
 - The most recent policy for the reallocation and disposition of County property was amended by Facilities Management Department (FMD) in 2011.
 - If a County agency wishes to dispose of surplus property, FMD distributes a memo to all County agencies, semi-autonomous agencies, the District Supervisor and Chairman of the Board. The memo will request any interested agency submit a request for the utilization of the property.
 - Semi-autonomous agency includes the Park Authority and the Redevelopment and Housing Authority.
 - FCPS does not receive the memo to dispose of surplus property.
 - According to FMD, most surplus property is comprised of small non-buildable parcels often in a floodplain.

Research

According to the Office of the County Attorney, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) is a legal entity separate and independent of the County unlike other County agencies. The County may not offer FCPS surplus real property in the same manner that it offers it to other County agencies, because a transfer of ownership to FCPS constitutes disposing of real property and must be transferred by legal conveyance, such as a deed, and requires a public hearing. Conversely, if County owned surplus real property is reallocated to another County agency, the real property is still owned by the County or Board of Supervisors and does not require a public hearing. There is nothing legally prohibiting the County from offering FCPS the first right of refusal for surplus real property it intends to dispose of or sell; however, the County must hold a public hearing for each property for which the County wishes to grant such a right.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation – Non-Land use

Include FCPS on notice of surplus property memo distributed to County agencies by FMD.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Co-location of Facilities

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

- Existing Comprehensive Plan policies resulting from the 2016 School Policy Plan Amendment support the co-location of County and FCPS facilities.
- The adopted FY 2019 – FY 2023 Adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes list of County and FCPS properties for potential co-location.
- FCPS and the Park Authority currently work together. High Schools use Park Authority facilities and the community uses FCPS recreation facilities as there is a shortage of park space.
- Schools must be within close proximity to Park Authority facilities in order to utilize them, as the costs and time associated with transporting students to Park Authority facilities further away is prohibitive.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- Consider the co-location of school fields and recreation space on Park Authority owned facilities.
- ~~Consider policies supporting FCPS facilities on Park Authority land.~~
- When County RECenters are renovated, coordination with FCPS should be considered.
- Encourage collaboration and co-location of FCPS facilities with compatible County facilities. *

*(Policy h of Objective 8 in the Policy Plan supports the co-location of FCPS and County facilities: FAIRFAX COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, 2017 Edition, Public Facilities, Amended through 7-25-2017, page 8
Policy h. Consider co-location of schools with other public uses such as a library or a recreational center.)

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: School Proffers

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

New proffer legislation was adopted by the General Assembly in 2016 and places restrictions on the proffers a locality can request or accept related to new residential development and the residential component of mixed use development. This legislation requires that proffers offsetting these impacts must be specifically attributable to the impact of the new development and can only address capacity need. These needs are determined by the existing capacity of the impacted facilities and must provide a direct and material impact to the new development. However, new residential development occurring within a small area plan that is approved as part of the Comprehensive Plan and meets certain criteria set out in the statute is exempt from the 2016 proffer legislation, and includes transit station areas, as well as some community business centers and suburban centers.

Exemption Categories

- Category A – An approved small area comprehensive plan in which the delimited area is designed as a revitalization area, encompasses mass transit as defined in Va. Code §32.2-100, includes mixed use development, and allows a density of at least 3.0 FAR in a portion thereof.
- Category B – An approved small area plan that encompasses an existing or planned Metrorail Station and allows additional density within the vicinity of such existing or planned station.
- Category C – An approved service district created pursuant to Va. Code § 15.2-2400 that encompasses an existing or planned Metrorail station.

One measure to determine if a residential development will have a direct impact on schools is to determine if the school is over capacity. Capacity is measured in two ways, design capacity and program capacity. Design capacity is based on the number of students a building can support per the original design of the building. Program capacity, the measure used by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) to determine if a residential development will have an impact, is based on the number of existing core classrooms and the specific unique programs assigned to a school which require specific facility space utilization that goes beyond the original design of the building. Modular classrooms are included in the calculation of school design and capacity; however, trailers are not included in the calculation of capacity.

Proffer contributions for schools are typically monetary contributions used for capital improvements that enhance capacity and do not offset the operating costs of schools. As of 2016 the most recent recommended proffer contribution is \$12,262 per pupil as determined by the FCPS Public Facilities Impact Formula. The formula was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2003 and updates and adjustments are made to the formula to reflect changes in student yield ratios by unit type and construction costs. However, construction costs do not include land acquisition. FCPS has received approximately \$20.6 million in proffer contributions since 2002. During this same time period, FCPS spent approximately \$2.43 billion on capital programs, and proffers only accounted for .73 percent. Proffer formulas (Table 1) for determining the student yield rate from new residential development are based on housing type and developed from countywide averages. Proffer formulas use a different methodology to determine student yields than the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which utilizes a

methodology to determine area specific student generation rates and is more accurate than the yield rates for proffers.

Table 1

Countywide Student Yield Ratios for Proffer Formula					
Single Family detached	Elementary	.266	Low-rise Multi-family	Elementary	.188
	Middle	.088		Middle	.047
	High	.179		High	.094
	Total	.533		Total	.329
Single Family Attached	Elementary	.258	Mid/High Rise Multi-family	Elementary	.062
	Middle	.067		Middle	.019
	High	.137		High	.031
	Total	.462		Total	.112

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- The revenue generated from the proffer formula is inadequate to offset the impacts of new residential development on schools and a change to the proffer formula followed by regular reviews should be examined.
- It may be more effective to fund capital improvement needs for schools resulting from new residential development through proffers and the long-term CIP than proffers.
- Consider exempting affordable dwelling units (ADU) from proffers to fund capital improvement needs for schools.
- Follow proposed state proffer legislation in the General Assembly.
- Adding Plan Language to Objective 3 of the Public Facilities Policy Plan supporting developer commitments for buildings and land within mixed-use developments in exempt areas should be considered.
 - (Suggested Plan Language: Proffer buildings or land for Fairfax County Public School facilities per developer commitments within mixed-use developments in exempt areas.)

