MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2026

PRESENT: Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chair, At-Large
Evelyn S. Spain, Vice Chair, Sully District
Candice Bennett, Parliamentarian, At-Large
Alyssa Batchelor-Causey, Dranesville District
Mary D. Cortina, Braddock District
Chris Landgraf, Franconia District
Alis Wang, Mason District
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
James Thomas, Springfield District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Jeremy Hancock, Secretary, Providence District
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District

OTHERS: Martha Reed, Division Director, Department of Management and Budget (DMB)
Joe LaHait, Deputy Director, DMB
Salem Bush, Branch Chief, Planning Division,
Department of Planning and Development
Tracey Reed, Assistant Fire Chief,
Fairfax County Department of Fire and Rescue (FCDFR)
Laurie Stone, FCDFR
William Barrack, Assistant Division Director, Wastewater Management Division,
Department of Public Works and Environmental Service (DPWES)
Vrushali Oak, Branch Chief, Capital Facilities, DPWES
Eric Carzon, Director, Fairfax County Public Library
Jill Clark, Policy and Planning,
Department of Health and Human Services, (DHHS)
Neighborhood and Community Services (NCS)
Jessica Werder, Deputy Director, Public Health Operations
Anna Shapiro, Deputy Director, Fairfax County Department of Housing &
Community Development
Jai Cole, Executive Director, Fairfax County Park Authority
Erik Gordon, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS)
James Krause, Deputy Chief
Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD)
David Jett, Director of Facilities and Security, FCPD
Gregg Steverson, Director, Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission,
Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Michelle Jordan, Deputy Clerk to the Planning Commission, DCS
Jordyn Crane, Administration, DCS

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m., by Chair Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Chair Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner announced that the agenda for tonight's meeting included the County's annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) workshop. He stated that Commissioner Hancock would be out of town in support of his family and that the commission's thoughts and best wishes go out to him and his family.

//

MINUTES APPROVAL – NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2025

In Secretary Hancock's absence, Commissioner Bennett MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE FOLLOWING MEETING MINUTES:

- NOVEMBER 12, 2025;
- NOVEMBER 19, 2025;
- DECEMBER 3, 2025; AND
- DECEMBER 10, 2025;

Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Wang seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 8-0. Commissioners Clarke and Thomas were not present for the vote. Commissioners Carter and Hancock were absent from the meeting.

//

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner then recognized Commissioner Sargeant, Chair of the Planning Commission's CIP Committee, who would conduct the CIP workshop and relinquished the duties of the Chair.

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced that the workshop for the CIP for Fiscal Years 2027 through 2031 (with future fiscal years to 2036) would delineate the key elements of strategic planning. He introduced the following committee members of the CIP Committee: Vice Chair Batchelor-Causey, Commissioners Mary Cortina, Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner, Evelyn Spain, and Alis Wang. He stated that all Planning Commissioners would be participating in the workshop. He noted that the CIP workshop would consist of ten scheduled presentations with a 10-minute recess halfway through the presentations. He stated that there would be no votes taking place

tonight following the public hearing, but that the Commission would be taking action on April 8, 2026 during the CIP markup hearing.

Commissioner Sargeant also noted that the Commission would not be offering final farewells to Martha Reed of the Department of Management and Budget during tonight's meeting. Martha had served for many years as the Planning Commission's coordinator, guide, and trusted partner throughout the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process. As she planned to retire later in the year, Commissioner Sargeant indicated that formal acknowledgments and farewells would be reserved for the Planning Commission's April 8, 2026 CIP markup meeting.

//

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FOR FISCAL YEARS 2027 THROUGH 2031 ADVERTISED (WITH FUTURE FISCAL YEARS TO 2036) - A public workshop will be held, in accordance with Section 15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia, on the Advertised CIP, Fiscal Years 2027-2031 (with future Fiscal Years to 2036), with briefings from various County agencies. The CIP is the County's five-year roadmap for creating, maintaining, and funding present and future capital infrastructure requirements. The CIP serves as a planning instrument to identify needed capital projects and coordinate the financing and timing of improvements. The CIP provides the framework for the County Executive and the County Board of Supervisors with respect to managing bond sales, investment planning and project planning. Fairfax County's CIP includes not only a 5-year plan, but also a future outlook that includes a glance at the potential long-term requirements beyond the current 5-year period. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

The Planning Commission held a workshop on the CIP, where presentations were made by the representatives of the following agencies:

1. Fairfax County Department of Management and Budget, Martha Reed, Division Director, Capital Programs Coordinator

Ms. Reed gave a presentation that provided an overview of the CIP for Fiscal Years 2027-2031 (with future Fiscal Years to 2036). (A copy of Ms. Reed's presentation is in the date file.)

