

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 25, 2008

The special meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, June 25, 2008, was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chairman Peter Fields in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the Stafford County Administration Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fields, Di Peppe, Mitchell, Rhodes, Carlone, Howard and Kirkman

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Knighting, Zuraf, deLamorton and Woolfenden

Mr. Fields thanked everybody for taking the time to carve out a third meeting. He promised to keep it very focused and brief and he appreciated everybody taking the time. He stated there were two main items on the agenda.

1. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE

- A. Presentation by Bill Allen - Transportation Model
- B. Review of Comprehensive Plan Meeting
- C. Authorization of Public Hearing for Comprehensive Plan

2. RECOMMENDATION FOR TRANSPORTATION BOND PROJECT

Mike Zuraf stated he wanted to provide an update of the latest Comprehensive Plan Committee meeting which was held Monday, June 23. At that meeting staff distributed the remaining chapters of the Comprehensive Plan document to the subcommittee. It was short of a few of the background maps and they still needed to work on some of the follow-up revisions and formatting in the document. He stated the subcommittee did provide a few comments on prior sections that they did review and did note that they would be continuing to review the document over the next few weeks. They would meet again in two weeks and continue the review of the document. There was also discussion on the impact fee cost estimates that would need to be part of the Comprehensive Plan as they related to Urban Transportation Service Districts and additional work was happening on that. He stated the committee also identified four issues that they saw with the Comprehensive Plan that they wanted more clarification on and those were Levels of Service, Impact Fees, a Public Facilities Plan and the Fiscal Impact Model. They saw those as similar issues but different that needed more clarification as they related to the Comprehensive Plan. That would be discussed at a future meeting. He stated there was a recommendation brought forward by the committee. Since the full document was not ready to move along the committee voted to recommend three revisions to the current Comprehensive Plan and those three revisions include (1) amending the USA on the existing Land Use Plan to reflect the new drafted USA on the latest draft of the Comprehensive Plan, (2) to repeal the Widewater Plan and (3) to amend the Master Water and Sewer Plan to eliminate water and sewer facilities that would be identified outside of this new USA boundary. He stated staff had a few questions for clarification sake. First, regarding the issue of the revisions of the USA staff was questioning whether this would include the ten year phase since that was an issue of the USA that they currently did not have and should they be identifying this future phase in this change. Second, with the Widewater Plan should they also be seeking to change the underlying Land Use designations as there were some Land Use designations such as neighborhood centers on the Land Use Plan that specifically applied to the Widewater Plan. Lastly, with the Water and Sewer Master Plan revisions they wanted to get clarification that this would also include water improvements in addition to sewer improvements. If so, they may need to consider amending the Land Use Plan text because the Land Use Plan text supported the extension of water outside of the USA. He stated with this third change staff would really recommend that the Planning Commission work to identify the specific projects that would be removed and include those in whatever ad would be prepared. The ad for the July 16 Planning Commission meeting would be due tomorrow and that could be problematic. He stated the reason why he was saying this was certain

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

projects outside of the USA would act to serve areas that were inside of the USA so this change could affect areas that were designated in the USA. They put together a list on sewer projects that were identified as being outside of the proposed USA and provided some notes as to which of those might have an affect on serving land inside the USA. He also noted that once these projects were removed they could have an affect on the overall network which may then have to be re-engineered because once certain projects were removed they would have to look at the whole network to see if any of the existing or remaining pipes would need to be resized because now they would have maybe less capacity or less capability to handle the remaining area. He stated because of these issues with this third request staff suggested tabling this issue and considering it again at the next meeting so staff could come back with a more solid list on the specific projects which would allow them to have a more solid list of projects that could then be advertised for possibly the last Wednesday, July 16.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if there were any questions or comments at this stage. He stated he would like to get the feel of the Planning Commission because they were hoping to vote on it tonight to go to public hearing.

Ms. Kirkman stated it would have been helpful to get this information earlier in the day from staff because it was new information from what had been presented to them previously. Before they proposed any changes to the USA she met with Bob Boss and Dale Allen from the Utilities Commission and at that time they said that their role was in fact to re-engineer their system to match whatever it was that ultimately the governing body would decide ought to be the USA. She stated one of the things that was important to understand about changing the USA, it would not lead to additional costs for the County. For two reasons, they would simply just re-engineer the system and what they would do would be to recalculate the pro rata shares across the different sheds so that there was no cost to the County in making those changes. She stated they had adequately addressed that piece and she wanted to remind the Committee members that there was an area in the USA, the expansion area, that they had originally pulled out and they added that back in at Utilities' request because there were already some substantial improvements underway. She stated they asked for legal to be there and she was wondering what the resolution of that was because she thought they may get into some of those kinds of questions.

Mr. Harvey stated it appeared they did not have legal representation tonight. He had not heard anything specific since their meeting last week.

Ms. Kirkman asked if the list they had prepared for them was off the 1994 Master Water and Sewer Plan.

Mr. Zuraf stated correct.

Ms. Kirkman asked if they were facilities that were located outside of what.

Mr. Zuraf stated outside of the proposed USA and that was done today and not completed until the end of the day because this issue just came up Monday evening.

Ms. Kirkman asked Mr. Zuraf to go through each of these to give a little bit about if they take off or put in what the consequences would be.

Mr. Zuraf stated no he could not as he did not put the list together. It was put together by the Utilities Department.

Mr. Fields stated these were all proposed projects though some were maybe close to construction and none of these were actually built and asked if that was correct. He asked if these were things that were on the Master Plan to be built at some future date but none of these were existing structures or existing systems.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if the first one was under construction.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Zuraf stated just one under construction and the others were planned or approved.

Ms. Kirkman asked, for clarification, if the first one, the Upper Accokeek Creek pumping station, would actually go into the expansion area.

Mr. Harvey stated he believed that was correct, the 2019 expansion area. He stated Mr. Zuraf had raised a question as to how the Commission would want them to represent that for the purposes of identifying the USA. Would they want to have the phased USA in this round or strictly the more constrained USA.

Ms. Kirkman stated having researched this area she would suggest that they would need to portray both, the initial boundaries and the expansion.

Mr. Di Peppe stated that was his understanding that was what they were going to do. He asked about the services area inside USA, Lower Accokeek pumping station but they had not built it yet. He stated that would be part of the thing if they changed the boundaries they would re-engineer and they would not need that and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Harvey state that was correct and in talking with Utilities it would be a two-step process like Ms. Kirkman had indicated. They would first identify the USA and the potential projects that would be eliminated from that and then, after that was adopted as a County policy, Utilities would go back and re-engineer the pipe sizes in which they would come back with the final version of the Sewer and Water Master Plan.

Mr. Fields stated this was informational and asked if Utilities articulated what they wanted to achieve by delaying a week. He assumed the list in the request came from Utilities and not from Planning.

Mr. Harvey stated yes the list came from Utilities. There was a discussion in the County Attorney's office and it was the attorney's recommendation that they have specific language that they would include in the proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan for advertising purposes. That was why staff was suggesting they delay a week and push the public hearing back a week so they could have to them next Wednesday a list that they could say finally these were the projects they had eliminated and that would be part of the resolution that would be advertised for the public hearing.

Ms. Kirkman asked if they could advertise removing all the projects and then during the time between now and July 16 Utilities could get them the information they were saying they needed. Just because they would advertise removal of all these projects did not mean that on the 16th they would have to vote for removal of all of them and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the problem with that was if somebody wanted to come up and say they advertised and if they came for information.

