



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

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

## Reston Network Analysis & Funding Advisory Group MEETING #9 MINUTES

**DATE:** June 20, 2016  
**TIME:** 7:00 pm - 9:00 pm  
**LOCATION:** Lake Anne Community Center

### ATTENDEES:

#### Advisory Group

Andy Sigle (Advisory Group Chair)  
Mark Looney (Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce)  
John Mossgrove (Resident)  
Matt Valentini (JBG Companies)

#### Staff

Tom Biesiadny (FCDOT, Director)  
Kristin Calkins (FCDOT, Network Analysis Project Manager)  
Janet Nguyen (FCDOT, Funding Plan Project Manager)  
Ken Kanownik (FCDOT)  
Paul Davis (Hunter Mill District Office)

Absent: Delores Bailey, Tim Cohn, Bill Keefe, Robert Goudie, Liana King, Cate Fulkerson, Maggie Parker

### I. Meeting Summary

This was the ninth meeting of the Reston Network Analysis and Funding Advisory Group. The focus of this meeting was to discuss the Reston Funding Plan. A hardcopy of the presentation was provided to all attendees; a digital version is available on the project website:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/fcdot/restonnetworkanalysis/>

#### General Discussion

- Chairman Andy Sigle called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.
- The meeting minutes for April 11 were approved unanimously. Approved minutes are posted on the project website.
- Kristin updated the group on projects and meetings related to the Network Analysis:
  - There was a public meeting on the Network Analysis on May 28, 2016. The results of Tier 1 and Tier 2 were presented to the community. There was a robust question and answer session that followed the presentation.
  - There was a meeting on the Fairfax County Parkway on June 9, 2016 where short term improvements for the Parkway were presented. The County will be conducting a long term study that will coordinate with the recommendations from the Network Analysis at Sunrise Valley Drive and at Spring Street.
  - There was an information meeting on the Soapstone Connector on June 15, 2016 where the status of the environmental work was presented and discussed.
- Kristin gave an update on the status of the Network Analysis. The project is currently focused on the phasing analysis and possible Tier 3 improvements.

### **Reston Network Funding Plan Presentation/Discussion**

- Tom began the presentation with a premise that this meeting will focus on the questions and requests for more information from the Advisory Group made at the meeting on April 11.
- Janet let the Advisory Group know that the cost of the grid of streets has been reduced by \$233 million due to refinements based on information from the Network Analysis.
  - A question was asked where the reductions in cost came from. Staff clarified that they came from reduction in the number of signals and a better understanding in the number of travel lanes on the grid streets.
- Janet gave an overview of the grid of streets that are considered to be built by proffers (in-kind) and those that will need to be built using another source such as a road fund.
  - An Advisory group member mentioned that some of the links that were indicated to be built using the road fund will actually be built by developers.
    - Staff encouraged the Advisory Group members to send comments on the designations of in kind and road fund links.
- Ken presented information on how Tax Increment Financing (TIF) works, where it has been used in the County and different types of TIFs.
  - A question was raised about how many property owners were involved in the TIF in the Mosaic District. Staff clarified that one property owner was involved.
- An overview of the comparison of land values between Tysons and Reston was presented.
  - An Advisory Group member commented that commercial and residential for rent in Tysons is worth about 25% more than the same type of land in Reston.
    - Staff clarified that owner occupied residential is assessed at a higher value in Reston than Tysons.
- Staff recognized that the numbers the County developed for commercial property values were very similar to those developed by the property owners.
- A member of the community asked if the comparison was based off of the Tysons Urban Center or the Tysons Transit Station Area. There is a concern that the comparison is not equitable, as the distance is not equal.
  - Staff clarified that the area in Tysons was the Urban Center. Staff indicated that a comparison based off of distance from the Metrorail Stations could be a more fair comparison.
- An Advisory Group member mentioned that until there is an agreement on the split between public and private funding the numbers were discussing will be hard to agree on.
- There was a public comment indicating that numbering for the scenarios should be continued to show the total number of scenarios staff has developed and considered.
- A question was raised about why a service district vs. a tax district would be chosen. Would one incentivize different types of development?
  - Staff clarified that there would be minimal impacts on development based on the type of district that was established.
- Staff clarified that a tax district would require a petition by a majority, 51%, of property owners. If one was established, it would only apply to commercial properties and any potential conversion to residential would have to buy out of the tax district.
- Tom mentioned that staff had met with the business members of the Advisory Group to discuss land values in Reston, at the request of Advisory Group during the April 11 meeting.
  - An advisory group member mentioned that at that meeting the developers raised questions including, if there are ways to prioritize the improvements in the plan, that the streets