//

A discussion followed between Ms. Reed; Joe LaHait, Deputy Director, DMB, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the historic courthouse project would need to be reviewed in coordination with facilities staff;
- Explanation that the County wanted to avoid fixing the heath, ventilation and air condition (HVAC) system alone without addressing other potential building needs at the same time;
- Clarification that staff needed to evaluate the scope and timing of the project which determined whether adjustments were necessary;
- Explanation that the useful life varied depending on the type of building system;
- Clarification that HVAC systems typically lasted about 20–25 years, and roof systems generally had a similar lifespan historic courthouse project;
- Staff offered to provide a detailed list of building systems and their typical life-cycle ranges historic courthouse project;
- Explanation that once systems reached the 20-year mark, facilities staff often saw maintenance and performance issues;
- Explanation that while 75% of facilities were at least 20 years old, about 60% were over 30 years old, which was when the effects of aging became more noticeable across County facilities;
- Explanation that for new capital projects the County had historically relied on General Obligation (GO) bonds;
- Explanation that when major capital needs arose, the County also used short-term capital loans in the absence of a sinking fund;
- Explanation that loans typically had 5–10-year terms, compared with traditional GO bonds that often extended 20 years;
- Explanation that short-term loans provided quick access to capital, but required higher debt service payments over a shorter period;
- Explanation that the County used these loans in two tranches totaling about $35 million which addressed infrastructure needs;
- Explanation that the creation of the sinking fund, combined with carryover funds, provided a one-time infusion of cash that significantly improved the County's ability which addressed capital needs;
- Explanation that quarterly one-time funding reviews had helped supplement these efforts; and
- Fiscal Year 2027 budget prioritized capital infrastructure needs by building the financial base through existing revenue sources, with short term loans considered only as a secondary option due to added debt.

2. Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA), Jai Cole, Executive Director

Ms. Cole gave a presentation on Fairfax County Park Authority projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 179 to 196. (A copy of Ms. Cole's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Ms. Cole, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification that the County would likely rely more heavily on pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) cash funding;
- Explanation that short-term loans were a backup option because they added additional debt costs on top of existing GO bond obligations;
- Explanation that some external factors construction costs had increased significantly;
- Explanation that material costs had also risen, which had affected project budgets;
- Explanation that many County projects were now costing more than originally anticipated when they were first planned;
- Explanation that the goal was to connect the planning phase of parks with the funding required to operate and maintained them;
- Clarification that there had been a disconnect between planning and operations, where new parks were built but the operating budget needed to maintain them had not been fully accounted for;
- Explanation that the County could not build new parks without ensuring there was funding to maintained them;
- Clarification that part of the solution involved budget requests but also required realistic expectations that free parks still had significant operating costs;
- Explanation that urban parks were very expensive to maintain, requiring staffing, daily operations, and ongoing maintenance;
- Explanation that the new approach linked park development planning with the CIP process, so maintenance costs were considered earlier;
- Clarification that many projects in the CIP were whole park renovations, while only a few involved building new parks;
- Explanation that new parks were being proposed primarily in high-equity areas identified as lacking recreational access;
- Clarification that earlier discussions about funding had largely focused on the operating budget, which was separate from the CIP funding process;
- Explanation that the strategy involved both acquisition and leveraging opportunities, but acknowledged the funding was limited;
- Explanation that the County faced significant pressures in the CIP, particularly related to aging recreation centers and infrastructure, which required large investments;
- Explanation that land acquisition funding was relatively small in comparison and could not support large-scale purchases;
- Explanation that land roughly cost around $1 million per acre, depending on where it was located in the County;
- Explanation that with approximately $6 million available for acquisitions, the County could typically only acquire smaller parcels, often adjacent to existing parks;
- Explanation that the current strategy therefore involved pooling limited funds so the County could act quickly if a feasible acquisition opportunity arose;
- Explanation that the County previously lacked even that level of flexibility and could not pursue properties if they exceeded available funds;

- Clarification that broader countywide discussions about long-term park acquisition strategies would be needed, especially capturing large generational opportunities that were currently beyond the County's financial reach;
- Explanation that alternative strategies were needed;
- Clarification that in other jurisdictions much parkland had been obtained through donations from developers, often because it benefited them financially;
- Clarification that Fairfax County's system differed because donating land could reduce a property's floor area ratio (FAR), which discouraged developers from making donations;
- Clarification that identifying ways to incentivize land dedication while preserving development rights could create a win–win outcome;
- Clarification that the needs assessment was separate from the playground study;
- Explanation that the needs assessment included a community engagement process and a statistically valid survey;
- Clarification that portions of the survey had already been presented to the Planning Commission;
- Explanation that the $180 million referred to deferred capital renovations, which qualified for CIP funding;
- Explanation that those projects included items such as pipes, tennis courts, picnic shelters, and other infrastructure repairs;
- Clarification that this was different from operational maintenance, such as mowing grass, picking up trash, and daily park upkeep;
- Explanation that new parks often appeared free when provided through development or proffers, but long-term operational costs eventually emerged, such as staffing and maintenance;
- Explanation that if several new parks were added, additional staffing might be needed to maintain them, which required General Fund operating budget support or artificial turf fields;
- Clarification that while outside groups paid for installation, the County was responsible for replacing the turf after its 10-year lifespan, creating future costs;
- Explanation that the total deferred capital backlog was approximately $200 million, and the current CIP investments were meant to reduce that backlog;
- Explanation that the County was intentionally prioritizing maintaining and repairing existing parks, even though those projects were less visible than building new parks;
- Explanation that Parks Authority invested $50 million toward deferred capital improvements as part of that strategy;
- Clarification that staff were already working with the Department of Budget and Planning to ensure operational funding for new facilities; and
- Positive comment about the small site enhancement program, noting that these smaller projects could have a significant impact on communities and supported the County's equity goals.

3. Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department, Tracey Reed, Assistant Chief

Assistant Chief Reed gave a presentation on the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department (FCFRD) projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 266 to 278. (A copy of Assistant Chief Reed's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Assistant Chief Reed; Mr. LaHait; Laurie Stone, FCDFR; Salem Bush, Branch Chief, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that for seven stations, the volunteer organizations owned the buildings and systems;
- Clarification that several volunteer stations indicated they were uncertain whether they could afford such repairs;
- Explanation that this created a potential liability for the County, since if a station became unusable and the volunteers could not repair or replace it, the County would need to step in;
- Clarification that a study was therefore underway which evaluated the risks and would determine how to address the issue before a major incident occurred;
- Explanation that the current funding only allowed for renovation of the existing buildings, not expansion of their footprint;
- Explanation that when new fire stations were built, the County now planned for future expansion, including accommodating larger apparatuses and evolving needs such as electric vehicles;
- Explanation with the existing stations under discussion, expansion might not be possible due to site constraints;
- Clarification that engineering and feasibility studies would evaluate these limitations, but acknowledged that lack of expansion space could present future operational challenges;
- Explanation that the issue had been raised intentionally during the meeting which highlighted the potential funding challenge;
- Explanation that the County currently had a placeholder in the capital budget for volunteer fire stations, recognizing that infrastructure issues could arise in the future;
- Clarification that if a major problem occurred, the County would likely review available funding during quarterly budget reviews, including reallocating balances from other projects if necessary;
- Clarification that in some cases, it required adjusting existing bond programs or project timelines, similar to how other capital projects might be moved up or delayed;
- Explanation that public safety bond referendums were typically broad in scope and allowed the County flexibility to fund repairs at either volunteer-owned or County-owned fire stations;
- Explanation that the County could use several potential funding sources, including:
    - General Obligation (GO) bonds;
    - Cash funding; and
    - One-time allocations identified through quarterly budget reviews.

- Clarification that addressing such issues depended heavily on early communication and coordination between volunteer fire departments and County staff so the County could plan for repairs before emergencies occurred;
- Explanation that in those cases the County would reprioritize projects already in the capital plan, moving the emergency project forward and adjusting other planned projects accordingly;
- Explanation that this process required coordination between the Department of Management and Budget (DMB), planning staff, and other County leadership;
- Clarification that emergencies sometimes forced projects originally planned for later bond cycles to be moved forward, while others might be pushed back;
- Explanation that there were two main considerations affecting apparatus needs:
    - Population growth and increasing call volumes, which sometimes required adding additional transport units; and
    - Changes in vehicle design and apparatus size, which could eventually affect whether new equipment fits in older stations.
- Clarification that in some areas, if stations had additional space, they could add another apparatus bay to house an additional ambulance which met the growing service demand;
- Clarification that stations were limited to their existing footprint, adding additional bays or equipment could be difficult or impossible;
- Clarification that new fire stations were designed with additional capacity, including space for future apparatus and expanded service needs;
- Explanation that current apparatus sizes had remained compatible with older stations so far, but future design changes could create challenges;
- Clarification that ladder trucks came in different sizes and that apparatus placement decisions were influenced both by operational needs and the physical capacity of existing stations; and
- Explanation that in some cases, the ideal apparatus for a given area might not fit in the nearest station, requiring adjustments to station assignments.

4. Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), William Barrack, Assistant Division Director, Wastewater Planning and Monitoring Division

Mr. Barrack gave a presentation on Wastewater Management projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 242 to 285. (A copy of Mr. Barrack's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Mr. Barrack and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the reimbursement program related to redevelopment that increased wastewater demand, particularly in areas with more vertical, high-density development;
- Further explanation that when redevelopment created additional wastewater flow that exceeded the capacity of existing sewer infrastructure, upgrades to the system were required;

- Explanation of what the reimbursement program was as followed:
  - The developer designs and constructs the necessary infrastructure improvements to handle the increased capacity;
  - The developer pays for the portion of improvements tied directly to their redevelopment's wastewater flow; and
  - The County reimburses part of the cost associated with capacity that benefits existing customers and future development.
- Clarification that the program ensured that infrastructure upgrades kept pace with redevelopment, while fairly distributing costs between developers and the County;
- Explanation that the County had made significant investments in asset management and infrastructure monitoring;
- Explanation that the County regularly inspected sewer infrastructure, including using cameras to assess conditions which identified potential failures;
- Explanation that approximately 30 miles of sewer lines were inspected each year as part of this monitoring effort;
- Clarification that inspection data was incorporated into risk models to evaluate the condition and criticality of infrastructure assets;
- Explanation that assets identified as higher risk were prioritized for rehabilitation or replacement;
- Explanation that the risk could not be reduced to zero because the system was aging and subject to corrosion and gas buildup;
- Clarification that the County was actively working to cut down risks as much as possible;
- Explanation that funding constraints were always a factor, but the County had proposed planned sewer rates which would increase for fiscal years 2028, 2029, and 2030;
- Explanation that these rate increases would help fund inspection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of wastewater infrastructure, which met obligations to regional wastewater partners;
- Explanation that maintaining adequate funding was critical because infrastructure failures could have serious consequences, and the goal was to reduce those risks through proactive investment;
- Explanation that the County was currently in the process of redirecting those resources from the East Tysons Pump Station;
- Explanation that staff would need to confirm the exact figure, but initial estimates for the pump station had been approximately $80 million to $100 million;
- Clarification that the system's condition assessment program was in use;
- Clarification that while risk could never be reduced to zero, they were actively inspecting and managing the system to cut down potential failures;
- Explanation that the wastewater system operated separately from the County's general bond program;
- Further explanation that they funded projects through a combination of pay-as-you-go funding and their own bond issuances;
- Clarification that COVID-19 was primarily used as a historic marker and timeline;