Ms. Kirkman stated they would get information on all the projects. The one she would suggest leaving off was the Upper Accokeek Creek pumping station because that was to serve the expansion area. What she was suggesting was that in order to not have to delay this an additional week and in order to not have a third meeting in July, that what they would do was advertise all the remaining projects.

Mr. Di Peppe asked what the question about the Widewater Plan was.

Mr. Zuraf stated the question was should they be looking to amend underlying land use recommendations that were on the Land Use Map. The one in particular was Neighborhood Center and was specifically talked about in the Widewater Plan.

Ms. Kirkman stated this was the district she represented and what she would suggest was that they advertise it with whatever changes they would need to make the Widewater area consistent with their agricultural Land Use designation. She asked if that would answer the question.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Zuraf stated yes. The majority of the remainder of the land was rural residential.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the change they would need to take out of the third part would be to just take the top project off because that was under construction and it would still serve the expansion area. They could solve that by saying take that off and the rest of these would go away because they were outside until they re-engineer the utilities, and they take Ms. Kirkman's suggestion on the Widewater Plan and asked if they would still be able to get the advertisement in tomorrow. He stated part of this was the window they were originally given by the BOS was 9 months and that was 26 months ago. There were certain elements they would like to see because they were more than a year overdue and, not blaming staff or anybody, they just did not get the information they needed to make the decisions and the project went on and on and on. He stated there were certain areas that were extremely important in the growth in the County that were long overdue that some decisions were made and he believed that was the reason they were trying to move forward. If the rest of the Commission agreed he would like to see this kept on schedule. He asked if that was going to be impossible to do to get the correct wording of the ad.

Mr. Zuraf stated this was just a list of sewer projects. They would not have a list of water projects either.

Ms. Kirkman stated she did not understand how it was that staff was saying that the ad had to be in tomorrow for the July 16 meeting. The way the requirements worked, they would have to advertise the change two weeks prior to the hearing and the way the statute defined two weeks prior to the hearing was the second ad would have to appear five or six days before the hearing and then there would be a minimum of six days between the first advertisement and the second advertisement. She thought they would not have to have this in the paper for four or five days from now.

Mr. Harvey stated following the normal course of the process typically they would provide their ads to the newspaper on Thursday afternoon and they would do their run for Tuesday the following week. There would be some wiggle room they could adjust based on what Ms. Kirkman said was correct that there was a five day requirement before a public hearing and there were also some time limits between the ads. They were flexible and some people had the expectation that they would see the ads run on Tuesday for the Wednesday meeting but it was not required it be that way. In the past they had made adjustments as necessary and that was something they could work on.

Mr. Di Peppe asked what the other water projects were that Mr. Zuraf was talking about.

Mr. Zuraf stated they would have to find out and it would be subject to getting that list.

Mr. Fields stated that was more complex and they should just think about advertising and leaving the water alone for the moment because the current code allows the extension of water outside the USA. That was actually a completely separate issue because the code treats water and sewer differently in relation to the USA. He stated as Mr. Zuraf pointed out originally, if they were to say they wanted to take the water projects out they would have to actually go into a text amendment to the code which was far more complex than what they were trying to do. They were simply trying to start getting the USA re-adjusted and the Water and Sewer Master Plan was simply the idea that they were trying to make it congruent with their adjustment. The Sewer Plan obviously would have to be congruent because that was governed strictly by the boundary of the USA and the water was not. The water projects could be looked at at a future date if they decided to look at to re-examine or not the extension of water outside the USA. He stated as long as that was possible it was not germane to this issue at hand.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he agreed as it was not an issue about water outside the USA.

Ms. Kirkman stated to summarize in response to the questions that staff raised she asked if they wanted to include the ten year phase. She believed they did.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Di Peppe stated he thought that whole thing would be part of it because they had talked about the ten year phase.

Ms. Kirkman stated in terms of repealing the Widewater Plan, if there were any additional changes they would need to make anywhere in the Comp Plan or the Land Use Map they would want to make all of the land use consistent with the agricultural land use. In terms of the Master Plan, she thought what they were saying was to move forward with the sewer projects and not address the water projects at this time with leaving Project 09-03F off the Accokeek Creek pumping station. She stated in the meantime if Utilities came back to them between now and July 16 and said there was a compelling reason to leave one of these other projects in the Master Plan, they could make that adjustment at the public hearing on the 16th. She thought that raised all the questions staff raised tonight.

Mr. Mitchell stated in presenting this it was brought forward on a 2-1 vote. He wanted to make the record clear that it was not a unanimous vote. Mr. Mitchell voted against it and he was concerned on two issues. He was concerned about removing sewer projects and he was concerned about removing water projects. The water and sewer in any county were a level of service and a quality of life issue. Water works well when it was looped and tied together and even sewer can, with certain sections tied together. He did not agree with it and did not think it was for the best interest of the county. He stated he saw it more as trying to suck up their belt and trying to bring just a little segment of the center of the county into conformance. He could not support this and he made that known by his vote, he was outvoted 2-1, but he wanted the other Commission members who did not hear the actual vote mentioned tonight, he wanted to give his honest opinion. He believed they would do a disservice by taking things out in that people beg and cry and plead for both water and sewer. Even though they were talking a different story about not removing the water people still need sewer for quality of life.

Mrs. Carlone stated she would like to make a point that the only thing they were taking out was the Upper Accokeek Creek and they could be built separately from the water. She felt they really needed to go ahead and get this moving.

Mr. Rhodes stated, just to clarify, at the July 16 they would receive a specific presentation on the impact of these other 20 projects or so. He asked if something would be coming from Utilities.

Mr. Zuraf asked as far as what the impact would be to the network.

Mr. Rhodes stated yes. He would just like to know if there were, based on their evaluation, any unintended consequences that they made have had concerns with and secondly, what were the implications of the repeal to the Widewater Plan, the changes Ms. Kirkman identified to the general agricultural area. He wondered if there were any second or third order effects.

Mr. Zuraf stated the Widewater Plan recommended land use intensities that were higher than what it would fall to. Without the Widewater Plan the land uses that were remaining were lower density and more like 3 acre lots as opposed to the Widewater Plan that recommended an overall density of about 1 lot per acre and more so recommended clustering and higher density.

Mr. Fields stated Mr. Zuraf was correct. He would point out though it had become somewhat problematic with what was currently zoned agricultural land being bought speculatively. There was a wide variety of uses permitted in the A-1 zone and he was not contradicting Mr. Zuraf but it was not just a question of going from a higher density to 3 acre zoning. It was preserving the broad spectrum of agricultural forestall and even business uses that were permitted in A-1. He stated residential at 3 acre density was being one of those many, many uses. He thought to equate a higher density plan which was planned for higher density specifically to accommodate primarily residential and some commercial use with simply saying the alternative was lower density residential, they were not exactly apples and apples there. He stated he was not criticizing Mr. Zuraf, he was saying that the agricultural underlying zoning permits a broad spectrum of uses including different types of rural business uses.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Harvey stated what Mr. Zuraf was eluding to earlier was the current map had a majority area designated rural residential with the exception of these small pockets for neighborhood centers. Staff would assume that the neighborhood centers would convert to rural residential like the surrounding area.

Mr. Fields asked if they would convert to rural residential or simply to agricultural

Mr. Zuraf stated the recommended density was the same whether it was rural residential or agricultural.