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH**Topic: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Recommendations****Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion**

- **Future CIP Needs**
 - The enrollment of students at FCPS is more than 188,000 students with approximately 27 million square feet of classroom space.
 - Approximately 1.4 million square feet of capital projects are in the planning stage.
 - Approximately 3.1 million square feet of space will be under construction or renovation during the next year, accounting for 10 percent of countywide classroom space.
 - Approximately 3.5 million square feet of space will be under construction during the next 10 years.
 - Lifespan of schools:
 - Renovation cycle is 37 years and currently extended to 44 years.
 - Some schools not renovated for a period of 50 years.
 - Less expensive and more environmentally sustainable to adaptively reuse an existing building than construct new schools.
 - Comprehensive Plan includes policies supporting the adaptive reuse of buildings for FCPS facilities.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- Fund capital improvement needs for schools resulting from new residential development through the long-term CIP.
- Supplement school proffer contributions from new residential development for schools through the long-term CIP.
- Joint presentations to School Board and County Board.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE

POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Long Range Student Population Forecasting

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) produces two projection sets each school year to forecast student membership. One projection set is produced in the fall for a five year horizon and the fifth year of this set is used for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The second set is a six month projection produced in the spring which is used to determine the enrollment for the upcoming school year. Projections within the five year horizon are accurate; however, the accuracy of student projections diminish beyond the five year horizon.

Methodologies used for student membership projections.

- Total student membership is compared to historical membership patterns.
- Births by elementary school boundary are compared to the kindergarten class five years later.
- Kindergarten class membership is compared to the previous school year's 12th grade class.
- Cohort progression – Each grade level cohort of students is compared to the previous year to understand the difference over time.
- Analysis of population and housing forecasts, housing trends and new housing construction.

Factors impacting the predictability of student projections.

- Students attending school within a different boundary from which they reside. This may occur for program access.
- Replacement of existing housing stock with larger homes.
- Lifecycle of existing housing, changing demographics, economic conditions, and multiple occupancy of dwelling units.
- Mixed use development creates uncertainties for projecting student enrollment.
- FCPS estimates of student yields resulting from planned new housing are based on countywide averages. Student membership projections for the CIP utilize a different methodology, based on localized analysis of demographics, housing types and school trends, resulting in more accurate projections.

Planning Commission Recommendation

- Seek resources to produce long-range forecasts.
- Reconsider Countywide averages used for proffer equation formulas.

**Proposed Amendment to Comprehensive Plan
Economic Development Policy**

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2017 Edition, Policy Plan, Economic Development, Amended through 3-4-2014, page 2

Objective 2: Provide an environment, through land-use decisions and public facilities investment, which promotes access to high quality education for all community members, to include pre-school through 12th grades, apprenticeships, career and technical education, certification programs, higher education, and adult education:

- Policy a. Promote land use and revitalization that encourages socioeconomic diversity throughout the County and minimizes pockets of poverty.
- Policy b. Foster diverse and high quality educational options that help develop the skills community members need to adapt to changes in the economy and technological and workplace innovation.
- Policy c. Collaborate with the business, non-profit organizations and other partners to provide Fairfax residents access to opportunities for knowledge and skills development needed to be successful in the workplace and community.
- Policy d. Enable access to high-quality life-long opportunities for adults to expand their knowledge and skills.

Include in listing of land-related actions that indirectly supports achieving Objective 2: **Consider FCPS needs before any County agency disposes of surplus real property.**

RENOVATION PROGRAMS

Renovations are aimed at ensuring that all schools provide the facilities necessary to support current educational programs regardless of the age of the buildings. Renovations are also used to restore capacity lost due to low-ratio special program instruction and other new instructional support needs (e.g., technology labs). Depending on need, a renovated school may acquire a new heating plant, air conditioning, upgraded electrical and plumbing systems, and spaces required to support the educational program. Both the usable lives of school facilities and School Board policy require renovation of buildings on 20-25 year cycles. Given the number of schools now in operation, this need implies a requirement to renovate an average of one high school, one middle school, and six elementary schools per year.

SPECIAL PROGRAM FACILITIES

The CIP includes funding to provide capacity enhancements at various schools in order to accommodate special programs such as Advanced Academic Programs and Special Education at the elementary and middle school levels. Additionally, FCPS periodically undertakes other capital projects to support its facilities. Examples include installation of safety and security systems as well as improvement of facilities for students and citizens with disabilities.

SITE ACQUISITION

The CIP proposes funding to acquire sites for future schools.

STUDENT MEMBERSHIP PROJECTIONS PROCESS

FCPS produces a projection set each school year. Once the school year begins, a five-year school-by-school projection set is produced. The last year of this set is used for the annual Capital Improvement Program.

The FCPS student membership projections process involves several steps.

STEP 1: Analysis of trends and patterns at the school system level, pyramid level, and school level

Examples of factors that are analyzed to understand historic and current trends to prepare for enrollment projections:

- Total student membership is compared to historical patterns of membership.
- Fairfax County and the City of Fairfax births (by elementary school boundary) are compared to the kindergarten class five years later. These ratios are compared to historical patterns of birth to kindergarten ratios.
- Kindergarten class membership is compared to the previous school year's exiting 12th grade class. These numbers are compared to the past school system patterns.
- Each grade level cohort of students is compared to its previous year to understand the difference in the grade level cohort membership over time. This is referred to as "cohort progression." Ratios are developed to understand the survival rate of each cohort as it ages through the school system. This is compared to past cohort patterns.
- Fairfax County and the City of Fairfax population and housing forecasts and trends are considered to better understand local and regional economic conditions.
- Migration patterns of students entering and exiting the school system are compared to the prior year, as well as to historical patterns of migration.

