



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 #8 MINUTES

DATE: April 11, 2016
TIME: 7:00 pm - 9:00 pm
LOCATION: North County Government Center

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Group

Andy Sigle (Advisory Group Chair)
Robert Goudie (Reston Town Center Association)
Mark Looney (Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce)
John Mossgrove (Resident)
Matt Valentini (JBG Companies)
Liana King (Resident)
Cate Fulkerson (Reston Association)
Maggie Parker (Comstock)

Staff

Tom Biesiadny (FCDOT, Director)
Kristin Calkins (FCDOT, Network Analysis Project Manager)
Ray Johnson (FCDOT)
Ken Kanownik (FCDOT)
Paul Davis (Hunter Mill District Office)
Beth Iannetta (FCDOT)

Absent: Delores Bailey, Tim Cohn, Bill Keefe,

I. Meeting Summary

This was the eighth 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 March 28 were approved unanimously. Approved minutes are posted on the project website.
- Kristin updated the group on projects and meetings related to the Network Analysis:
 - The Design Guidelines Advisory Group met on April 7 to discuss the draft version of the document. It covers multiple topics related to architecture, site design, and
 - The Stakeholders Group met on March 30, 2016 to discuss Tier 2 Mitigation results. The conversation was similar to that of the Advisory Group's on the same topic.

Reston Network Funding Plan Presentation/Discussion

- Tom began the presentation with a reminder that the discussion will focus on different funding possibilities. No decisions have been made yet, and the information presented is meant to stimulate conversation with the Advisory Group. Staff wants to hear what the Advisory Group Members do not like about the options and what they do like about the different options.

- Tom clarified that all funds for the different options were calculated in 2015 dollars, but that the plan will be monitored as projects go through the process. The plan also excludes operations and maintenance costs for these new facilities; it is assumed that this will become the responsibility of the state.
- Tom also clarified that the plan only covers capital costs of projects and does not include a transit component. Reston already has robust transit services, which will be reconfigured with the opening of the Silver Line Phase II to better serve the community and the new Metrorail stations.
- An Advisory Group member asked if the current buses will be enough to meet the future needs as Reston Redeveloped. Staff replied that service can be reconfigured to meet the future needs and that bus service will continue to be monitored throughout the years.
- Tom gave an overview of how the Tysons Funding plan was broken down.
- An Advisory Group member asked about the potential plan density for Tysons. Staff indicated that Tysons has an approximate plan potential of 113 million square feet. An Advisory Group member noted that the Reston Transit Station Areas have a plan potential of 60 million square feet.
- Ray gave an overview of the six different potential plans staff has developed to fund the transportation projects in Reston.
 - In all plans the grid of streets is assumed to be 100% funded privately.
 - An Advisory group member asked if private share includes tax/service districts. Staff confirmed that these are considered private funding sources.
 - Public funding sources include: federal, state, local, and regional sources.
 - Private funding sources include: proffers, Road Fund contributions, in-kind contributions and new revenue sources including tax and service districts.
- After giving an overview of the six funding options presented at the February meeting Ray focused on Option 5, which proposes a 50/50 funding split between private and public funds.
 - Staff proposed to use Option 5 as an option to investigate further, before looking at how the monies might be found. Option 5 was not 'backed into', after deciding how much funding is available from public sources.
- An Advisory Group member asked what areas the County is anticipating in-kind roadway contributions. Staff replied that the areas with development potential in the plan have been assumed to be the location where roadways are built by developers.
 - An Advisory Group member suggested that referring to links as proffered and not proffered could be helpful in distinguishing which grid links will be built by developers.
- An Advisory Group member asked if the grid of streets is planned to be publicly or privately owned. Staff indicated that the majority of the grid of streets will be publicly owned, but that privately owned streets will be considered on a case by case basis.
- A question was raised about how utility relocation costs are accounted for in the grid of streets. Staff confirmed that utility relocation is part of the cost for the grid of streets.
- An Advisory Group member asked if "by right" development would have to pay into a grid fund. Staff indicated that by right development would not have to pay into a grid fund if it was established for the Reston TSAs.
- There was a question about when other road funds were established in the County, and how much each fund had accrued.
 - Staff indicated that the Centreville Road fund was established in the early 1990's and the Fairfax Center Area Road fund was established in the mid 1980's. The Centreville Road Fund has generated approximately \$9 million and the Fairfax Center Area Road fund has raised approximately \$20 million.

