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Administrative Items
Agenda

1. Welcome / Sign-in / Dinner / Administrative Items
2. Over view of Meeting
3. Fiscal sustainability presentation and discussions
4. Transportation planning and CTP status
5. Transition policy area
6. Place types
7. Next Steps
8. Adjourn
The Process
Envision Loudoun will last through the spring of 2018.

2016
PHASE 1
Foundation
What do we know?

2017
PHASE 2
Vision
What do we achieve?

PHASE 3
Explore
Where do we go?

PHASE 4
Plan
Putting it together.

PHASE 5
Review & Adopt
Finishing the work.

2018
ROUND 1
LISTENING & LEARNING WORKSHOPS
Public Engagement
NOVEMBER 2016

ROUND 2
ENVISION THE FUTURE WORKSHOPS
JANUARY 2017

ROUND 3
PLAN REVIEW WORKSHOPS
JANUARY 2018
Next Steps
Fiscal Modeling for Plan Development
History

• Using fiscal modeling – one tool in helping to evaluate major decisions:
  • General Plan (1989-90)
  • Revised General Plan (2000-01)
  • Moorefield Station/Rt. 772 (2002)
  • Silver Line Phase 2 Extension (2011, 12)
  • Silver Line CPAM (2016-17)

• Integration of land use and fiscal planning (Chapter 3, Revised General Plan)

• Fiscal Impact Committee 1992 to present
Revised General Plan

Purpose of Fiscal Impact Analysis

Estimate the 20-year net effect of proposed land use changes on Loudoun County Government finances.

- Revenues minus expenditures
- Expenditures include operating and capital costs
Revised General Plan

Approach

1) Developed 20-year Baseline Scenario (1991 General Plan)

2) Translated Planning Commission proposed land use changes into 20-year Alternative Scenario

3) Conducted fiscal analysis of each scenario (using models)

4) Examined the net difference: compared demographic, economic, expenditure, revenue and capital facility impacts
Revised General Plan

• **Results:**
  
  • High level of growth accommodated: growth in both commercial and residential development
  
  • Both Baseline and PC Alternative scenarios fiscally negative initially, but PC Alternative becomes fiscally positive earlier and more strongly over time
Addressing Needs Generated by Growth
## Capital Planning and Budgeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Long-range:</strong> Development Forecasts</th>
<th><strong>Mid-range:</strong> Capital Facilities Planning</th>
<th><strong>Short-range:</strong> Budgeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact Committee Guidelines</td>
<td>Capital Facility Standards</td>
<td>Capital Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Improvements Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long-Range Forecasting:
**Fiscal Impact Committee Guidelines**

- **Forecasts of:**
  - Residential and nonresidential development
  - Population and households
  - Employment

- **Forecasts are based on the current land use plan**
## Mid-Range Planning: Capital Facility Standards (CFS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Facility Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Facility/Apparatus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Building Square Feet</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mid-Range Planning: Capital Needs Assessment (CNA)

- Forecasts facilities needed by ten planning subareas
- Estimates the date when each facility is triggered for development
- Mid-range: needs for the ten years past the CIP
Budgeting: The CNA Feeds the CIP

- Six year outlook.

- Projects that have first been identified in the CNA should be considered for inclusion in the CIP.

- Not all CNA projects are included in the CIP for funding.
Mitigating the Cost of Growth: *Capital Intensity Factor (CIF)*

Guideline for proffer contributions for residential rezonings.

\[
CIF = (\text{Household Size} \times \text{Facility Cost per Capita}) \\
+ \\
(\text{Students per Household} \times \text{School Cost per Student})
\]
Loudoun’s System:

• Forecasts capital needs

• Feeds these needs into the capital budgeting process

• Recovers capital costs associated with residential development
TischlerBise

• 35-year national practice
• Fiscal Impact Analysis (800+)
• Impact Fees/Cash Proffers (900+)
• Economic Impact Analysis
• Market Analysis
• Revenue Enhancement Options
Questions that can be Addressed with Fiscal Impact Analysis

• What is the impact of a mix of land uses from a fiscal perspective?

• What is the relationship between the geographic location of new development and the cost?

• What is the relationship between development densities and infrastructure costs?