Mr. Fields asked if there was an implication that rural residential implied that its destiny was residential versus agricultural and which implied a variety of potential uses.

Mr. Harvey stated yes as the current plan acknowledged that areas designated for rural residential typically did not have the better soils that could support agriculture. The exception might be silviculture where it was not necessarily soil dependent.

Ms. Kirkman asked staff if they could “explain the differences in the zoning districts that were associated with rural residential versus the zoning districts that were associated with rural residential”.

Mr. Harvey stated the zoning districts that matched with the Comprehensive Plan gets a little confusing. The Comprehensive Plan for rural residential and agricultural said there should be a variety of uses to be permitted there but maximum density was one dwelling unit per three acres. However, their current zoning did not necessarily match that in that the rural residential A-2 zoning classification had a minimum lot size of one acre but the Comprehensive Plan said that area should be for three acre lots.

Mr. Howard asked Mr. Zuraf to define under construction. On this list it indicated that the Upper Accokeek Creek was currently physically being constructed and asked if that was fair to say and did they know that to be factual.

Mr. Zuraf stated he assumed that.

Mr. Howard asked for the pending construction had somebody actually started or was it pending like they would start Monday.

Mr. Zuraf stated he did not know.

Ms. Kirkman stated she could answer that question. The status of the Upper Accokeek Creek pumping station she believed the contract was just signed for that and she thought the site plan just went through the TRC so it actually had not started actual construction yet. She thought typically what pending construction meant was that there was some approval process that had been completed regarding the facility but there was not an approved construction plan.

Mr. Howard asked what the potential impact to the whole system was if these Master Plan projects were actually removed or because of the new Comprehensive USA they were not permitted.

Mr. Zuraf stated for a detailed answer that would be where the re-engineering would come in. He thought the Utilities Department would be able to help them in providing some generalizations as to how some of these improvements might affect the system, not in specifics as to sizing of pipe or needing a new pump station.

Mr. Howard stated the Comprehensive Plan at this point had been quite a big project for the Planning Commission for several years. He asked if they really wanted to go forward with the first public meeting with information that might not totally be accurate and ready for the public hearing. He was asking this out loud as they were waiting that additional week or day which would turn into a week

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

because of notification. If they committed to that July date as the public meeting was that something that they did not want to do. It would seem more logical to do that so they would all have a better understanding on this Commission.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the only comments on that was on the long list of changes made in the sewer plan the only one actually under construction was the top one. They knew that when the whole purpose about behind changing the Master Water and Sewer Plan was to conform with the new USA. Staff knew and everyone else involved in this process knew that when they changed those lines and they would bring those lines in they did not need some of those projects that were bringing water to what was not in the USA. With the single exception of this whole long list of the top one, they knew that those were going to go away. It was common sense that they were going to go away because the USA was not going to be there so they would not have to provide that. The second part was under the Wadewater Plan, since the majority of the Wadewater Peninsula was no longer going to be in the USA it kind of made the Wadewater Plan needing to be repealed because it was based on it being in the USA. It was a common sense consequence of changing the USA. He stated he was not sure why the question came up whether they wanted to include the phasing in because that was part of the plan for a long time. He understood that some people would ask why were they doing it this way and he would go back to the point that they had lost a whole year on the 20 year plan from what they were originally directed to do because the process took so much longer. He would also say that when the process started out and they said it was going to be a 9 month program the majority of them threw their hands up and said they would not be able to do a complete Comprehensive Plan in 9 months. But that was the charge they were given and it was now 26 months later. He stated he would like to see this move forward because it had been 26 months. He did not see any of the things that were brought up tonight blocking what they were attempting to do.

Mr. Howard stated his fourth question would be for staff. He asked if there was anything else that may had been missed that had not been spoken about to this point with regard with what was trying to be advanced for the public session. There was a lot more detail now and more understanding and it was more visible. He asked if there was anything like that that would come to mind from staff that they were working on or thinking.

Mr. Harvey stated since they had clarification from the Commission they had some pretty clear direction. If they were to advertise the change to the Master Water and Sewer Plan to exclude the following projects on the list less and except the first project listed they could move forward with that kind of advertisement provided the Commission would make a motion to do so. He stated as far as additional information that would be at the discretion or direction of the Planning Commission as far as what additional studies they would have to do with regard to this. In their staff report they would list out the projects and give more detailed information as far as, like Mr. Zuraf said, order of magnitude type of issues that might come up with each one and, specifically, what did pending construction mean. They would give more details of that in the staff report.

Mr. Mitchell stated he personally could not support an issue without knowing the impacts of the issue. He felt there were 21 projects on there and they were looking at taking off one and putting on 20 to be revoked or never built or whatever. He would like to have someone from the Utilities Department give them a better rendition of what it would affect, how it would affect and, not to disagree with any one statement, but when they engineer there was a cost. There was no re-engineering done for free and it did not matter if they had a man on staff they were still paying him to do the re-engineering. He stated he personally believed that this was not in the best interest. To him it was a shotgun effect and what they were trying to do was to throw it in real fast in the interest of saving one meeting. He was willing to go to a third meeting. They did three this month and he would do three next month, it did not bother him a bit.

Mr. Rhodes stated just to clarify, and he knew staff would do it because they do a good job, he would like an assessment or something, whether or not a presentation, from the Utilities Department clarifying the implications or ramifications of the drop of this to their master planning process, etc.

Mr. Zuraf asked if he wanted that information at the next meeting before the public hearing.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Rhodes stated at a minimum in conjunction with the public hearing so they would have that information and input and could digest it.

Mr. Fields stated he understood where Utilities was coming from. The decision of particularly the sewer component of the USA in a county like Stafford with thousands of vested units and still lacking most of the sophisticated growth management tools that most other States had, they were left with sewer as about their only effective control over density. The existence of places where sewer could not be defined that area as to some degree rural forever and that was a very powerful tool. He stated even though many of them had been on different sides of different issues, even the debates that they had been on different sides, everybody had been working on the idea of a more compact urban settlement area so to speak for Stafford and a more open and well preserved rural area. This idea was consistent with ideas voiced on all sides of the issues for the last couple decades in this county and certainly in the last several years. There was nothing about a more compact USA than he had ever heard to be inconsistent with anybody's view of how land use should evolve in Stafford. He stated he did not want to cause Utilities hardship but, at the same time, ultimately he knew their opinion had been expressed to Ms. Kirkman and Mr. Harvey. Ultimately they would have to re-engineer to the broader picture of what the future of the county was. They were not engineers and they could get up to speed and informed but they would never understand the engineering details. He stated he did not want to see them get lost trying to comprehend and let engineering choices drive land use decisions because land use decisions for the Planning Commission was what they did.

Mr. Di Peppe stated before they moved forward the only other thing was originally on the agenda there was a transportation model presentation by Mr. Allen and asked if they needed to hear that before they move forward.

Ms. Kirkman stated she thought these issues were separate from that and while the discussion was fresh in their minds she would suggest they move forward with any motions.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to move to public hearing their changes in the boundaries of the USA and along with that the appropriate changes in the 1994 Master Water and Sewer Plan to conform to those boundary changes and the repeal of the Widewater Plan. Ms. Kirkman seconded.

Mr. Howard asked if there was something in writing that they could look at for this motion or was it just verbal.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the only other thing he needed to clarify with the one exception of keeping the first project, 09-03F, that that would continue since it was under construction, with that one change in the Master Water and Sewer Plan.