STEP 2: Development of student membership projections from elementary schools to middle schools to high schools.

Factors used to produce membership projections are:

- Entering kindergarteners are projected by using actual births from prior five years by elementary school boundary and applying a birth to kindergarten ratio.

- Past cohort survival ratios are used to progress each cohort through successive grades ahead. Multi-year averages of grade level progression are considered when projecting for upcoming school years.
- Entry grades to middle school and high school are projected using historical cohort ratios of students residing in a school's boundary compared to the membership at the school. These ratios are applied to rising cohorts in the school's boundary.
- Modifications and adjustments are made, as needed, to account for other factors which may influence a particular school's membership. Examples of this include: boundary phasing decisions, housing developments, and other relevant information unique to a specific school or group of schools.

STEP 3: Special program student membership projections are factored into projections.

- Unique programs are considered as they may impact school specific membership.
- School-by-school projections from various specialists are received for: level IV advanced academic programs (AAP), special education (level 2 or self-contained), FECEP/Head Start, preschool resource, nontraditional sites, and alternative programs.

MONITORING MEMBERSHIP IMPACTS FROM NEW HOUSING

FCPS monitors residential development through development review and field verification of development status:

Development Review:

Comprehensive Plan Studies and Rezoning Application Review

FCPS works with the Fairfax County government to determine the impact planned housing proposed from comprehensive plan studies and rezoning applications would have on school facilities. School impact analysis memos with estimated student yields from the planned and proposed development are provided to Fairfax County government and to the appropriate School Board members.

In addition to estimated student yields for comprehensive plan studies and rezoning applications, recommendations to address future school facilities needs are also provided to Fairfax County government. Fairfax County long-range planning initiatives include Tysons Urban Center, Reston, Dulles Suburban Center (Route 28 Corridor), Bailey's Crossroads Community Business Center (CBC), Seven Corners CBC, Huntington TSA, Franconia-Springfield Transit Station Area (TSA), Embark Richmond Highway (Route 1), Fairfax Center, Lincolnia CBC, Merrifield Suburban Center, McLean CBC, and West Falls Church TSA. These long-range planning initiatives and comprehensive plan studies are often the first step for planned new housing. For more information on Special Planning Areas in Fairfax County, please visit www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning-zoning/comprehensive-plan/special-planning-areas

Development Monitoring

In conjunction with the development review process, FCPS staff conduct field verifications of previously approved applications to track the construction status of residential development. Additionally, new housing can be constructed by-right (i.e. does not require a rezoning development application to construct). This field verification process allows FCPS staff to gain insight into changes in a community and helps provide a better understanding of when and where students from new housing may have an impact on nearby schools.



ASSESSMENT OF FACILITY CAPACITY

Understanding and accurately capturing school capacity is important to ensuring the most efficient use of school facilities and capital funds. Knowing how many students a school can accommodate allows FCPS to quickly assess appropriate program placement and to develop student accommodation solutions. Accurate school capacity assessments help to ensure that classroom spaces are sized appropriately and spaces are designed with flexibility in order to meet the needs of multiple and/or changing instructional programs. Beyond current programmatic and membership challenges, accurate capacity assessments are necessary to formulate long-term facility plans.

As a follow-up to the 2007 DeJong Capacity Study and the 2008 implementation of a new methodology for school capacity calculation, FCPS provided detailed school capacity and facility information on the public website in the form of a Facility and Enrollment Dashboard, which may be found at:

<https://www.fcps.edu/enrollmentdashboard>.

School Capacity Model

It is important to note that school capacity is measured differently depending upon the school type. For instance, elementary schools are calculated based upon the number of core classrooms and self-contained special education class rooms. While some middle schools are team taught, which limits the amount of students to the quantity of rooms required to support a team, others follow the departmental teaching model and need to be assessed similarly to high schools. High school capacity is far more complex than that in elementary and middle schools. The capacity of a high school is based upon the required core programs and the various elective options available. For more information on school capacity calculation methodology please refer to the "Methodology and Calculations" link at:

<https://www.fcps.edu/enrollmentdashboard>.

School Capacity: Information and Assessment

Having determined the methodology that would be used to assess capacity for elementary, middle, and high schools, it is then necessary to evaluate how each individual school uses its spaces. The Office of Facilities Planning Services staff includes capacity architects who manage and process the annual capacity and utilization surveys for each traditional K-12 school. In this survey, school administrators are asked to indicate the use of their spaces (including modular and temporary classrooms) based on their current programs. Upon receipt of the surveys, capacity architects apply the developed methodology to recalculate the capacity of each school. The capacity is calculated considering the school building design, unique school characteristics, and program changes. Lastly, capacity architects, working closely with planning staff, use certified membership and five-year projected membership to determine the current and projected capacity utilizations. These help to identify schools with critical capacity deficits or surpluses, which inform and direct facilities planning activities such as: identifying schools that should be closed to student transfers; prioritizing potential temporary classrooms and building additions; and guide new program placement and possible boundary changes. Information on current and projected capacity utilization can be found in the Membership and Capacity Comparisons section. Modular additions continue to be counted towards capacity while temporary classrooms do not. Temporary classrooms will continue to remain on site in many schools where small capacity deficits or even capacity surplus exists. This is largely due to lack of funding to remove and store these structures elsewhere and changes in programs which require specialized spaces within school buildings. Trailer relocations take place when additional trailers are needed to accommodate an increase in membership at specific schools. The annually updated modular and temporary trailer counts for each school can be found within the Membership and Capacity Comparisons section.