• What is the return on public investment at various densities?
Common Fiscal Impact Analysis

Types and Uses

• Cost of Land Use: Fiscal impact of discrete land uses
• Development Project: Fiscal impact of specific projects
• Subarea/Small Area: Fiscal impact of subarea of larger jurisdiction
• Countywide Growth: Fiscal impact of Countywide growth/future land use plan
TischlerBise Review of Capital and Fiscal Efforts in Loudoun County

- Long history of capital planning
  - Fiscal Impact Committee
  - Capital Facility Standards
  - Capital Needs Analysis
  - Capital Improvement Program
- Identifies cost to provide infrastructure and facilities
- Has served the County well for capital planning and fiscal condition (*highest bond ratings possible*)
 Developers occasionally submit fiscal and economic impact analyses

 External attention occasionally has been on the “cost of a house”

 Loudoun County illustrates a high-quality example of capital planning and fiscal evaluations
Elements for Discussion: Potential Modifications to Loudoun County Approach

• Updating factors to reflect changing development patterns and housing product types in the County

Source: City of Falls Church, VA; TischlerBise
Elements for Discussion: Potential Modifications to Loudoun County Approach

- Marginal approach: Differentiating demand and impacts due to availability of infrastructure capacity

$50 million difference due to the need to not extend infrastructure

Source: TischlerBise
Elements for Discussion: Potential Modifications to Loudoun County Approach

- Shifting from residential development (population and school children) as factor for capital planning to add factors from nonresidential development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Calls for Service per Unit</th>
<th>Officer Initiated per Unit</th>
<th>Weighted Avg Minutes per Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1000sf</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0:16:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1000sf</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0:14:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1000sf</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0:08:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1000sf</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>0:29:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements for Discussion: Potential Modifications to Loudoun County Approach

- Using **existing** levels of service as foundation for capital planning instead of adopted levels of service

Community Park Existing LOS by Fiscal Analysis Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAZ</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>73.94</td>
<td>47,800</td>
<td>0.0015 acres per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>304.81</td>
<td>72,200</td>
<td>0.0042 acres per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>0.0018 acres per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>373.00</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0.0104 acres per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>0.0009 acres per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>841.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>216,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0038 acres per capita</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timing for Discussion:

• After development of draft land use plan

• Use analysis to test land use plan / decisions

• Make modifications and re-test land use decisions

• Key idea: allow creative land use planning and decision-making
QUESTIONS
Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP)
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Overview of the CTP

- Purpose

- Objectives
  - Roadways
  - Metrorail and Transit
  - Bicycles and Pedestrians

- Use in Practice

- Funding

- Implementation

- Questions
What is the CTP?
What does it do?

- Establishes long-range vision for County’s transportation network
- Identifies existing and planned arterial and collector roads
- Policies for transit and bicycle and pedestrian accommodations
- Financially unconstrained plan based on mobility, access, safety, and efficiency goals
- Provides for a transportation system to meet the needs of the general (land use) plan
How does the 2010 CTP approach roadway planning?

- Establishes a grid of major roads in the Suburban Policy Area
- Protects and seeks to enhance the rural character of roads in the Rural Policy Area
- Provides a robust and efficient network to support the 2001 Revised General Plan
Dulles Metrorail Project (Silver Line) Phase II

- 3 Stations in Loudoun County, including Dulles Airport Station
- 1 Station (Innovation Center) immediately adjacent to Loudoun
- Anticipated to be operating and open to riders in 2020
- Local bus service planned to connect Loudoun neighborhoods and employment centers to Metrorail Stations
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning

- Combination of 2003 Bike/Ped Plan and 2010 CTP concepts and policies
- Calls for facilities on roads in the Suburban and Transition Policy Areas, with more robust facilities on CTP Roads
- CTP provides broad guidelines for facility types based on the number of planned roadway lanes
How is the CTP Used?

- To preserve right-of-way for future (long-term) capacity
- To guide implementation of projects to improve the transportation network
- To ensure developer conformance with the County’s long-term vision
- To preserve historic corridors and ensure protection of the environment
- To help inform prioritization of capital projects
How Are Projects Funded?

- Transportation projects in the CTP may be funded by sources including:
  - Local Public Funding
    - Capital Improvement Program
    - Special Tax Districts
  - Other Public Funding
    - NVTA/NVTC Regional Funding
    - State Funding (SmartScale, Revenue Sharing)
  - Private Funding
    - Development Proffers
    - Public-Private Partnerships
How Are Projects Funded?

- FY 2018 CIP has nearly 40 transportation projects
  - 11 Intersection-specific improvement projects

- Publicly-funded transportation projects reflect the County’s comprehensive plan policies
  - 28 projects in the suburban area
  - 5 projects in the vicinity of Leesburg
  - 3 projects in the rural area in the vicinity of Purcellville
  - 2 projects in the transition area

- The FY 2018 CIP also includes non-transportation capital projects
  - Public Safety
  - Schools
  - Parks
  - Government Services

*FY 2018 CIP map does not include development-proffered projects*
Have We Been Able to Implement CTP Plans and Policies?

- County began significant expansion of its internal road-building program in the past six years.