- Explanation that costs had increased significantly after that period due to multiple factors, including labor costs, material prices, and tariffs;
- Clarification that the system actually inspected about 250 to 300 miles of sewer lines each year, which represented roughly 10% of the system rather than 1%;
- Explanation that public outreach was handled through multiple channels, including:
    - Information distributed in partnership with Fairfax Water through customer communications;
    - Outreach programs connected to the wastewater and public works departments;
    - Educational efforts in schools; and
    - Social media campaigns and informational videos.
- Explanation that recent regional wastewater issues had prompted additional outreach, including communication with homeowners associations to emphasize two key messages:
    - Residents should never pour grease down drains; and
    - Flushable wipes were not truly flushable and should not be placed in the sewer system.
- Explanation that those planned rate increases were not tied specifically to Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) requirements;
- Explanation that Fairfax County's wastewater treatment process involved incinerating biosolids rather than land application, which helped destroy PFAS compounds and reduced regulatory risk;
- Clarification that some regional partners that used land application were more directly affected by PFAS regulations and were involved in discussions with the state legislature in Richmond;
- Explanation that expected compliance costs had already been incorporated into the capital improvement program and that they did not anticipate another significant rate increase specifically related to PFAS regulations;
- Clarification that Upper Occoquan Sanitation Authority (UOSA) discharges to the Occoquan Reservoir which was used by Fairfax Water's Griffith Water Treatment Plant, while the Norman Cole facility discharges to the Pohick Creek which enters the Pohick Bay portion of the Potomac River;
- Clarification the indirect potable reuse concern applied specifically to the UOSA system;
- Explanation that UOSA was built in the 1970s and was widely recognized as the first major indirect potable reuse facility in the world;
- Explanation that the facility maintains very high treatment standards and strong coordination with County wastewater operations;
- Explanation development in Fairfax County historically progressed from east to west, older sewer systems from the 1940s through 1960s were mostly located in the eastern part of the County;
- Explanation that the UOSA service area infrastructure was largely built in the 1970s through 1990s and included newer materials such as PVC instead of reinforced concrete;
- Explanation that the cost-sharing structure depended on the specific development and infrastructure involved;

- Further explanation that in many cases, the County's reimbursement portion covered approximately 90% to 95% of the total infrastructure cost;
- Explanation that the program was designed to help address affordability concerns;
- Clarification that instead of reimbursing developers only at the end of construction, the County offered staged reimbursements:
    - Partial payment at 40% project completion;
    - Another payment at 80% completion; and
    - Final payment after completion.
- Explanation that these phased payments helped reduce the financial burden on developers while construction was underway; and
- Further explanation that they had not encountered situations where developers were unable to participate because of the initial funding requirements.

5. Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD), James Krause, Deputy Chief

Mr. Krause gave a presentation on the FCPD projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 103 to 119. (A copy of the Deputy Chief Krause's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Deputy Chief Krause; Vrushali Oak, Branch Chief, Capital Facilities, DPWES; David Jett, Director of Facilities and Security, FCPD; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the impact from drone technology would likely be minimal because existing facilities could house the drones with only minor adjustments for equipment storage;
- Explanation that drone operations were managed through the Real Time Crime Center at headquarters, which coordinated directly with the communications center;
- Clarification on the possible sale of the police training center property and how that related to the County's bond program;
- Staff explained the following:
    - A new Criminal Justice Academy would be built on the driver training track site;
    - The project was already funded through the CIP with an estimated cost of about $88 million; and
    - The project had been approved through the 2024 bond referendum.
- Explanation that some existing facilities on the training site were nearing the end of their life cycle;
- Clarification that a potential sale of a portion of the land could generate proceeds that would be used to modernize or replace those facilities;
- Clarification if the sale of the land would free up public safety bond funding for other projects:
    - The bond funding already allocated in the CIP was separate from the proceeds of the land sale;

  - The sale revenue would mainly cover modernization of existing facilities on the site; and
  - They did not anticipate leftover proceeds that could be redirected to other projects.
- Further explanation about the proposed wellness center for police and fire personnel and whether the location could affect response times:
  - The centralized wellness facility would mainly be used by officers and firefighters who were not on active shift duty;
  - Personnel on shift would continue using fitness facilities located in their individual stations; and
  - All nine police stations and fire stations already had gym facilities which supported wellness programs;
- Further explanation that in some stations, when officers brought in individuals for processing, the building layout required them to move through areas that were not designed to be secure or efficient;
- Explanation that some stations required officers to transport individuals through interior sections of the building to reach interview rooms or processing areas;
- Clarification that this could create operational inefficiencies and security concerns because those areas were not ideally located relatively to secure entrances or vehicle sally ports;
- Explanation that newer station designs aim to place these functions closer together so that individuals could be brought directly from the police vehicle into secure processing areas without moving through multiple parts of the facility;
- Explanation that the objective was to cut down movement through the building which kept detainees within secure areas;
- Explanation that the issue varied by station but often involved the placement of key operational areas such as cell blocks, processing areas, and interview rooms;
- Explanation that the county previously conducted a test-fit study to evaluate space needs and vehicle inventory;
- Clarification that the study looked at possible locations, including county land near the police training academy, but further analysis would still be required;
- Explanation that a new study would need the following:
  - Inventory of all police and fire vehicles;
  - Determination of how many vehicles should be stored in a centralized facility; and
  - An estimation of the total square footage required.
- Clarification that many vehicles were currently stored outdoors or spread across different stations, even though they should be stored in a centralized facility;
- Explanation that the full inventory and analysis had not been updated, staff did not have a precise square footage estimate or construction cost for a new facility;
- Clarification that the project would involve renovations within the existing building footprints, not expansions;

- Explanation that the focus of the renovations would be on internal infrastructure upgrades, including the following:
  - HVAC systems;
  - Lighting; and
  - Security features
- Explanation that the decision not to expand buildings was largely due to rising construction costs and limited available resources; and
- Explanation that some exterior improvements would be part of the projects, including:
  - Lighting upgrades;
  - Fences and
  - Security gates.