Expanded facility and membership information for all schools may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.fcps.edu/enrollmentdashboard> under the link "Facility & Enrollment Dashboard."

Temporary Classroom Needs

Fairfax County Public Schools has established a supplemental capacity method to accommodate students through the temporary provision of portable classrooms. This resource allows the School Board to maintain intended student-per-classroom and per-instructor ratios despite short-term fluctuations in school memberships.

Temporary classrooms used to address student membership and program requirements at schools and centers where the buildings themselves lack sufficient capacity. FCPS is implementing multiple strategies to reduce the use of temporary facilities. These include architectural modification of existing spaces to provide additional instructional areas, expanding capacity as part of a school renovation, relocating modular additions as permanent construction is completed, and shared use of School Aged Child Care (SACC) classrooms during the regular school day.

Membership and Capacity Comparisons

To be effective as a planning tool, comparisons between membership and capacity should be performed at different levels: countywide, by regions, by high school pyramids, and by individual schools.

Countywide Comparison

FCPS compares five-year projected capacity by level and by geographic areas. This helps inform analyses about membership trends and trends in surplus and deficit capacity throughout the entire school system. It also helps identify projected capacity needs throughout the school system.

School Level Comparisons

A better understanding of FCPS' ability to accommodate students and their instructional needs emerges by reviewing the circumstances at individual schools. Comparisons of school capacity and projected membership for individual schools at all levels are presented in the following region summaries.

Note that the impact of funded new schools, if any, is not reflected in this analysis since the effect for any one school cannot be determined until the new boundary is drawn. Although additional capacity provided by a modular building is included in the analysis, the benefits of any temporary classroom allocated to the schools is not reflected as they are not part of permanent building capacity.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE

POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Existing Policies

FAIRFAX COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, 2017 Edition, Public Facilities, Amended through 7-25-2017, pages 5-9

Objective 6: Acquire sites for schools or educational facilities through negotiation, dedication, or condemnation. This may include the siting of schools or facilities in high density areas or on parcels of limited size.

Policy a. Place schools on parcels meeting the optimum number of general locational criteria. Sites should be evaluated by the following factors:

- Safe and convenient accessibility to pedestrian and road networks, and transit where available.
- Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) to accommodate expansion, when the school is originally sized below the maximum efficiency standard for that type of school.
- Compatibility with adjoining planned and existing development and with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Aesthetically pleasing physical qualities with appropriate engineering features (e.g. soils, topography).
- Proximity to other public facilities, such as police and fire and rescue services, public parks and libraries.

Policy b. Locate school sites, when situated in areas conducive to pedestrian traffic, to take advantage of maximum walking distances of one mile for elementary schools and one and a half miles for middle schools, high schools, and secondary schools.

Policy c. Locate middle schools, high schools, and secondary schools, and when possible, elementary schools, where they can be served by public water and sewer. When elementary schools must be located in non-sewered areas in order to serve their target student population, well and septic can be utilized if no other alternative is available.

Policy d. Acquire school sites, when land dedications cannot be obtained, as far in advance of construction as possible, to ensure availability of both the preferred location and the necessary site features. Plan for acquisitions through the Capital Improvement Program.

Policy e. Encourage site dedications which provide sufficient F.A.R. to meet locational criteria.

Policy f. Coordinate the acquisition and design of the site's active recreation areas with the Fairfax County Park Authority and other agencies. This will ensure maximum opportunities for co-location and efficient use of recreational and other facilities.

Policy g. As part of the development and redevelopment process, encourage commitments for

school renovations and additional capacity where permissible.

Objective 7: Distribute administration and maintenance facilities to conveniently serve the areas they support where feasible.

Policy a. Locate Area Administration buildings in the school areas they are intended to serve.

Policy b. Locate maintenance and operation facilities to afford greater convenience, efficiency and reduction of travel time.

Character and Extent

Objective 8: Locate schools on sites which meet or exceed minimum state size guidelines where feasible.

Policy a. Ensure that minimum site size conforms to the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance F.A.R. requirements. This may result in the acquisition of sites that do not conform to the state suggested guidelines.

Objective 9: Design schools and educational facilities to allow for optimal site utilization while providing optimum service to, and compatibility with, the local community.

Policy a. Design schools to maximize a site's utility, while providing for safety and aesthetics. Provide for possible future expansion and allow for efficient flow of traffic. Provide adequate stacking space and circulation for school buses, student drop off, and offstreet parking, as required. The impact of school traffic on local road networks should, to the extent possible, be minimized.

Policy b. Design and construct schools with appreciation for, and attention to, environmentally sensitive lands.

Policy c. Locate schools in relation to residential or mixed-use areas, the road network, traffic patterns and transit where available to optimize the resulting safety and convenience for students, residents, and commuters. When possible, elementary schools should be located in, or on the periphery of, residential or mixed-use areas to ensure proximity and convenience for students and the local community.

Policy d. Provide for compatibility between schools and adjacent properties with appropriate screening and fencing, in accordance with the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. When designing and constructing schools, preserve as much mature natural vegetation as possible.

Policy e. Design buildings for educational purposes so that intensity and character are compatible with surrounding planned and existing development.

Policy f. Consider Area Plan design guidelines, as appropriate, for schools and buildings for educational purposes.

Policy g. Consider co-location of different levels of education and other types of programs, with the option of shared facilities such as cafeteria, gymnasium, auditorium, library, and administrative offices.

Policy h. Consider co-location of schools with other public uses such as a library or a recreational center.

Objective 10: Consider adaptive reuse of buildings for public schools and educational purposes.

Policy a. Consider properties such as office, commercial, or other buildings for conversion to education facilities.