Mr. Zuraf asked for clarification did this also include changing the land use in the Widewater area to agricultural or rural residential.

Ms. Kirkman asked Mr. Harvey to please explain what the consequences for changing to agricultural use versus what rural residential use would be in terms of the Land Use Map.

Mr. Harvey stated as far as development potential there was very little different other than for agricultural it assumed that they could not have farming in that area whereas rural residential was intended to be more a residential-type setting.

Ms. Kirkman stated in representing that district she would suggest agricultural.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the only question he had with that was the rest of the county they said the land use was going to be what it was currently zoned.

Mr. Rhodes asked to clarify the motion of what they were presenting for public hearing.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Di Peppe stated the clarification was the vote would be for a public hearing on July 16 to change the boundaries of the USA and, in addition to that, to change the Master Water and Sewer Plan to conform to that. The only difference between the list they had was they would keep the top project in because it served an expansion area. In addition, they would be repealing the current Wadewater Plan and would have the land designation go back to agricultural.

Mr. Rhodes asked if they had a map they were proposing to change it to.

Mr. Zuraf stated no.

Ms. Kirkman asked Mr. Di Peppe to please finish restating the motion.

Mr. Rhodes stated he did not know Mr. Di Peppe was not done.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he thought he was done.

Mr. Howard stated to follow-up on Mr. Rhodes' question, the map was being changed and altered the last meeting he was at after the Commission had a chance to look at it. There were two areas that someone indicated were not exactly correct on the map. The actual map he brought with him he did not think was the final map that the committee was recommending.

Ms. Kirkman stated she believed staff would be preparing the map for the public hearing materials. She also wanted to point out to the full Planning Commission that the draft of the Land Use Map which was passed out a month ago showed the designation of the Wadewater area as agricultural with the exception of some expansion of the park area on the lower part of the peninsula. The last draft of the Land Use Map was consistent with what they were proposing tonight.

Mr. Zuraf stated the last draft of the Land Use Plan was actually now on the county website under the Comprehensive Plan revision section and it had a revision date of May 22 which reflected all the changes.

Mr. Rhodes asked if that was the one they would be discussing for July 16.

Mr. Zuraf stated yes. As far as a map showing changed agricultural no but as far as the USA boundary yes.

Mr. Mitchell stated he would submit one more time to take 20 sewer projects off would need the Utility people there to give a better rendition of how it would affect other lines, other areas, other looped areas or other non-looped areas. He thought they would be doing a disservice to the people if one of the areas could loop into a sewer system and lock two and two together he thought they would need to have a better understanding of how 20 projects could be thrown off the burners.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would like to comment since he had been involved with this for 26 months. Since they were not going to be in the USA, they were not going to have sewer. Since they were not going to have sewer, they were not going to need the projects. That was the whole concept, to shrink the USA and to control how their county would grow and how fast it would grow and where it would grow. He stated the whole point was if they shrink the USA they would no longer need to provide those water and sewer projects that were going to be on the books to go and service it because it would not have sewer. It was a simple thing of they were not going to be providing the lines so they would not be needing the pumping stations. He did not understand what the problem was as far as costing the county money. He would think building 20 less projects would save a lot of money.

Mr. Fields stated he understood Mr. Mitchell's concerns. Their advertisement was simply to have an inclusive and most restrictive advertisement. If the information they would receive by the time of the public hearing or even by next week's meeting, or in between, presented a compelling and irrevocable case for reinstating one of those projects, they had given themselves the option of doing so by having the most restrictive ordinance. He stated when they go to public hearing if there was a compelling

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

reason to include one of these outside the USA projects for the sake of engineering efficiency they had given themselves the option of doing that. They had not quite thrown the baby out with the bathwater yet. Until the public hearing would go through, there was some flexibility because they were advertising everything. He stated they could always make it less restrictive once it was advertised.

Mr. Mitchell stated he would ask that someone in Utilities be ready to explain the volume, be ready to explain how they were tied together, be ready to explain a number of things, not just saying these projects would not be built. He stated they needed someone from Utilities here to answer any questions and the question he wanted answered was re-engineering costs.

Mr. Fields stated they wanted to save money wherever possible and it was important to note that re-engineering costs were part of the Utilities enterprise fund so any costs to the Utilities, while he would not want to incur large costs to the Utilities Department, it was important to make sure that everybody understood it was not general fund money, it was Utilities enterprise fund money which was driven by a different revenue stream.

The motion passed 5-2 (Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Howard opposed).

Mr. Di Peppe stated they had one more presentation. He recognized Bill Allen and apologized for delaying his presentation.

Bill Allen, the County's Transportation Planning Consultant, stated he had a presentation on the work he had been doing with Sara Woolfenden of the Office of Transportation on the travel forecasting model. He had a few slides which spoke about the model itself and he had some material on the results they had been doing for the initial forecast. He went through a brief overview of the whole process. He stated he developed the forecasting model that covered a very large area, about 7,600 square miles, which covered the area from about the southern part of Caroline County all the way up to the Pennsylvania border and from the Blue Ridge to the Bay. They needed a very large area to be covered in order to model long trips. Quite a few trips leave Stafford County and go to other places and they needed to be able to reflect those accurately. He stated the county itself was divided into 926 traffic zones. The best way to think of traffic zones were like neighborhoods, they were small area units that was an area of geography where the traffic would come from and would go to. He stated this was far more detailed than any other model that had been developed for the county to date. It had been validated to the year 2006 counts which were counts taken by VDOT all over the county and they had matched them reasonably well. Their forecast year was 2028 and that was their main forecast year at the moment. Other forecast horizons would be developed in the coming weeks and this model was complete at this point and was ready for forecasting use. He stated the general structure of the model was a very conventional model not a research project. It was a project to develop something for practical use right away and he thought they accomplished that. It used the conventional four-step approach that many had probably heard of in other models. The four steps were generation, distribution, auto occupancy and traffic assignment. He stated they did not have a home interview survey that was taken for this area. The co-efficients and parameters in this model were based on those used by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and the Fredericksburg Area MPO and so it was based on those co-efficients and those sensitivities. It used a special software package called Cube and it would run over five hours. It would take quite a while to crunch through all the numbers. He stated they had several different types of trips they were representing separately in this process. A lot of travel models just represented trips as trips and sometimes when they would be confronted with information on the ITE trip rates they would just talk about trips. A model like this would have to work with different types of trips. They broke the whole travel market down on the trips in front of them, work, shop, other and other was a very broad category, personal business, recreational trips, pretty much everything that was not one of the other categories. They had a special category for medium and heavy trucks and a new special category for light vehicles. He stated not home-based was a separate category that did not begin or end at home. They were also splitting out all the person trips by the modes as shown which were called travel modes, transit, drive alone, three different types of carpools and the walk-bike mode which was also called non-motorized. The different carpool trips were assigned HOV lanes based on their occupancy. They have assigned trips separately through the