//

The Commission went into recess at 8:53 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 9:09 p.m.

//

6. Health and Human Services (HHS), Jill Clark, Neighborhood and Community Services

Ms. Clark gave a presentation on HHS projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 159 to 172. (A copy of Ms. Clark's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Ms. Clark; Jessica Werder, Deputy Director, Public Health Operations; Ms. Oak; Mr. LaHait; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation of the typical timeline for developing a county capital project which included the following:
  - Pre-planning phase which was about 2–3 months to identify needs and develop the project program;
  - Design phase which was about 2 years which completed designs and obtained required permits;
  - Procurement phase which was a few months to advertise the project and receive construction bids; and
  - Construction phase which was typically 2–3 years, depended on project size and complexity.
- Explanation that most capital projects took approximately 4–5 years from planning to completion;
- Explanation that once a necessity was identified, the county typically conducted a feasibility study which evaluated options and determined whether the project was warranted;
- Clarification that the feasibility study examined the following:
  - Whether new construction was required;

  - Whether an existing facility could be renovated or retrofitted instead;
  - Opportunities for co-location with other agencies which shared space reducing costs; and
  - Whether land could be purchased or an existing building could be acquired and adapted.
- Clarification that the county worked closely with the Department of Management and Budget (DMB) and capital facilities teams which evaluated these options before moving a project forward;
- Explanation that the Co-Responder Program paired officers with mental health professionals;
- Explanation that the program was a partnership between the police department and the Community Services Board (CSB) within the Health and Human Services;
- Explanation that some related services, such as those connected to Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court and domestic and sexual violence services, were included in broader needs assessments;
- Explanation that the community center would be operated by the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services (NCS) and would provide programming similar to other county community centers;
- Staff clarified the funding structure for the facility in the following:
  - The developer constructed the project as part of a larger development:
  - The county contributed funding specifically for the community center portion and a share of parking spaces;
  - The community center funding appeared in the CIP, and the county would pay the debt service on that portion; and
  - The housing portion of the project was funded separately through private development financing, tax credits, and other sources.
- Explanation that the Public Health Laboratory project which was listed as a $35 million item on the proposed CIP had been in the planning pipeline for sometimes;
- Explanation that the project had been included in the 2026 bond referendum proposal;
- Clarification that the project had not yet entered the design phase because it required voter approval;
- Explanation that once the bond was approved, design and construction would begin after bond approval;
- Explanation that the project had received one-time federal funding through congressional earmarks, now referred to as community project funding;
- Clarification that the project was currently funded entirely by Fairfax County;
- Explanation that the lab conducts a wide range of clinical and environmental tests, including:
  - Drug testing for substances of abuse;
  - Testing for sexually transmitted infections (STIs);
  - Testing for vector-borne diseases, such as West Nile virus;
  - Environmental testing, including water quality tests; and
  - Tuberculosis testing and other public health–related diagnostics.

- Clarification that most testing results were clinical in nature, so individual results were not publicly shared, but the county could share aggregate data and statistics;
- Explanation that the majority of testing was for Fairfax County residents, but the lab also performs testing in partnership with other jurisdictions;
- Clarification that the funding and reimbursement structure was complex and often involves state reimbursement mechanisms;
- Explanation that in Virginia, most health departments were operated directly by the Virginia Department of Health (VDH), while Fairfax County operates its own health department;
- Explanation that Fairfax County sometimes receives revenue or reimbursements through state-administered federal grants when conducting certain types of testing;
- Explanation that the county had not requested state funding for this particular project, and the facility was currently planned as a county-funded capital project; and
- Staff agreed that they would provide additional information such as caseload numbers and other data to better illustrate the demand and impact of the services next year.

7. Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), Gregg Steverson, Director

Mr. Steverson gave a presentation on the Department of Transportation projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 205 to 223. (A copy of Mr. Steverson's presentation is in the date file).

A discussion followed between Mr. Steverson, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the county had recently been inquired to evaluate the cost-benefit of taking over road ownership in smaller areas, such as specific activity centers, rather than the entire county;
- Clarification that the idea might appear to generate cost savings, but staff noted that taking ownership of roads would require the county to establish and maintain several operational functions, including:
    - Sidewalk maintenance crews;
    - Road resurfacing teams;
    - Sign installation and maintenance staff; and
    - Traffic signal maintenance operations.
- Explanation that if the county took control of only a small geographic area, these operational groups would still need to be created or expanded, resulting in additional personnel and operational costs;
- Clarification they had not yet conducted a detailed cost analysis for a small area but planned to produce rough order-of-magnitude estimates;
- Explanation that the state maintenance funding Virginia provided per mile of roadway could be considered, though calculating the appropriate percentage of state funding for a limited area could be complex and would likely require discussions with the state;