Policy b. Consider commercial sites to offer programs such as Transitional High Schools, Family and Early Childhood Education Program (FECEP)/Head Start and distance learning. These sites could also provide services to the community.

Policy c. Consider alternative spaces for outdoor recreation, such as converted rooftops and underutilized surface parking lots. Coordinate with the Fairfax County Park Authority or other organizations for efficient use of recreational facilities for both school and community use.

Objective 11: Encourage optimization of existing schools and other facilities, whenever possible and reasonable, to support educational and community objectives.

Policy a. Build additions, when appropriate, to minimize the need for new facilities. Analyze carefully the costs and benefits associated with construction of an addition as compared to a new facility.

Policy b. Consider the expansion of existing school facilities identified on the Comprehensive Plan map as a feature shown of the Comprehensive Plan provided the proposed expansion has received prior approval by a public bond referendum, is included in the county's currently adopted Capital Improvement Program, and does not significantly impact the character of the existing facility and its compatibility with the surrounding area.

Policy c. Provide temporary facilities as required to respond to short term student population accommodation needs.

Policy d. Encourage parity between older and newer schools and facilities through renovation. Apply the same educational specifications used as a guide in the construction of new school facilities for planning the renovation of existing facilities. Consider expected future utilization rates when proposing renovation projects.

Policy e. Continue the practice of serving local communities for scouting, senior citizen programs, and other neighborhood based activities through the use of school facilities. Provide access to school grounds for community use of recreational facilities.

Policy f. Continue the practice of working in collaboration with the Fairfax County Office for Children and other organizations for the provision of space for before and after-school child care services.

Policy g. Continue the practice of allowing the Park Authority and other organizations to utilize sites before school construction begins.

Policy h. Provide space for other public service needs, when possible and reasonable, in underutilized schools.

Policy i. Consider co-location of multiple education facilities on school sites.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- Consider adding Plan language regarding the need for flexible education space utilizing creative design that can be incorporated into activity centers and revitalization areas.
 - (Suggested Plan Language: Identify flexible education space that can be incorporated into activity centers and revitalization areas.)

DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Utilization of Existing Facilities

Research

Existing Policy Plan Language

Objective 11: Encourage optimization of existing schools and other facilities, whenever possible and reasonable, to support educational and community objectives.

- Policy a. Build additions, when appropriate, to minimize the need for new facilities. Analyze carefully the costs and benefits associated with construction of an addition as compared to a new facility.
- Policy b. Consider the expansion of existing school facilities identified on the Comprehensive Plan map as a feature shown of the Comprehensive Plan provided the proposed expansion has received prior approval by a public bond referendum, is included in the county’s currently adopted Capital Improvement Program, and does not significantly impact the character of the existing facility and its compatibility with the surrounding area.
- Policy c. Provide temporary facilities as required to respond to short term student population accommodation needs.
- Policy d. Encourage parity between older and newer schools and facilities through renovation. Apply the same educational specifications used as a guide in the construction of new school facilities for planning the renovation of existing facilities. Consider expected future utilization rates when proposing renovation projects.
- Policy e. Continue the practice of serving local communities for scouting, senior citizen programs, and other neighborhood based activities through the use of school facilities. Provide access to school grounds for community use of recreational facilities.
- Policy f. Continue the practice of working in collaboration with the Fairfax County Office for Children and other organizations for the provision of space for before and after-school child care services.
- Policy g. Continue the practice of allowing the Park Authority and other organizations to utilize sites before school construction begins.
- Policy h. Provide space for other public service needs, when possible and reasonable, in underutilized schools.
- Policy i. Consider co-location of multiple education facilities on school sites.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- When appropriate, build additions or redistrict.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Use of County owned vacant and underutilized property for facilities and programs.

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

- County Process for Reallocation or Disposition of County Owned Property
 - The most recent policy for the reallocation and disposition of County property was amended by Facilities Management Department (FMD) in 2011.
 - If a County agency wishes to dispose of surplus property, FMD distributes a memo to all County agencies, semi-autonomous agencies, the District Supervisor and Chairman of the Board. The memo will request any interested agency submit a request for the utilization of the property.
 - Semi-autonomous agency includes the Park Authority and the Redevelopment and Housing Authority.
 - FCPS does not receive the memo to dispose of surplus property.
 - According to FMD, most surplus property is comprised of small non-buildable parcels often in a floodplain.

Research

According to the Office of the County Attorney, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) is a legal entity separate and independent of the County unlike other County agencies. The County may not offer FCPS surplus real property in the same manner that it offers it to other County agencies, because a transfer of ownership to FCPS constitutes disposing of real property and must be transferred by legal conveyance, such as a deed, and requires a public hearing. Conversely, if County owned surplus real property is reallocated to another County agency, the real property is still owned by the County or Board of Supervisors and does not require a public hearing. There is nothing legally prohibiting the County from offering FCPS the first right of refusal for surplus real property it intends to dispose of or sell; however, the County must hold a public hearing for each property for which the County wishes to grant such a right.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation – Non-Land use

Include FCPS on notice of surplus property memo distributed to County agencies by FMD.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Co-location of Facilities

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

- Existing Comprehensive Plan policies resulting from the 2016 School Policy Plan Amendment support the co-location of County and FCPS facilities.
- The adopted FY 2019 – FY 2023 Adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes list of County and FCPS properties for potential co-location.
- FCPS and the Park Authority currently work together. High Schools use Park Authority facilities and the community uses FCPS recreation facilities as there is a shortage of park space.
- Schools must be within close proximity to Park Authority facilities in order to utilize them, as the costs and time associated with transporting students to Park Authority facilities further away is prohibitive.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- Consider the co-location of school fields and recreation space on Park Authority owned facilities.
- ~~Consider policies supporting FCPS facilities on Park Authority land.~~
- When County RECenters are renovated, coordination with FCPS should be considered.
- Encourage collaboration and co-location of FCPS facilities with compatible County facilities. *

*(Policy h of Objective 8 in the Policy Plan supports the co-location of FCPS and County facilities: FAIRFAX COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, 2017 Edition, Public Facilities, Amended through 7-25-2017, page 8
Policy h. Consider co-location of schools with other public uses such as a library or a recreational center.)