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

I-95 HOV lanes and the I-66 HOV lanes and could vary those as the occupancy criteria varied. He stated the next slide talked about a distinction between this new model and the FAMPO model. Many were probably familiar with the FAMPO model as it was probably what they had been seeing most of over the last several months or years. This model was at a very broad level, very similar to the FAMPO model. The outputs it would be producing were very similar to those that they had seen from the FAMPO model but there were some important differences. The first one he mentioned was that this model covered a much larger region. The FAMPO model only covered the Fredericksburg region which was fine for the Fredericksburg area trips but did not do a good job at covering the trips that leave the region. He stated this new model was much more detailed inside Stafford County. For example, as he mentioned, they had 926 neighborhoods they divided the county into and the FAMPO model was only 202 neighborhoods so they were much more detailed in that respect. The trip estimation was much more sophisticated as they would take into account the income of a household, the type of dwelling unit and the FAMPO model did not do that. This model breaks the daily travel activity to three different periods, a.m. peak, p.m. peak and off peak and also accounts for multi-model trips which meant transit and carpool trips. He stated this model was very well documented and he just submitted the documentation to Sara yesterday and that would be sufficient for everybody's needs for the next several years. He stated the next slide talked about the comparison of this model versus another type of model they were familiar with, models that were done for traffic impact analysis. They were all familiar with a site impact analysis or a rezoning analysis for a particular site, a shopping center or a gas station, and that type of model focused very tightly on a small area. It would be concerned with peak hour volumes, a handful of intersections and it was only intended for a short term review of the whole process. It would only look a couple of years into the future and the phrase he would use was it was a mile deep and an inch wide. He stated the type of model he developed was very different. It operated on daily volumes and at the whole county, not just a focused area, it produced link level statistics, not intersection turning volumes and it was really intended for a longer term analysis, a broader view of the whole county. It was really more of an inch deep and a mile wide. It was important to keep those distinctions in mind as they go through this because there was a tendency to use one tool for the other purpose and it did not work that way. These were separate tools for separate purposes and they each had their role. He stated he wanted to talk a little about the roadway network that was in the county. They had pretty much every road of any significance in the county, every road in the Comprehensive Plan down to a great many local roads that were not necessarily in the FAMPO model. They did not include all subdivisions roads as they were not of great importance for the scope of work they were doing. They were not doing a traffic impact analysis, they were doing a project for the whole county. He stated they every interchange on I-95 was fully coded with every ramp at every interchange as it existed. The coded network did line up exactly with the county centerline which was very important for presentation purposes. When he said less detail in the rest of the region what he meant the rest of the region being outside of Stafford County though they did include King George County, Spotsylvania County, Montgomery County, D.C. and all other jurisdictions, 23 other counties, there was much less detail so they would not burden themselves with having to worry about the traffic on some minor street in Fairfax County. He stated the next slide talked about the different types of roadways they had. They had broken the county down into 11 different potential types of roadways and he thought some of them did not even exist today but they might exist in the future. The hierarchy started at the top with I-95 and worked its way down to the local streets and the on ramps and off ramps. If they wanted to make a change in the roadway network they needed to be thinking in terms of one of these roadway types so they could move from one roadway type to the other and that was the way the model operated. He stated the next slide talked about different schemes of classifying roadways. What they may be familiar with and what they may have seen before in VDOT presentations for example was what they called functional classification and that created a hierarchy of roads that were based on who owned the road, who would pay for the road and who would maintain it. That was very important but that was not what they were about here. What they were about here was a type of facility based on the physical attributes of the road. It related specifically to the speed of the road and the capacity of the road. As an example, Route 29, as it went through the Manassas Battlefield just north of Gainesville, was a major highway and classified as a major arterial by VDOT in terms of its ownership and the importance of the road. For most of its route it was a four lane fairly major highway except where it went through the Manassas Battlefield. Because of the restrictions of the National Park Service and other attributes, Route 29 necks down to a

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

two lane country road as it went through the Manassas Battlefield Park and it operated as a two lane country road because that was the way the Park Service wanted it. He believed the Park Service was working on trying to get it closed. At the moment it was a two lane country road, it was not a major facility or major arterial as it went through the Manassas Battlefield. Physically it operated as a two lane rural road and that was the way it was coded in the Prince William County model. That gave an idea of the distinction between functional classification and facility type. He stated the model had been validated very well in the last couple of months he had been working on this. They had two different sets of criteria for what was good enough. The key criteria for goodness of fit of any travel model was it must replicate today's volumes. What a calibration of a network like this was they would run it for today, today in this case being 2006 because that was the most recent year they had count data for. They would run it for today's inputs, 2006 land use, 2006 network and all the other attributes representing 2006 and they would look at the outputs of the model and see if those estimates on those models on the links would match the actual counts that VDOT actually counted in the field and they did, very closely. He explained in detail the three different kinds of key criteria, total error, route means square error and R-squared by link. In the final report there were other statistics like this that demonstrate that this model was very well validated and replicated the existing volumes better than expected. He stated one of the things about a travel model was it reduced a tremendous amount of output information. Over the coming weeks if they were not stopped they were going to swamp them with a tremendous amount of data any many an imaginable sort of travel information that this model could produce. One of the things he would like to do was to boil it down as much as possible because if they were not careful and if they were not constraining themselves they would just keep dumping more and more data and plots and tables than anyone could handle. That was not helping the process in his opinion. One of the things was an assignment summary report and a copy would be handed out later. This basically summarized in three pages pretty much everything they would need to know about a given model's run and answered the question if it was better or worse. They would compare one run with another and it showed if they did a better job or not. He stated the loaded network was the primary output, loaded in this case meant a network of roads with the daily volume shown on every link. They also could convert that volume into a link level of service which would give a general idea on every link whether the level of service was A, B, C, D, E or F and they could plot that. All of this information operated within the travel model, within the Cube software package he mentioned, but it could all be exported to a GIS layer. He could provide all of this information to the County's GIS department and they could insert that as a layer overlayed on top of any of their GIS maps. They had a tremendous variety of information at the link level, at the zone level, pretty much anything they could imagine, volumes, speeds, levels of service. He explained in detail some of the acronyms, VMT Vehicle Miles Traveled, VHT Vehicle Hours Traveled which included the free-flow speed and the congested vehicle hours of travel. He stated he wanted to talk about the forecast. They ran the model for 2006, they replicated the counts, they have a model that was based on solid parameters and coefficients from other models, good relationships and they would have very good reason to believe if they put in reasonable estimates for future land use and future roadway networks that they would get a reasonable estimate of future traffic. Their initial test was to input the land use plan that was developed by this Commission and that plan was divided into 926 neighborhoods in terms of the jobs and the housing in each neighborhood and they would input that into the model. The salient characteristics were there, between 2006 and 2028 total households and total employment almost doubled. What was interesting was outside of Stafford these numbers only went up 32%. Obviously Stafford was one of the highest growth counties in the region. Another interesting thing was regional through travel went up by a dramatic number, 168%. In this context, regional through travel was people going from Boston to Miami, long distance travel. Normally they would not really care about that except that a lot of those people were on I-95 and sometimes they would get off onto US 1 and then they would care about that. That was why that was important. He stated when they ran the model county travel, VMT in the county, did not quite double, it went up 83%. There was one question right off the bat that if households and jobs went up 92%, how come VMT only went up 83%. One of the reasons was that the trips were getting shorter. One of the things that was happening in the future, and he was sure this would be common sense to them, as they get more jobs and more people in the county, more people were staying within the county for their travel. The number of long distance trips was being reduced slightly so the trip length was shrinking. That meant that they could have trips go up by 90% but the VMT would only go up by 83% because the trips were getting a little bit shorter. They

