

Reston Network Advisory Group (RNAG)

Mission Statement: Following the adoption of the Reston Master Plan Phase 1 update, the Reston Network Advisory Group was created by the Hunter Mill District Supervisor to establish a forum for the County Transportation staff to receive input and feedback from residents and property owners/developers on the Reston Network Analysis and associated plans. Beyond its work helping County staff shape the future multi-modal grid of streets/paths (i.e. “complete streets”) within the Reston Transit Station Areas (TSAs), and the mechanisms and timing/prioritization for related transportation project funding, a main output of the team is intended to be structured feedback to the Supervisor and the community about the plans; with a goal of consensus response, but allowing for majority/minority opinion, as needed.

RNAG High Level Feedback on funding plan (as approved on 9/26/16):

- Total Project Cost = \$2.266B (as presented in County Staff materials)
 - Reston Roadways = \$1.20B (100% to be paid by public funding)
 - Reston Intersections = \$45M (100% to be paid by private funding)
 - Grid of Streets = \$1.021B (100% to be paid by private funding)
- High Level Definitions:
 - Public Funds: Funds available from general taxation; at County, State or Federal levels.
 - Private Funds: Funds available from private entities (e.g. developers) and specific area taxations (e.g. a Service District collected over a specific geographic area where funds are only useable in that area).
- “Road Fund”: Of the \$1.066B to be paid from Private Funds, it is expected by County Staff that developer in-kind contributions will amount to \$716M, or about 32% of the overall project cost. A “road fund” account must be created to pay for the balance of \$350M, or about 15% of the overall project cost. The issue presented to RNAG is how to best fund that account: via developer “proffer”, via a Service District, or via a combination of both methods.
- Note: There was unanimity from the group that a Tax District scenario (vs. a Service District) is unrealistic and should be taken off the table.
- After much discussion, the RNAG team has become most interested in funding options for the Road Fund which include both proffer and service district revenue streams; e.g. that funding options **8** (Service District pays 30%), **10** (Service District pays 50%), and **11** (Service District pays 38%) presented by Staff merit further analysis.
- There is agreement that there are benefits and drawbacks of both funding approaches, service district and proffer (i.e. developer paid) revenues. Benefit examples include:
 - Service District revenues have the benefit of being predictable and “bondable.”
 - Proffer revenues have the benefit of being ‘just-in-time’ revenues, coming in as development is getting underway.
- There continues to be much discussion on finding an equitable balance between proffer and service district revenues in the various funding options proposed. The RNAG team recognizes that transportation is but one of many important development objectives under the comprehensive plan update that must be funded.
- There is agreement that there should be a sunset provision that terminates the Road Fund and service tax district when all the projects for which they were intended have been funded.