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: School Proffers

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

New proffer legislation was adopted by the General Assembly in 2016 and places restrictions on the proffers a locality can request or accept related to new residential development and the residential component of mixed use development. This legislation requires that proffers offsetting these impacts must be specifically attributable to the impact of the new development and can only address capacity need. These needs are determined by the existing capacity of the impacted facilities and must provide a direct and material impact to the new development. However, new residential development occurring within a small area plan that is approved as part of the Comprehensive Plan and meets certain criteria set out in the statute is exempt from the 2016 proffer legislation, and includes transit station areas, as well as some community business centers and suburban centers.

Exemption Categories

- Category A – An approved small area comprehensive plan in which the delimited area is designed as a revitalization area, encompasses mass transit as defined in Va. Code §32.2-100, includes mixed use development, and allows a density of at least 3.0 FAR in a portion thereof.
- Category B – An approved small area plan that encompasses an existing or planned Metrorail Station and allows additional density within the vicinity of such existing or planned station.
- Category C – An approved service district created pursuant to Va. Code § 15.2-2400 that encompasses an existing or planned Metrorail station.

One measure to determine if a residential development will have a direct impact on schools is to determine if the school is over capacity. Capacity is measured in two ways, design capacity and program capacity. Design capacity is based on the number of students a building can support per the original design of the building. Program capacity, the measure used by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) to determine if a residential development will have an impact, is based on the number of existing core classrooms and the specific unique programs assigned to a school which require specific facility space utilization that goes beyond the original design of the building. Modular classrooms are included in the calculation of school design and capacity; however, trailers are not included in the calculation of capacity.

Proffer contributions for schools are typically monetary contributions used for capital improvements that enhance capacity and do not offset the operating costs of schools. As of 2016 the most recent recommended proffer contribution is \$12,262 per pupil as determined by the FCPS Public Facilities Impact Formula. The formula was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2003 and updates and adjustments are made to the formula to reflect changes in student yield ratios by unit type and construction costs. However, construction costs do not include land acquisition. FCPS has received approximately \$20.6 million in proffer contributions since 2002. During this same time period, FCPS spent approximately \$2.43 billion on capital programs, and proffers only accounted for .73 percent. Proffer formulas (Table 1) for determining the student yield rate from new residential development are based on housing type and developed from countywide averages. Proffer formulas use a different methodology to determine student yields than the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which utilizes a

methodology to determine area specific student generation rates and is more accurate than the yield rates for proffers.

Table 1

Countywide Student Yield Ratios for Proffer Formula					
Single Family detached	Elementary	.266	Low-rise Multi-family	Elementary	.188
	Middle	.088		Middle	.047
	High	.179		High	.094
	Total	.533		Total	.329
Single Family Attached	Elementary	.258	Mid/High Rise Multi-family	Elementary	.062
	Middle	.067		Middle	.019
	High	.137		High	.031
	Total	.462		Total	.112

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- The revenue generated from the proffer formula is inadequate to offset the impacts of new residential development on schools and a change to the proffer formula followed by regular reviews should be examined.
- It may be more effective to fund capital improvement needs for schools resulting from new residential development through proffers and the long-term CIP than proffers.
- Consider exempting affordable dwelling units (ADU) from proffers to fund capital improvement needs for schools.
- Follow proposed state proffer legislation in the General Assembly.
- Adding Plan Language to Objective 3 of the Public Facilities Policy Plan supporting developer commitments for buildings and land within mixed-use developments in exempt areas should be considered.
 - (Suggested Plan Language: Proffer buildings or land for Fairfax County Public School facilities per developer commitments within mixed-use developments in exempt areas.)

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE - POLICY RESEARCH**Topic: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Recommendations****Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion**

- **Future CIP Needs**
 - The enrollment of students at FCPS is more than 188,000 students with approximately 27 million square feet of classroom space.
 - Approximately 1.4 million square feet of capital projects are in the planning stage.
 - Approximately 3.1 million square feet of space will be under construction or renovation during the next year, accounting for 10 percent of countywide classroom space.
 - Approximately 3.5 million square feet of space will be under construction during the next 10 years.
 - Lifespan of schools:
 - Renovation cycle is 37 years and currently extended to 44 years.
 - Some schools not renovated for a period of 50 years.
 - Less expensive and more environmentally sustainable to adaptively reuse an existing building than construct new schools.
 - Comprehensive Plan includes policies supporting the adaptive reuse of buildings for FCPS facilities.

Suggested Planning Commission Recommendation

- Fund capital improvement needs for schools resulting from new residential development through the long-term CIP.
- Supplement school proffer contributions from new residential development for schools through the long-term CIP.
- Joint presentations to School Board and County Board.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHOOLS COMMITTEE

POLICY RESEARCH

Topic: Long Range Student Population Forecasting

Summary of Planning Commission Schools Committee Discussion

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) produces two projection sets each school year to forecast student membership. One projection set is produced in the fall for a five year horizon and the fifth year of this set is used for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The second set is a six month projection produced in the spring which is used to determine the enrollment for the upcoming school year. Projections within the five year horizon are accurate; however, the accuracy of student projections diminish beyond the five year horizon.

Methodologies used for student membership projections.