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

had increased the roadway capacity by 38%, that was the current transportation plan that was coded in the network assumed to be in place by 2028 and if they looked at the amount of lane miles, 1 mile of road multiplied by the number of lanes which was really a measure of the pavement space in the county, that would go up 38%. Those two numbers should have told them something. If travel numbers were going up 80% and roadway space was going up 38%, the next line would be the delay would go up by a factor of 4, 300% which was not a good number. The average speed would go down 12% which may not seem like a lot but the average speed was a very significant figure and that was a very significant difference. The only bright spot in this forecast was that one of the key statistics in measures of effectiveness was what percentage of the lane miles in the county were operating at a failing level of service. For this purpose he defined failing as a daily level of service of E or F. Clearly nobody could disagree that levels of service E or F was failing. That was considered failing pretty much everywhere except in New Jersey where they tolerate levels of service E. The good news was that the percentage of roadway mileage that operated in a failing level of service was unchanged. He stated that may not sound like a great accomplishment but it was not bad. He had worked in other jurisdictions where that number would go up and other jurisdictions where it would go down. They were battling congestion to a draw maybe. On one of the slides you could see some of the specific volume increases on other roads in the county. There were some very big numbers, Route 1 went up dramatically with 161%. Part of that was the development along Route 1 and part of that was the fact that they had widened Route 1 and it could handle more traffic than it could, along with some other changes. He stated the next slide was what would happen next. Now that the model was calibrated and applied it to make what they would call a base year forecast, it was not the end of the process but, as far as he was concerned, it was the beginning of the process. They would now have a tool that they could use to analyze any kind of scenarios they would want to analyze and look at a wide variety of land use and transportation changes for the next 10 or 20 years. They plan on analyzing quite a few scenarios as far as developing recommendations for the transportation plan update and there would be a new study of impact fees coming up soon and this model would generate the perfect kind of information to support the development of credible, defensible impact fees. He stated the last slide was a discussion of some of the scenarios they would be testing over the next couple of weeks. One test was to take the future land use and run that with the existing network so that would answer the question of what would happen if they could not build any more roads than what was already in place today but the development would continue to go unabated. Obviously it would be very bad news and obviously it would not be a scenario that was realistic necessarily but it would give the answer to that question and it would tell them exactly how bad things were going to be and where they were going to be bad. Then they would do a similar analysis but back it off to use 2018 land use and 2018 land use, because it would happen to be ten years from today, was more foreseeable more understandable scenario. He would say at this point that 2018 probably would include stuff that was pretty much in the pipeline. If it was not in the pipeline and not at least vaguely known about it probably would not be in place and open by 2018 at this point. They would be able to analyze the projects that were in the bond projects list with this model as well to answer the question of what would happen to those. That concluded the overview of what he had been doing and he had been working very closely with staff on this. They were helping him do a very good job and he thought they had a new tool that would produce a tremendous amount of information and bring a new quantitative analysis to this transportation process.

Ms. Kirkman stated the 2028 projections they have received were based on two assumptions. One was a build-out by the land use so population growth was based on the land use map rather than population projections and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Zuraf stated that was full build-out.

Ms. Kirkman stated that was full build-out which had more than doubled the capacity they needed for the projected population of growth. That was a really big problem with that assumption.

Mr. Zuraf stated it was probably going to be build-out without the commercial apartments.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Ms. Kirkman stated even that had far more capacity. They would get a very different number than if they used populations projections. The second concern she had about the 2028 modeling was that it was based on assuming that every project in their current road plan was built. She stated they had requested in the Comprehensive Plan Committee and also from the Planning Commission in order to inform their decision-making on the Transportation Bond, that they have this transportation modeling done for 2018 using two assumptions. One was allocating the population growth across the TAZs by using population projections rather than the land use map and by assuming no road improvements other than what was already funded. She thought they were going to have those results before tonight and she was wondering what the status of that was.

Sara Woolfenden stated they were working on the land use portion of it but the land use did take some time to develop and they were working on the land use side of the 2018. For the network, they had spoken with Bill about to get that into place and as far as when exactly it would come back, it would come back as soon as they could get the land use into place. That would take a little bit of time for them to go through and forecast it. It took about 3 to 4 weeks last time to do the forecast.

Ms. Kirkman stated they did not have anything that was more realistic modeling to use to inform their decision-making on the Transportation Bond projects that they had to make tonight.

Ms. Woolfenden stated correct.

Mr. Howard stated on page 12 Mr. Allen had the vehicle miles of travel equaling the sum of the distance traveled by all vehicles in the county on a weekday and asked if there was an average for the county using the 2006 numbers.

Mr. Allen stated it was a little over 4 million. That was with VDOT counts and what the model replicated.

Mr. Howard stated on the same page he had vehicle hours of travel equal the sum of time traveled by all vehicles in the county and had the free-flow speed and the congested speed and the free-flow was the speed people would like to travel at and asked Mr. Allen if he had an average for those in terms of miles.

Mr. Allen stated he was going to be handing that out. Page 2 gave the estimation for 2006 and the 2028 scenario of vehicle miles, congested vehicle hours and free-flow vehicle hours.

Mr. Howard stated they also had contained in the summation the delay as described as the difference between free-flow and congested vehicles per day. What he would really like was if they had information by street, what was the delay with the 2006 numbers today and asked if that was contained in the report.

Mr. Allen stated that was not contained in the report and that was a summary report for the whole county.

Mr. Howard asked if he could produce it by the streets that they were looking to recommend the improvements on. He stated that would be helpful so if no growth occurred. He thought Mr. Allen did an excellent job with the methodology he used to come up with the model. In comparing the model to the FAMPO model he was impressed with how Mr. Allen consolidated the presentation into 15 or 20 minutes. He stated it was good information.

Mr. Allen stated he had to because there was so much information and so many millions and millions of bytes of output from each run that it would very easily overwhelm anybody looking at it. He found it to make it any sense of it all he had to boil it down to as few numbers as possible and as few graphics as possible to really get a sense of was it better or not because otherwise it would be just too difficult to determine that.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Howard asked if they could get that information by street.

Mr. Allen stated yes.

Ms. Kirkman stated she wanted to remind folks earlier that they did get the modeling of the 2006 network and that did have level of service based on existing conditions. This was the most accurate portrayal they had and it was pretty amazing what they were able to do with this because all of the dwellings in the county were geo-coded. She stated it was about as precise as they could get with the traveling modeling. Although they did not have a list by street, if they went back to the map they received previously it was color-coded that way.

Mr. Fields stated this was a little off the topic but he did want to proceed with this having dealt with the transportation impact fees from day one. He asked if he was hearing him correctly were they going to be able to get past having to just use the default ITE numbers as they assigned impact fee values by land use type then to generate some of their own data. He stated that had always been an area of serious concern because ITE was a very broad average across basically the entire planet as far as he could tell and did a medical office in Stafford generate X number of trips per square foot versus a medical office in New York. The ITE standard numbers seemed to be somewhat punitive on a lot of commercial uses for the application of impact fees. It was not saying they did not generate traffic but there had always been a feeling that the way commercial and residential units balanced out in the ITE world was not necessarily as equitable as what people's sense of what the reality on the ground was.

Mr. Allen stated that was correct and the ITE rates were not intended to produce the kind of balance Mr. Fields was talking about whereas this model must balance the trips. Every trip that leaves a house must arrive at some destination and there was no getting around that. In the ITE analysis that was not necessarily the case. He stated he just finished a study with TischlerBise, the firm that would be doing the impact study here and the same type of study in Spotsylvania County. He worked very closely with the TischlerBise people with a model similar to this one to take the detailed kind of travel information that they had and feed it to the impact fee calculation. They were able to do a very detailed and equitable calculation of who would pay and who would benefit and he thought they did a good job of not making the developers pay for problems that they did not create. It was a good job of tying the impact fee to the development that actually created the need for it all over the whole county. He stated it was very well calculated and very defensible and he was anticipating that the impact fee study being done here would operate pretty much the same way.