- Policy implementation has been generally successful, but all policies should be revisited, with opportunities for improvement.

- Select key projects completed since 2010 or currently under construction include:
  - Route 7 interchanges
  - Belmont Ridge Road widening
  - Gloucester Parkway extension and bridge
  - Russell Branch Parkway and Pacific Boulevard extensions
  - Old Ox Road and Loudoun County Parkway widening and connection
  - Tall Cedars Parkway extension
  - Route 50 widening to six lanes
Have We Been Able to Implement CTP Plans and Policies?

- Substantial portions of the roadway network have already been constructed.
- Most new lane miles are planned for the eastern portion of the County.
- Rural area corridors are generally intended to be preserved as they currently exist, with spot safety improvements as needed.

Legend:
- Grey: Built to the Ultimate Planned Condition
- Yellow: Built to an Interim Condition
- Red: Future Roadway (Unbuilt)

This map outlines the CTP roadways that are built to their planned cross section, are planned for widening, or are missing links. Every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of this map, but reliance upon it is at the risk of the user.
Have We Been Able to Implement CTP Plans and Policies?

Grey: Built to the Ultimate Planned Condition
Yellow: Built to an Interim Condition
Red: Future Roadway (Unbuilt)

- Major corridors to be constructed are located:
  - Along the Route 50 corridor
  - Southeast of Leesburg
  - Near the Dulles Metrorail (Silver Line) Station Areas

- Many north-south corridors are not built to their ultimate planned conditions, including:
  - Route 28
  - Old Ox Road
  - Loudoun County Parkway
  - Northstar Boulevard
  - Evergreen Mills Road
Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP)
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Purpose

• Overview the Transition Policy Area
• Environmental Considerations
• Policy History
• Zoning
• Infrastructure
• Development Activity
Natural Features

- Reservoirs
- Steep slopes
- Diabase
- Archaeology along the streams
Policy History

- Resource Management Plan
- In 1984-Rural Land Management Plan
  - established Urban Growth Areas
  - Conserve farmland
  - Rural cluster
  - Focus capital investment
Policy History

• 1991 the General Plan
  – Eastern UGA & added development phases
  – distinct urban and rural area
  – Phase 1: Eastern Growth Area Phase 2
  – Phase 2: Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Subareas
  – Phase 2 and Phase 3 areas designated Rural Areas
Phase 1
1990-93
Phase 2
1993-95
Phase 3
Post 1995
DSAMP 1993

- 1993 Dulles South Area Management Plan
  - Western ultimate urban area
  - Phasing eliminated
- North of Braddock Road
  - 3 to 6 du/ac
- South of Braddock Road
  - 1 and 3 du/ac
DSAMP 1997

- Established phasing
  - interim development boundary
    - reduced densities
- West of interim boundary
  - Rural Policies apply
  - Ultimate density 1 to 2 du/ac
Revised General Plan
Infrastructure
Zoning Middle Goose

[Map showing zoning areas: PDRV-Planned Development Rural Village, TR10-Transitional Residential 10, PDH4-Planned Development Housing, TR3UBF-Transitional Residential]
Upper Broad Run
Upper Foley
Lower Foley
Lower Bull Run
Development Activity

Transition Policy Subareas
Development Activity/
Natural Features Area Focus

REZONING
1 - Luck Stone Leesburg Plant
2 - Luck Stone
3 - Luck Stone and Loudoun Water
4 - Stonewall Hybrid Energy Park
5 - Stonewall Secure Business Park
6 - Red Cedar
7 - Evergreen Rural Village
8 - Woodland Village (Greene Mill Preserve)
9 - Brambleton

Legend
- County Owned/Leased
- Quarry Areas
- By Right Development
- Steep Slope

Rezoning Development Plan Conformance
- No = 2
- Prior To Plan = 2
- Yes = 5

Floodplain
- Major Floodplain > 640 AC
- Minor Floodplain < 640 AC

Loudoun County
Development Activity

Transition Policy Subareas
Development Activity/
Natural Features Area Focus

REZONING:
8 - Woodland Village (Greene Mill Preserve)
9 - Brambleton
10 - Arosia Industrial Zoning Amendment
11 - Corpus Christi Church
12 - Stone Ridge
13 - Westridge (CD Smith)
14 - Stratshire Crossing (Braddock Crossing)

Legend:
- County Owned/Leased
- Quarry Areas
- By Right Development
- Steep Slopes
- Rezoning Development Plan Conformance
- No - 3
- Prior To Plan - 1
- Yes - 3
- Floodplain
  - Major Floodplain > 640 AC
  - Minor Floodplain < 640 AC

UPPER BROAD RUN

Loudoun County
Development Activity
Development Activity