- Total student membership is compared to historical membership patterns.
- Births by elementary school boundary are compared to the kindergarten class five years later.
- Kindergarten class membership is compared to the previous school year's 12th grade class.
- Cohort progression – Each grade level cohort of students is compared to the previous year to understand the difference over time.
- Analysis of population and housing forecasts, housing trends and new housing construction.

Factors impacting the predictability of student projections.

- Students attending school within a different boundary from which they reside. This may occur for program access.
- Replacement of existing housing stock with larger homes.
- Lifecycle of existing housing, changing demographics, economic conditions, and multiple occupancy of dwelling units.
- Mixed use development creates uncertainties for projecting student enrollment.
- FCPS estimates of student yields resulting from planned new housing are based on countywide averages. Student membership projections for the CIP utilize a different methodology, based on localized analysis of demographics, housing types and school trends, resulting in more accurate projections.

Planning Commission Recommendation

- Seek resources to produce long-range forecasts.
- Reconsider Countywide averages used for proffer equation formulas.

**Proposed Amendment to Comprehensive Plan
Economic Development Policy**

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2017 Edition, Policy Plan, Economic Development, Amended through 3-4-2014, page 2

Objective 2: Provide an environment, through land-use decisions and public facilities investment, which promotes access to high quality education for all community members, to include pre-school through 12th grades, apprenticeships, career and technical education, certification programs, higher education, and adult education:

- Policy a. Promote land use and revitalization that encourages socioeconomic diversity throughout the County and minimizes pockets of poverty.
- Policy b. Foster diverse and high quality educational options that help develop the skills community members need to adapt to changes in the economy and technological and workplace innovation.
- Policy c. Collaborate with the business, non-profit organizations and other partners to provide Fairfax residents access to opportunities for knowledge and skills development needed to be successful in the workplace and community.
- Policy d. Enable access to high-quality life-long opportunities for adults to expand their knowledge and skills.

Include in listing of land-related actions that indirectly supports achieving Objective 2: **Consider FCPS needs before any County agency disposes of surplus real property.**

RENOVATION PROGRAMS

Renovations are aimed at ensuring that all schools provide the facilities necessary to support current educational programs regardless of the age of the buildings. Renovations are also used to restore capacity lost due to low-ratio special program instruction and other new instructional support needs (e.g., technology labs). Depending on need, a renovated school may acquire a new heating plant, air conditioning, upgraded electrical and plumbing systems, and spaces required to support the educational program. Both the usable lives of school facilities and School Board policy require renovation of buildings on 20-25 year cycles. Given the number of schools now in operation, this need implies a requirement to renovate an average of one high school, one middle school, and six elementary schools per year.

SPECIAL PROGRAM FACILITIES

The CIP includes funding to provide capacity enhancements at various schools in order to accommodate special programs such as Advanced Academic Programs and Special Education at the elementary and middle school levels. Additionally, FCPS periodically undertakes other capital projects to support its facilities. Examples include installation of safety and security systems as well as improvement of facilities for students and citizens with disabilities.

SITE ACQUISITION

The CIP proposes funding to acquire sites for future schools.

STUDENT MEMBERSHIP PROJECTIONS PROCESS

FCPS produces a projection set each school year. Once the school year begins, a five-year school-by-school projection set is produced. The last year of this set is used for the annual Capital Improvement Program.

The FCPS student membership projections process involves several steps.

STEP 1: Analysis of trends and patterns at the school system level, pyramid level, and school level.

Examples of factors that are analyzed to understand historic and current trends to prepare for enrollment projections:

- Total student membership is compared to historical patterns of membership.
- Fairfax County and the City of Fairfax births (by elementary school boundary) are compared to the kindergarten class five years later. These ratios are compared to historical patterns of birth to kindergarten ratios.
- Kindergarten class membership is compared to the previous school year's exiting 12th grade class. These numbers are compared to the past school system patterns.
- Each grade level cohort of students is compared to its previous year to understand the difference in the grade level cohort membership over time. This is referred to as "cohort progression." Ratios are developed to understand the survival rate of each cohort as it ages through the school system. This is compared to past cohort patterns.
- Fairfax County and the City of Fairfax population and housing forecasts and trends are considered to better understand local and regional economic conditions.
- Migration patterns of students entering and exiting the school system are compared to the prior year, as well as to historical patterns of migration.

STEP 2: Development of student membership projections from elementary schools to middle schools to high schools.

Factors used to produce membership projections are:

- Entering kindergarteners are projected by using actual births from prior five years by elementary school boundary and applying a birth to kindergarten ratio.

- Past cohort survival ratios are used to progress each cohort through successive grades ahead. Multi-year averages of grade level progression are considered when projecting for upcoming school years.
- Entry grades to middle school and high school are projected using historical cohort ratios of students residing in a school's boundary compared to the membership at the school. These ratios are applied to rising cohorts in the school's boundary.
- Modifications and adjustments are made, as needed, to account for other factors which may influence a particular school's membership. Examples of this include: boundary phasing decisions, housing developments, and other relevant information unique to a specific school or group of schools.

STEP 3: Special program student membership projections are factored into projections.

- Unique programs are considered as they may impact school specific membership.
- School-by-school projections from various specialists are received for: level IV advanced academic programs (AAP), special education (level 2 or self-contained), FECEP/Head Start, preschool resource, nontraditional sites, and alternative programs.

MONITORING MEMBERSHIP IMPACTS FROM NEW HOUSING

FCPS monitors residential development through development review and field verification of development status:

Development Review: Comprehensive Plan Studies and Rezoning Application Review

FCPS works with the Fairfax County government to determine the impact planned housing proposed from comprehensive plan studies and rezoning applications would have on school facilities. School impact analysis memos with estimated student yields from the planned and proposed development are provided to Fairfax County government and to the appropriate School Board members.