Mr. Mitchell stated on slide 14 there two specifics he looked at, county travel vehicle miles up 83% and VMT up 161% on Route 1, 16% on Route 3, 69% on Route 17 and 44% on Route 630. In all the projections, he asked if anything was worked into the projections about the present gasoline crunch. He stated he commuted north every morning and personally could see a difference on 95 and if there was a difference he was curious why they were up 161% down here.

Mr. Allen stated this model did not take into account the recent changes in the cost of gasoline and there was a very good reason for that. The cost of gasoline was about not quite the lowest it had ever been but it was pretty low in real dollars. The cost of gasoline was the most expensive back in 1920. If they looked at a graph, and he had analyzed this in great detail, of the cost of gasoline in real dollars, today's dollars, since 1920 it had been dropping like a rock with a couple of blips, WWII, the gas crisis in 1974 and the gas crisis in 1980. In all three cases the gas prices were coming down in real dollars. It went up during those three blips, so to speak, and it came right back down afterwards and kept dropping like a rock. He stated this model was looking 20 years into the future. It was anticipating that over a course of a couple of years the price of gas would come down in real dollars to the point where travel would resume in its normal fashion as it had for the last almost 100 years. They were taking a long-term view here. He stated Mr. Mitchell was absolutely on point that in the last 12 months statistics compiled by the Federal Highway Administration had shown that the traffic for many, many years had gone up by 2% or 3% per year almost like clockwork. In the last 12 months it had either stayed the same or in some cases dropped because of the price of gas. He was assuming, this model was assuming, and all past history has indicated that this was a temporary trend. He did

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

now know when it would go back up but he did know that trends of the past would resume in the next couple of years.

Mr. Mitchell asked what he was saying was the gasoline prices were going to drop.

Mr. Allen stated in real dollars.

Mr. Di Peppe asked meaning in relation to what people were making versus what they were paying.

Mr. Allen stated exactly. It was all relative to the cost of inflation and what inflation would be doing. It was amazing that if they divided the cost of gasoline over the years by the ratio of consumer price index to convert it to real buying power it had been dropping dramatically since 1920.

Mrs. Carlone thanked Mr. Allen for the presentation. She stated she would love to see some type of Route 28 expansion out of the area to take off some of the burden from Route 17. She would like to see what the effect would be on 17.

Mr. Allen stated he believed VDOT did plan to widen Route 28 through Prince William and Fauquier Counties.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he appreciated the immense amount of work and the very intelligent and articulate presentation. He asked if any thought had gone into telecommuting and what kind of affect that would have.

Mr. Allen stated it was not directly built into the model. There was a lot of controversy in the travel forecasting business about that very topic because they would like to think there was a lot to be gained from that. What was happening over the years was the percentage of work traffic, by which he meant directly from home to work and work to home, really was shrinking. It use to be 25-27% of total trips but now it was down to less than 20%. One reason was because so many people were making stops on their way to and from work to do other things so they were chaining their trips and it would be difficult to do that when telecommuting. The other problem was that trying to get enough people together to do telecommuting to really make a dent in the process was very difficult. If they looked at the trends of employment and employers by size they would find that about half the employment was in large employers and half was in smaller employers and he thought the cutoff point was 100 employees or less. If they thought of half the employment being in small firms those places would have a very difficult time telecommuting because they were not doing the big office-related things that a lot of the Federal government was involved with. The market was 20% of total travel to begin with, only half of the people were really able to do that and if they kept breaking it down to the percentage of people eligible they would have to have something like 70-80% of the people who were eligible to telecommute actually telecommuting to make a difference. The other problem with telecommuting was it would depend on how they did it. If a company went to a four day work week it would not work because what they found when they surveyed the people who were traveling on that fifth day was they were not going to work but they were going to Home Depot, the ballpark or 12 other places and the vehicle miles traveled went up. It was not happening at rush hour so the congestion was improved but in terms of their total impact on the system, their car emissions, their energy usage, the accidents, it went up. Telecommuting was not always the great thing it was cracked up to be.

Mr. Fields thanked Mr. Allen for an outstanding job. He was glad to have in-house capacity for running all the different scenarios and it would improve over the next year or two. He stated he wanted to give a brief overview of how they wanted to tackle the Transportation Bond project. This was obviously a big question and had a lot of different components to it. He would like to suggest as they proceed he give an overview of his thinking and ask for any comments and then have Ms. Kirkman make her report. He stated what they were being asked to do was to simply provide a recommendation from the perspective of the Planning Commission on these projects to the Board of Supervisors. They needed to be sure they were not getting involved in many different questions related to the Transportation Bond which were easy to do because it was a big complex picture. They

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

were not there to decide on certain aspects of it and they were not there to decide if the Bond should go to referendum or not and they were not there to decide how this Bond was going to be paid for. What he would like to suggest, his own personal recommendation, was that they not take this whole set of projects and go yes or no on a vote because he did not think that was a particularly meaningful action on their part. He stated the BOS needed to see the diversity of opinion they all had on how all this would work out because they represented 7 different areas of the county. As far as one giant question, they could vote yes or no on this document in its entirety for 20 different reasons. He would like everyone to keep in mind that what they were trying to come up with was a set of comments, votes and/or decisions that were based on what would most thoroughly represent what they feel, from a Planning standpoint, the state of these different projects as they move forward with the Transportation Bond. He stated if they did vote and discuss, and he thought they should have some sort of vote, that they take the three segments, the Youth Driver Taskforce project as one area of discussion, the Pedestrian Improvements as one area of discussion, and the Secondary and Primary Road larger projects as another area of discussion as they were three very different things. He asked Ms. Kirkman to make a report as far as the Transportation Committee's activities on this.

Ms. Kirkman stated the Transportation Committee had not met on this. She had been for the past several weeks attending the Board Subcommittee meetings on this. She could reiterate that the Subcommittee and the Board had been very clear that what they were looking was any recommendations that they make be budget neutral. They were pretty committed to the \$70 million being the upper threshold so if anybody wanted to add a project they would have to be willing to take one off. She stated they had talked about a lot of these projects both in relationship to the Secondary Road Plan and that would be the thing to see if the members of the Commission needed a review from Fulton on the specific projects or the other way they could proceed was she was prepared to make a series of motions about each of the three segments. She was willing to move forward in whatever way the body thought was the most fruitful for right now.

Mr. Fields asked if they needed an update on the details of these projects. To articulate in what he called the big projects they had Warrenton Road, Ferry Road, Garrisonville Road, two different Courthouse Road projects, Telegraph Road and Truslow Road. They had the Youth Driver Taskforce project with an appendix identifying those and then they had Pedestrian Improvements. He stated they had bond proceeds of \$70 million in total, he did not think they had a subtotal on the road projects, and they had the Youth Driver Taskforce at \$16.9 million and Pedestrian at \$1.6 million. It was important to note there were several funding numbers on there in terms of total cost, source of funding and he wanted to make sure they were very clear on where this was and to always look over to the bond line when looking at a question related to this specific recommendation today in terms of funding. The \$70 million was set by the Board committee and they were not at liberty to move that number around.

Mr. Howard asked what some of the filters or components were that were used in addition to what Mr. Allen did and were there other factors considered when these roads were selected.