- Concerns about the high cost of pedestrian safety improvements, such as crosswalks and pedestrian refuges;
- Explanation of the several factors that often drove project costs up, which included the following:
    - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance requirements, such as rebuilding or adding curb ramps;
    - Requests to expand the project scope, for example improving the entire intersection rather than just adding a crosswalk;
    - Utility conflicts or underground infrastructure that must be relocated; and
    - Right-of-way acquisition, which depended on nearby property values.
- Clarification that many projects appeared simple initially but became more complex once design and regulatory requirements were applied;
- Staff also noted that the county planned to address these issues at an upcoming Board of Supervisors Transportation Committee meeting in April and would focus on the following:
    - The cost of transportation projects;
    - The time required to complete projects; and
    - Possible strategies to reduce costs and shorten schedules.
- Staff acknowledged that rising infrastructure costs were a regional issue, but said the county intended to explore ways to streamline projects and influence partners such as Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and utilities which would help reduce costs and delays;
- Explanation on the estimates for the Richmond Highway corridor improvements;
- Clarification that they funding range represented two separate projects:
    - $441 million for the Richmond Highway widening project; and
    - $775 million for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project.
- Explanation that the overall project corridor was approximately 7.4 miles, extending from Fort Belvoir to the area near Kings Crossing;
- Explanation that the BRT component would run in dedicated lanes along that section, while farther north the buses would operate in mixed traffic up to the Huntington Metro Station;
- Clarification that the long-term plan did envision transit improvements south of the county line, but currently the concept there was enhanced transit rather than full BRT;
- Explanation that enhanced transit could include several options such as:
    - Bus signal priority;
    - Dedicated or partially dedicated bus lanes; and
    - Other transit-supportive roadway improvements.
- Explanation that Prince William County had previously asked Fairfax not to assume a BRT extension automatically, preferring to study transit options first before committing to that level of infrastructure;
- Clarification on a slide showing $0 federal funding for transportation;
- Staff explained that the number was used only as a simplified example in the presentation;

- Explanation that federal funding was sometimes used, especially for large projects like Richmond Highway;
- Clarification that accepting federal funds would involve meeting significant federal requirements, including:
    - Environmental review processes;
    - Extensive documentation; and
    - Additional regulatory steps.
- Explanation that these requirements could lengthen project timelines, so the county must balance the benefits of federal funding against the potential delays and administrative complexity;
- Staff noted that the county often tries to match projects with available federal or state grant programs, and if funding was secured, local funds could be shifted to other projects that may not qualify for outside funding;
- Explanation that the Richmond Highway project was still several years away, with the anticipated start around 2028;
- Clarification that some early work was already occurring such as property clearing, utility relocation and preliminary preparation activities;
- Further clarification that the major construction phases, including large scale earthwork and roadway building, would occur later in the timeline;
- Clarification that the county continued to coordinate closely with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and had recently met with them;
- Explanation that the project remained on track for funding, and they had received no indications that federal support was at risk;
- Explanation that the corridor improvements would extend to a turnaround point near the Fort Belvoir gates, in the area near Fairfax County Parkway and Telegraph Road;
- Clarification that the Richmond Highway project would terminate near the Tully Gate at Fort Belvoir, not at the Fairfax County Parkway;
- Explanation that the design included a turnaround slightly beyond the Tully Gate intersection, where buses would reverse direction and head back north;
- Explanation that there were multiple transportation funding mechanisms in Tysons and other areas;
- Explanation that Reston had a similar funding structure which included a Reston Service District and a Reston Road Fund;
- Further explanation that additional road funds may exist in other areas, such as Fairfax Center and Centreville, where proffers or development agreements contribute funding;
- Explanation that the Transportation Priorities Plan (TPP) generally guides how these funds were applied to projects;
- Explanation that the staff map expected funding sources to projects when preparing the TPP, though the projections may change over time depending on development activity or funding availability;
- Clarification that the Comprehensive Plan did play a role in determining priorities;
- Explanation that when developing the six-year transportation plan, staff considered the following:

  - Comprehensive Plan priorities;
  - Board of Supervisors policy directive; and
  - Funding availability and project timing.
- Explanation that not all projects in the Comprehensive Plan could be funded during a six-year window;
- Clarification that staff determined which projects were more feasible within that timeframe; and
- Explanation that the study examining whether Fairfax County could take ownership of certain roadways originated as a budget request from the Board of Supervisors, which asked staff to evaluate the potential costs and implications of the county assuming responsibility for certain roads.

8. Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS), Erik Gordon, Fairfax County Public Schools

Mr. Gordon gave a presentation on the Department of Public Schools projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 197 to 203. (A copy of Mr. Gordon's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Mr. Gordon; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the school division tracks various metrics across the organization, including academic outcomes and operational measures;
- Explanation measuring equity specifically within facilities planning could be more complex;
- Clarification leadership regularly reviews successes, challenges, and community feedback related to equity initiatives;
- Explanation that the school system had begun a comprehensive facility condition assessment process;
- Explanation that a contractor had been hired and was beginning a pilot phase that included:
  - Four elementary schools;
  - Two middle schools; and
  - One high school.
- Explanation that the assessment would eventually evaluate all facilities in the division, including roughly 231 owned and leased buildings;
- Explanation that the evaluation would examine major building systems such as:
  - HVAC systems;
  - Roof systems;
  - Building envelope;
  - Fire and life safety systems; and
  - Elevators and other vertical transportation systems.
- Explanation that each facility would receive a condition score, which would be used to rank all schools from highest to lowest priority for renovations;