In addition to estimated student yields for comprehensive plan studies and rezoning applications, recommendations to address future school facilities needs are also provided to Fairfax County government. Fairfax County long-range planning initiatives include Tysons Urban Center, Reston, Dulles Suburban Center (Route 28 Corridor), Bailey's Crossroads Community Business Center (CBC), Seven Corners CBC, Huntington TSA, Franconia-Springfield Transit Station Area (TSA), Embark Richmond Highway (Route 1), Fairfax Center, Lincolnia CBC, Merrifield Suburban Center, McLean CBC, and West Falls Church TSA. These long-range planning initiatives and comprehensive plan studies are often the first step for planned new housing. For more information on Special Planning Areas in Fairfax County, please visit www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning-zoning/comprehensive-plan/special-planning-areas

Development Monitoring

In conjunction with the development review process, FCPS staff conduct field verifications of previously approved applications to track the construction status of residential development. Additionally, new housing can be constructed by-right (i.e. does not require a rezoning development application to construct). This field verification process allows FCPS staff to gain insight into changes in a community and helps provide a better understanding of when and where students from new housing may have an impact on nearby schools.



ASSESSMENT OF FACILITY CAPACITY

Understanding and accurately capturing school capacity is important to ensuring the most efficient use of school facilities and capital funds. Knowing how many students a school can accommodate allows FCPS to quickly assess appropriate program placement and to develop student accommodation solutions. Accurate school capacity assessments help to ensure that classroom spaces are sized appropriately and spaces are designed with flexibility in order to meet the needs of multiple and/or changing instructional programs. Beyond current programmatic and membership challenges, accurate capacity assessments are necessary to formulate long-term facility plans.

As a follow-up to the 2007 DeJong Capacity Study and the 2008 implementation of a new methodology for school capacity calculation, FCPS provided detailed school capacity and facility information on the public website in the form of a Facility and Enrollment Dashboard, which may be found at:

<https://www.fcps.edu/enrollmentdashboard>.

School Capacity Model

It is important to note that school capacity is measured differently depending upon the school type. For instance, elementary schools are calculated based upon the number of core classrooms and self-contained special education class rooms. While some middle schools are team taught, which limits the amount of students to the quantity of rooms required to support a team, others follow the departmental teaching model and need to be assessed similarly to high schools. High school capacity is far more complex than that in elementary and middle schools. The capacity of a high school is based upon the required core programs and the various elective options available. For more information on school capacity calculation methodology please refer to the "Methodology and Calculations" link at:

<https://www.fcps.edu/enrollmentdashboard>.

School Capacity: Information and Assessment

Having determined the methodology that would be used to assess capacity for elementary, middle, and high schools, it is then necessary to evaluate how each individual school uses its spaces. The Office of Facilities Planning Services staff includes capacity architects who manage and process the annual capacity and utilization surveys for each traditional K-12 school. In this survey, school administrators are asked to indicate the use of their spaces (including modular and temporary classrooms) based on their current programs. Upon receipt of the surveys, capacity architects apply the developed methodology to recalculate the capacity of each school. The capacity is calculated considering the school building design, unique school characteristics, and program changes. Lastly, capacity architects, working closely with planning staff, use certified membership and five-year projected membership to determine the current and projected capacity utilizations. These help to identify schools with critical capacity deficits or surpluses, which inform and direct facilities planning activities such as: identifying schools that should be closed to student transfers; prioritizing potential temporary classrooms and building additions; and guide new program placement and possible boundary changes. Information on current and projected capacity utilization can be found in the Membership and Capacity Comparisons section. Modular additions continue to be counted towards capacity while temporary classrooms do not. Temporary classrooms will continue to remain on site in many schools where small capacity deficits or even capacity surplus exists. This is largely due to lack of funding to remove and store these structures elsewhere and changes in programs which require specialized spaces within school buildings. Trailer relocations take place when additional trailers are needed to accommodate an increase in membership at specific schools. The annually updated modular and temporary trailer counts for each school can be found within the Membership and Capacity Comparisons section.

Expanded facility and membership information for all schools may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.fcps.edu/enrollmentdashboard> under the link "Facility & Enrollment Dashboard."

Temporary Classroom Needs

Fairfax County Public Schools has established a supplemental capacity method to accommodate students through the temporary provision of portable classrooms. This resource allows the School Board to maintain intended student-per-classroom and per-instructor ratios despite short-term fluctuations in school memberships.

Temporary classrooms used to address student membership and program requirements at schools and centers where the buildings themselves lack sufficient capacity. FCPS is implementing multiple strategies to reduce the use of temporary facilities. These include architectural modification of existing spaces to provide additional instructional areas, expanding capacity as part of a school renovation, relocating modular additions as permanent construction is completed, and shared use of School Aged Child Care (SACC) classrooms during the regular school day.

Membership and Capacity Comparisons

To be effective as a planning tool, comparisons between membership and capacity should be performed at different levels: countywide, by regions, by high school pyramids, and by individual schools.

Countywide Comparison

FCPS compares five-year projected capacity by level and by geographic areas. This helps inform analyses about membership trends and trends in surplus and deficit capacity throughout the entire school system. It also helps identify projected capacity needs throughout the school system.

School Level Comparisons

A better understanding of FCPS' ability to accommodate students and their instructional needs emerges by reviewing the circumstances at individual schools. Comparisons of school capacity and projected membership for individual schools at all levels are presented in the following region summaries.

Note that the impact of funded new schools, if any, is not reflected in this analysis since the effect for any one school cannot be determined until the new boundary is drawn. Although additional capacity provided by a modular building is included in the analysis, the benefits of any temporary classroom allocated to the schools is not reflected as they are not part of permanent building capacity.