- Staff indicated that the pre-2013 Tysons Road fund raised approximately \$19 million and that the new (post 2013) Road funds have generated \$7 million and has offered \$8 million in credit for developers who have contributed above and beyond their responsibility to physical improvements to the transportation network.
- Ray continued his presentation on the funding plan, focusing on Option 5. Staff developed seven different possibilities to generate the shortfall (\$480 million) in funding after considering what contributions would be made in kind (or proffered) for the private sector in this funding option.
- It was indicated that for the first three options for generating the needed funds for the private funding short fall staff should emphasize that the associated costs per unit and square foot are a one-time cost at time of development.
- A question was raised about if INOVA is considered private or public from a tax perspective. Staff indicated they were not sure, and would look into its status.
- An Advisory Group member asked what sources the public funding comes from. Staff indicated that its money that is collected irrespective of if transportation improvements are made in Reston, essentially its money the County is already collecting.
- An Advisory Group member indicated that if staff is confident that the \$1.3 billion in public funding is likely to be secured the plan should assume it, as it would not have a direct correlation with property taxes going up.
- An Advisory Group member asked if the County (or public) would fund more than 50% of the plan. Staff indicated that there are multiple areas with long term transportation needs within the County. These area's needs have to be balanced to ensure that there is enough funding to meet the needs of the whole county. Tysons already has a funding plan, and Seven Corners and Richmond Highway will both be going through a similar process in the future.
- An Advisory Group member asked what the possible percent of incremental tax increase based off of the 60,000,000 square feet of development potential might be.
 - An Advisory Group member indicated that this is a type of financing called, Incremental Tax Financing (TIF) and that it has been used in Merrifield.
 - An Advisory Group member asked if it was a possibility for Reston, to which a different member responded that it would be very unlikely as the Board has used them only in situations where the improvements would not otherwise be built, which is not likely to be the case in Reston.
 - The Advisory Group would still be interested in seeing what a TIF would look like.
- The Advisory Group is interested in seeing if there are any options that make the public share even larger than 50%.

Community Q&A

- A community member asked why Reston's public sector funding is less than Tysons, which was 56%.
- A community member pointed out that staff should look at who will benefit from the improvements, and focus the tax district on them, specifically that the area could be even greater than Reston.
 - Staff indicated that they are contributing through the 50% portion of public funding allocated in Option 5.
- The question was raised about if the private sector funding responsibility is viable for developers to still feasibly implement their sites.
- A community member asked why Hunter Mill Road is not included in the Funding Plan. Staff indicated that it is a different study, and that the County is working to reinstate the Hunter Mill Road Study.

- A community member asked how the Rock Hill Bridge over the Dulles Toll Road is being considered. Staff indicated that is assumed to be funded through public funds.
- An audience member indicated that 1 square foot of development is not equivalent to 1 square foot of development in Tysons, and that development in Reston is less valuable.
 - An Advisory Group member asked about the factors that make Tysons more valuable.

Advisory Group Q&A

- An Advisory Group member asked that staff indicate in the next presentation what projects Herndon is funding around the Metrorail Stations.
- An Advisory Group member indicated that clarifying the terms will be important before presenting this information to the community.
- The Advisory Group is very interested in helping staff narrow down the number of options in the Plan.
- While there have been multiple options presented for the Funding Plan, very few of them could be implemented. There should be more discussion about possible ways to fund the transportation improvements needed.
- It was noted that the tax/service district is not intuitively seen as a private form of funding. Many residents see it as a public form of funding.
- Advisory Group members voiced concern on the possible burden the Funding Plan could put on developers, and that they may choose to pass over Reston and develop somewhere else.
- An Advisory Group member asked that the developer representatives in the Group coordinate with County Staff to create a comparison sheet to help the rest of the group understand the possible rates and how they affect the ability to develop.
- An Advisory group member asked if all of the improvements included in the Funding Plan are necessary for the transportation network to be successful. Staff indicated that they are needed to support the planned growth.
- An Advisory group member asked how by-right development would be treated in the Funding Plan. Staff indicated that if they came through for a rezoning they would need to be part of the funding plan.
 - Impacts of the rezoning would be compared to those of their by right development, which would be taken into consideration.
- An Advisory Group member asked if there is a way to capture how different parties benefit from the possible redevelopment in the Reston TSAs.

II. Action Items

- *FCDOT Staff:*
 - Set date for community meeting
 - Set date for next Advisory Group Meeting on the Funding Plan
 - Create a glossary for funding terms
 - Create a map showing where in-kind contributions are expected

III. Next Steps

- Staff will continue working on different potential fund allocations for the Plan.
- FCDOT staff and the Supervisors Office are looking at dates for a second public meeting.