should be more multimodal, and that they want to ensure that their projects can ‘get off the ground’.

### **Community Q&A**

- A member of the audience indicated that they are interested in seeing how a form of TIF could be used in Reston, possibly around specific station areas.
- A comment was made that development has happened in Reston that has not been supported by infrastructure. The projects being funded through the Reston Funding Plan are needed to support existing travel needs. They should be paid for by the developers, not the community.
- A member of the community indicated that it is important for coordination between public and private streets in Reston as public streets in Reston have a history of being too auto oriented.
  - Staff indicated that there are now ways to make public streets more urban and pedestrian friendly. The decision on public vs. private streets will be made through the rezoning process, but it is important to have public streets for bus service.
- Andy asked that staff respond to a list of comments submitted by a member of the community at the next Advisory Group meeting.
- A question was raised about the content of the public meeting on June 27 on the Funding Plan. The community member expressed concern that the material presented today would be too detailed for the public to understand.
  - Staff indicated that the presentation will be a high level review of the work done to date, and will include background information on why the Funding Plan is being done.
- A community member wanted to know why projects far from the TSAs are included in the Funding Plan.
  - Staff indicated that the projects were identified through the Phase I planning process and are needed to support the trips to and from the new development around the Metrorail Stations.
- An Advisory Group member mentioned that the projects related to the Innovation Station should be removed from the Reston Funding Plan and included in a subsequent plan. This will ensure that the later plan has a similar split between private and public funding of the transportation improvements.
- A comment was made that a tax district will be much harder to implement than a service district.
- A community member indicated that the Soapstone Connector should be a top priority for the County as it is needed for circulation.

### **Advisory Group Q&A**

- An Advisory Group member asked if Tax Districts, Service Districts and TIFS have to be voted on by the land owners, or if they are created by legislation.
  - Staff indicated that tax districts and TIFS would require action from the landowners, but service districts would be enacted by the Board.
- Concern was expressed that a potential tax on the residential communities of Reston could become part of the plan.
- A comment was made that road infrastructure is only one of the costs associated with developments and the costs need to be balanced.
- A desire to look at the grid links again for in-kind versus road fund was expressed.
- An Advisory Group member suggested that the Funding Plan needs to determine the ‘sweet spot’ between a tax rate and proffer rate as part of the process. This rate will be important as any potential tax will be passed on to tenants.

## Network AG Minutes #9

- There needs to be a decision made on how much existing development should pay vs. the new development. Existing development will also benefit from the improvements funded by this plan.
- A question was asked if it would be more appropriate for the Advisory Group to give guidance on rates rather than setting a specific number.
- An advisory group member asked that staff come up with more creative ways to help fund the transportation improvements. These ideas could be linked to increased vehicle trips, which is a main concern of Reston residents.
- Andy asked if other members of the Advisory Group would be interested in writing a paper to summarize the Advisory Groups thoughts on the Funding Plan to share with the community and Supervisor Hudgins.

### **II. Action Items**

- *FCDOT Staff:*
  - Set date for next Advisory Group Meeting
  - Determine date for Board Transportation Committee briefing

### **III. Next Steps**

- Staff will continue working on different potential fund allocations for the Plan.
- Public meeting on Funding Plan set for June 27