- Explanation that the current renovation schedule was still based on a 2008 facilities study, which established the existing renovation queue;
- Clarification that approximately nine schools remain in that cycle before the next renovation schedule begins;
- Explanation that once the new condition assessment was completed, the results would help determine the next renovation queue, and staff would work with leadership and the School Board to apply additional criteria to finalize priorities;
- Clarification that the two numbers in the presentation represented two different categories:
    - The $1.6 billion relates to major capital construction projects, such as new schools and large renovations; and
    - The $394.52 million represents deferred maintenance, which included operations and maintenance repairs handled by the Office of Facilities Management.
- Clarification that the School Board policy calls for renovating schools every 25 years, but due to current funding levels the system was operating on about a 43-year renovation cycle;
- Explanation that Fairfax County Public Schools managed roughly 231 facilities totaling about 28 million square feet;
- Explanation that about 62% of those buildings were originally constructed in 1960 or earlier, although many had received partial renovations or capacity improvements over time;
- Explanation that the capital program relies heavily on bond funding, which currently provided about $230 million per year;
- Explanation that renovations could cost $40–50 million per elementary school, the available funding typically allowed only a few major renovations per year;
- Clarification that population fluctuations did not significantly change the necessity for facility improvements because the system still had aging infrastructure across the county;
- Explanation that many schools rely on temporary classrooms, including:
    - About 569 temporary trailers; and
    - Around 260 modular classrooms.
- Explanation that even if a school appears to be operating below full capacity, removing those temporary structures would reveal continued space needs;
- Explanation that the school system still required ongoing renovations and facility upgrades despite modest enrollment changes;
- Clarification that the student membership projections showed:
    - About 3,000 fewer students currently compared with earlier counts; and
    - A projected total decline of about 5,700 students by 2030-2031.
- Explanation that the projected decrease was not considered significant enough to change the overall construction program;
- Clarification that this was largely because the school system still faced substantial deferred maintenance needs across many facilities;
- Explanation that the current deferred maintenance estimate of $394 million could increase significantly once a full facility condition assessment was completed;

- Explanation that adjustments were possible and cited Silver Line High School as an example. That project had been included in the CIP since 2019 and the schedule had been adjusted to respond to growth in the western part of the county;
- Staff estimated the deferred maintenance needed might rise to around $700 million after the independent evaluation;
- Explanation that capital planning could shift priorities when necessary, though large projects still required long lead times for planning, funding and construction;
- Concerns about the age of school facilities and how that compares with other county facilities presented during the CIP discussions;
- Clarification that each facility was listed along with its construction year and renovation history in the appendix of the Schools Capital Improvement Program;
- Explanation that additional funding had recently been approved through increased bond allocations;
- Explanation that the school boundary analysis examined several factors and initially aimed addressing issues such as attendance islands and split zones;
- Explanation that the process examined several factors and initially aimed addressing issues such as attendance islands and split zones;
- Clarification that many families preferred not to change existing school assignments, even when boundaries were geographically unusual;
- As a result:
    - About 1,600–1,700 students would be reassigned in the current round of boundary adjustments; and
    - Additional boundary planning was underway in the western part of the county related to the new Skyview High School.
- Explanation that the goal was to:
    - Finalize Skyview High School boundaries by June; and
    - Addressing several additional areas with capacity issues through further community engagement.
- Clarification that those additional boundary adjustments were expected to be presented to the School Board for approval by January of the following year;
- Explanation that modular classrooms were more difficult to remove because they were semi-permanent structures built on concrete slabs and often include bathrooms;
- Clarification that the school system currently had about 569 temporary trailers and had removed roughly 150 since 2021;
- Clarification that additional capital projects, such as completing Dunn Loring and the Silver Line High School projects, could allow the division to remove about 57 more temporary trailers across the county;
- Explanation that modular buildings did require maintenance, but staff clarified that they were still necessary in some locations which met capacity needs;
- Explanation of facility condition assessments, which begins with a third-party assessment and provided an independent evaluation of facility conditions;
- Explanation that such assessments often included a combination of visual inspections, review of work orders, and analysis of the age and condition of building systems;

- Clarification that capital funds were used to purchase the Skyview property, totaling about $150 million;
- Explanation that new construction typically costs about $300 to $500 per square foot;
- Explanation that based on that range a new high school designed to serve about 2000 students would likely cost more than $300 million;
- Explanation that Skyview site already included the following:
  - A main building capable of serving about 1,200 to 1,300 students; and
  - Two additional shell buildings that could be renovated to add classroom space.
- Explanation that the plan was to convert those shell structures into approximately 10 classrooms each to expand capacity.

9. Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development (FCHCD), Anna Shapiro, Deputy Director

Ms. Shapiro gave a presentation on the Department of Housing and Community Development projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 173 to 177. (A copy of Ms. Shapiro's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Ms. Shapiro and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concern about the timeline for achieving affordable housing goals;
- Explanation that the county currently had a housing task force made up of representatives from multiple agencies working to identify ways to increase the pace of housing production, particularly for affordable housing;
- Several strategies were described as the following:
  - Prioritizing housing development in county planning and development decisions;
  - Adjusting how other project requirements were prioritized so that housing; production could move forward more quickly; and
  - Identifying opportunities which would reduce project timelines and streamline development processes.
- Explanation that the county was focusing on acquiring already-entitled properties sites that already had approved land use or zoning permissions, but where development had stalled;
- Clarification that by acquiring or partnering on these sites, the county hopes to restart development quickly which would include significant affordable housing components;
- Explanation that this strategy helped avoid lengthy processes such as Comprehensive Plan amendments or full rezonings, which could take years;
- Explanation that projects may only require smaller adjustments, such as a proffer condition amendment or other limited approvals, which allowed them to move forward faster;

