



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 #11 MINUTES

DATE: Monday, September 12, 2016
TIME: 6:00 pm - 7:30 pm
LOCATION: Reston Association
ATTENDEES:

Advisory Group

Andy Sigle (Advisory Group Chair)
Robert Goudie
Cate Fulkerson
Maggie Parker
Delores Bailey
Mark Looney
Matt Valentini

Staff

Tom Biesiadny (FCDOT, Director)
Kristin Calkins (FCDOT, Network Analysis Project Manager)
Janet Nguyen (FCDOT, Funding Plan Project Manager)
Ken Kanownik (FCDOT)

Absent:, Tim Cohn, Bill Keefe, , Liana King, John Mossgrove

I. Meeting Summary

This was the eleventh meeting of the Reston Network Analysis and Funding Advisory Group. This meeting had a presentation and discussion of the Reston Funding Plan. Hardcopies of the presentation were 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 6:05 pm.
- The meeting minutes for August 8 were approved unanimously. Approved minutes are posted on the project website.
- Kristin mentioned that there had been no meetings related to Reston transportation projects other than the Advisory Group working meeting on the Funding Plan on September 7. Andy mentioned that he had sent thoughts and takeaways from the meeting to the Advisory Group and would like comments from the members. He would like to send this to staff by September 26.

Reston Funding Plan Presentation/Discussion:

- Staff presented the work on the Funding Plan to date, and focused on the three Funding Alternatives that are still being considered after the working group meeting on September 7.
- Andy requested that the map of the improvements included in the Funding Plan be included in the presentation for the next meeting so the Advisory Group has an ability to discuss.
- An Advisory Group member mentioned that at the previous meeting the alternatives that included a Tax District were removed from consideration because there is already a tax district being used to

fund the construction of the Silver Line and if a service district is used the monies raised would stay in Reston and could be bonded.

- Staff reviewed how each of the scenarios being considered would raise funds.
 - Service Districts would be applied to all properties in the Transit Station Areas (TSAs).
 - An Advisory Group member suggested that the slides that reference the service district should emphasize that it would only be applied to the TSAs and not all of Reston.
- There was a request that staff address how current applications in the rezoning process, that are not yet approved, will be affected by the Funding Plan.
 - Staff indicated that current rezoning would not be subject to the Road Fund, but that staff is requesting that the applicants proffer to a potential road fund. This has happened with the two cases that have been approved in Reston after the adoption of the Reston Master Plan.
- There was a question raised about if there is a better way to show what the total costs for residential and commercial are, specifically regarding the life of the service district combined with the upfront rates.
- A question was raised about whether apartments would contribute towards or the residential or commercial contribution rates in a road fund.
 - Staff clarified that apartments would contribute towards the road fund with the residential per dwelling unit rate.
- There was a comment made that the rates from the service district will be passed on to tenants of the apartments and offices.
- A question was raised about what the life of a road fund and service district would be and when they would start. Staff indicated that the timeframe for both is anticipated to be 40 years. Contributions to a road fund would begin after Board's approval of the funding plan and contributions to a service district would likely begin in the new fiscal year after the approval.
- A question was raised about if any consideration was given to looking at half the time frame and doing a re-correction in the future.
 - Staff indicated that there will be an annual review of the Funding Plan when the Board approves the rates for the service district.
- A comment was made about the importance of remembering that land values in Reston are less than Tysons. Current office values will make even the office rate as proposed challenging.
 - Staff indicated that the difference between Tysons and Reston was how Scenario 8 was developed. If there is more information and data that would help inform the Plan, staff would appreciate it being provided.
- A comment was made that the development community would be comfortable with a service district. Shifting some from the road fund side to the service district side would make development more stable and bring consistent contributions to the County.
- A question was asked about the difference between the three scenarios and if it was just when the money was paid. If this is the case, would scenario 10 be the best because residential pays the least?
 - Staff indicated that a shift to higher rates in the service district would mean a resident in the TSA would pay more into the plan over the life of the plan.
- A comment was made that the higher the service district rate, the more predictable the revenue source would be.

- The difference between a service district and road fund rates is that service district contributions are bondable, while rates would provide funds ‘as the development comes/as needed’. The goal of balancing the two is finding what is equitable.
- It was noted that the gap the road fund is trying to fill is \$350 million, while developers will build over \$700 million in transportation infrastructure. A service district will allow projects to move forward sooner.
- A comment was made that the service district will provide the smallest ‘piece of the funding pie’.
- Staff reminded the Advisory Group that the plan has to be adopted and supported by the Board. There will be comparisons made to the Tysons plan and that we need to make sure the Plan is fair and reasonable.
- A member of the Advisory Group discussed how a main goal of the Phase I Task Force was to fix the transportation issues, and that a main component of that is creating a jobs/housing balance. The plan needs to incentivize the development and delivery of residential. Spreading the cost over time with a service district would help achieve this goal.
- An Advisory Group member noted, based on their calculations, that under all three funding scenarios commercial property will pay more over the 40 year plan.
 - Staff indicated that they would present information on the total costs for residential and commercial over the life of the Plan, including Road Fund contributions and Service District Rates, at the next Advisory Group meeting.
- A member indicated that the Advisory Group will need to help staff make the case for the Funding Plan.
- An Advisory Group member asked staff what was needed from the group.
- Staff indicated that a recommendation come to with consensus would be helpful.

II. Action Items

- *FCDOT Staff:*
 - Reach out to Advisory Group for possible meeting in advance of September 26
- *Advisory Group:*
 - Respond to Kristin’s email
 - Respond to Andy’s thoughts on the Working Group meeting

III. Next Steps

- Advisory Group Meeting September 26
- Tier 3 presentation
- Funding Plan Recommendation