- Explanation that flexibility in interpreting existing entitlements and support for streamlines approvals could help accelerate affordable housing development across the county;
- Explanation that housing-related CIP activities often occur through co-location projects, where housing was developed alongside other county facilities;
- Examples of these co-location projects included the following:
    - The Exchange Community Center project, which moved forward quickly when an opportunity arose;
    - The Chantilly Library redevelopment; and
    - The Centreville Library redevelopment.
- Explanation that in those cases, housing opportunities were identified alongside existing county facility needs, which allowed the county to create projects that delivered both community facilities and housing at the same time;
- Explanation that housing-related capital investments were often opportunistic rather than scheduled years in advance, since they depend on available sites, partnerships, and development opportunities;
- Explanation that housing financing was typically handled through:
    - Housing bonds issued through the Redevelopment and Housing Authority (RHA); and
    - Economic Development Authority (EDA) bonds, particularly when housing projects were tied to economic development or community facilities.
- Clarification that housing projects had not typically relied on the county's general obligation bond program, which was the primary funding source used for many other CIP projects.

10. Fairfax County Public Library (FCPL), Eric Carzon, Director, Library Administration

Mr. Carzon gave a presentation on FCPL projects, as outlined in the CIP report from pages 154 to 158. (A copy of Mr. Carzon's presentation is in the date file.)

A discussion followed between Mr. Carzon, Ms. Shapiro, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification that the closure was caused by boiler failures, not a broader structural or renovation issue;
- Explanation that:
    - The boilers had completely failed and could not be repaired;
    - Replacement boilers had to be ordered and installed; and
    - The county's facilities team had been managing multiple boiler replacement projects simultaneously, including at Centreville and Kings Park.
- Explanation that most buildings had two boilers, which allowed one to be replaced while the other continues operating. However, at Richard Byrd Library both boilers failed, leaving the building without heat and forcing closure;

- The replacement boilers had arrived and installation had begun, with the reopening expected in late March;
- Explanation that the Byrd Library situation illustrated why the County Executive had increased funding for capital renewal, which allowed facilities staff to address aging systems earlier and avoid unexpected shutdowns in the future;
- Clarification that housing was not the reason Chantilly rose to the top of the list, the urgency was due to serious building systems failures including failing cooling systems, electrical issues, and other infrastructure risks that could cause major operational disruptions;
- Explanation that the building also housed technical operations critical to the entire library system, and if a major failure occurred, the county would have difficulty relocating those functions quickly because specialized warehouse and office space was hard to find;
- Clarification that because of these risks, staff described the situation as a race against time to prevent catastrophic system failure;
- Clarification that while a full-building replacement was considered the most likely outcome, staff noted that the final approach would depend on the development proposal and site planning;
- Explanation that possible redevelopment scenarios included:
    - Demolishing the entire site and rebuilding from scratch with integrated housing and library facilities;
    - Constructing housing on one portion of the property while renovating the existing library structure; and
    - A developer building a new library facility while developing housing on the remaining portion of the site.
- Explanation that the Centreville Library site was smaller and more constrained, making a single unified redevelopment project more likely;
- Explanation that a condition assessment currently underway had confirmed significant facility issues at both libraries;
- Explanation that the assessments reinforced the necessity to move forward with redevelopment strategies, with:
    - Centreville would likely require a co-located redevelopment project, due to limited site capacity; and
    - Chantilly offering more land and flexibility, which allowed the potential for multiple housing types along with a new library facility.
- Explanation that Sherwood Hall Library was currently undergoing a master planning process which meant renovation decisions could not be finalized until the broader planning effort was completed;
- Clarification that the master plan was exploring whether the site could become a multi-use campus similar to the Kingstowne model, potentially combining several county services in one location;
- Explanation of possible co-located facilities being considered included the following:
    - A library;
    - A police station;

  - A fire station;
  - A fueling station; and
  - The Supervisor's office
- Clarification that the planning process needed to determine:
  - Whether these services should be combined into a single building or multiple facilities; and
  - How the site layout and land capacity could accommodate the different uses.
- Explanation that because these decisions could significantly affect the design and layout of the library facility, staff stated that the county needed to complete the planning process first before committing to a renovation or redevelopment project;

//

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner resumed duties of the Chair.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner established the following order of the agenda:

1. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – FISCAL YEARS 2027 – 2031 (With Future Fiscal Years to 2036)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – FISCAL YEARS 2027 – 2031 (WITH FUTURE FISCAL YEARS TO 2036)- A public hearing will be held on the Fairfax County Advertised Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Fiscal Years 2027-2031 (with future Fiscal Years to 2036).
COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers. Chair inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers. With no speakers/testimony presented he waived the presentation by staff. Chair Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing with the record remaining open for public input until the Commissioner acts on the CIP and recognized Commissioner Sargeant to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Sargeant MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER ANY MOTIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2027 TO 2031 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 8TH 2026.

Commissioners Batchelor-Causey seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Carter and Hancock were absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:31 p.m.
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chair
Jeremy Hancock, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 552, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Michelle Jordan
Approved on: June 24, 2026

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax

Commonwealth of Virginia

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 30 day of June 2026 by Nicole Blackwell.

Signature of Notary

Notary Seal

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028