Ms. Kirkman clarified the work of Mr. Allen was not used at all. The Board committee did not have the benefit of that and they were hoping to have some of that tonight but they did not. The Board Subcommittee thought of these projects in two terms, one was safety improvements which were the Youth Drive Taskforce projects and flow projects which were the larger projects that were on the other list. First and foremost she believed for consideration was putting together a package that they believed would be acceptable to the voters and would pass. It was really crafted carefully with the notion of how they could get that done.

Mr. Howard stated safety and it sounded like levels of service or congestion were two of the filters.

Ms. Kirkman stated yes. They looked at not existing level of services, they looked at projected level of services using the FAMPO model, she believed all of the projects listed on the large road improvements, the flow improvements except for Telegraph Road were projected in the future to have a level of service of F by 2015 and asked if that was correct.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Fulton deLamorton, Transportation Administrator, stated, as a point of clarification, the Transportation Bond Committee, Mr. Crisp, Mr. Dudenheffer and Mr. Sterling, did look at the 2006 county model as a base year to identify a level of service of F and F- roads as a starting point.

Mr. Fields asked if there were any other questions before they move forward. In general, the \$70 million unfortunately did not go as far as it used to. They were looking at the roads that were, in a county full of fairly congested roads, the really bad ones.

Ms. Kirkman stated she would move a series of motions dividing by the three areas that the plan was put forward to them. The first was the Pedestrian Improvements and these were unspecified in the document that was provided to them. The discussion was they would primarily apply to some pedestrian improvements along and adjacent to Garrisonville Road. She made the motion they recommend adopting the Pedestrian Improvement section of this plan. Mr. Rhodes seconded.

Mr. Fields stated the motion was to really recommend inclusion of this. They were not adopting anything, they were forwarding their recommendations that this be included in the Transportation Bond.

Ms. Kirkman stated she would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Rhodes stated so modified.

Mr. Fields asked if there was any discussion on the motion as amended.

Mr. Rhodes stated he thought this was an important focus area that had long been overlooked.

The motion passed 7-0.

Ms. Kirkman stated regarding the Youth Driver Taskforce she was going to pass some papers out so they had something to look at while she made this motion. She recommended inclusion of the list of the Youth Driver Taskforce projects as presented to them with the following changes. First she would like to recommend that the Board look at any way they could find to fully fund these projects with bond revenues to make sure they happen. They have other safety improvements projects that could be identified to be used for revenue sharing projects in the future. The second change she would recommend in the motion was they remove the spot improvement for Brooke Road starting at Raven Road and terminating 0.50 miles east of Raven Road. The third change she would recommend in the motion was they remove the Sanford Drive project. The fourth change she would recommend was they add spot safety improvements to Decatur Road.

Mr. Fields asked if she could clarify why the recommendation for the removal of Brooke Road and Sanford Drive.

Ms. Kirkman stated for a point of order she thought they needed a second and then she would be glad to discuss that.

Mr. Di Peppe seconded.

Ms. Kirkman stated she made the recommendation regarding these particular projects for the following reasons. Regarding removal of the spot improvement for Brooke Road starting at Raven Road and terminating 0.5 miles east of Raven Road, that project was on here and identified as a hazardous curve because it was a blind curve. As she reviewed with the Planning Department she believed last week, there was a subdivision going in exactly at that spot. In order to gain VDOT approval for that road to open, they were going to have to do a very significant line of sight easement improvement so she believed it would be the best use of dollars to wait and see if that line of sight easement improvement they were going to have to do... basically there was a hill sitting in the middle of the bend of the curve. In order to gain VDOT approval for access to the subdivision they were going to have to grade out the

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

entire hill which may remove the blind spot in that curve. She was going to recommend they remove that project for now to see if that addresses the safety issue. She stated in terms of the Sanford Drive project, her understanding was even as recently as the past month there had already been significant improvements made to that road since the Youth Driver Taskforce made their recommendations so she would suggest they remove that project until a reassessment was done of the safety issues on that road given the improvements that had already been made to it. Lastly, she recommended adding to the plan some spot safety improvements to Decatur Road because they had a very serious situation down there. Recently they had a structure in that area that burned to the ground because Decatur Road presented problems to the pumper trucks carrying water to the site of the fire. It really had to do with that road and the curves and the narrowness of it. There was a significant safety issue there. In addition, VDOT kept lowering the posted speed limit on that road because of the safety issues on it. There were sections now that were down to 15 mph and they just could not get any slower. Although this was not on the original Youth Driver Taskforce list, she did believe if it was stated at this point people would find that there were significant safety issues on it. She stated those were the reasons for the recommendations she made.

Mr. Fields asked if it affected the total amount of the recommendation of the Youth Driver Taskforce within the \$16.9 million parameter as presented to them.

Ms. Kirkman stated the Sanford Drive and Brooke Road improvements totaled she believed almost \$5 million and again they could suggest if some spot improvements on Decatur Road they be limited to that amount.

Mr. Fields stated it depended on what the improvements were and \$5.1 million was a fair amount of money. One would assume that that could handle that.

Mrs. Carlone stated she did reconfirm Sanford Drive. They had finished it about 1 month ago, especially the improvements to the lanes.

Mr. Fields asked functionally the issues that caused this to appear on the Youth Driver Taskforce initially she felt had been resolved at this point.

Mrs. Carlone stated pending a review of the accomplishments.

Mr. Fields asked if there was any discussion on this motion.

Mr. Howard made a substitute motion that they exclude the list of roads she submitted this evening and vote to move forward with the Youth Driver Taskforce projects as presented originally on the document they received. Mr. Mitchell seconded.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would like to hear Mr. Howard's reasoning behind that.

Mr. Howard stated there had been an awful lot of work to date put into this and they could all go back to their districts and pick a road or two. He happened to live on one that could use some spot improvements. The direction they were given was if they were going to recommend a road certainly come prepared to have one removed. He was not certain that that was the right angle for the Planning Commission to take since this Taskforce had been in existence for a while. He stated this had been through the Board and he thought they were asked, and Mr. Fields said it he thought very well early on, did they want to spend \$16.9 million on the Youth Driver Taskforce projects and that was ultimately what they were recommending or saying to the Board of Supervisors. They agreed with that without getting very specific. He stated certainly before this would go to the bond referendum there would be some changes for sure, but for them to start picking individual roads for specific reasons he thought was a mistake.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. Di Peppe stated the reason he asked was because Mr. Brito called about Sanford Drive which had been paved and widened a month ago. He stated in his opinion some of what Ms. Kirkman was saying reflected some existing circumstances had changed since this was drawn up.

Mr. Howard stated as presented he thought they were recommending the \$16.9 million be spent on those types of conditions without being very specific. He did not know if the document was factual either, the one Ms. Kirkman presented, and he would hesitate and would not want to muddy up what they were trying to accomplish as a county by being that specific at this point in time. That was his only point. He stated he agreed he wanted fire trucks to be able to get to homes that were on fire and he was not saying that was something that was not important to him.

Mr. Rhodes asked if they were to adopt the first of the five items on the list that was handed out on fully funding the projects with bond revenues, would they need to drop about 40% of the projects. They were looking at using some fund sharing and some other items and he just wanted to make sure he understood what that meant. If the total cost of all items were \$30 million and they were looking at using \$17 million of the bond proceeds, if they wanted to do projects only up to the amount of \$17 million would they need to drop about 40% of the projects from the list in order to have only \$16.9 million of total costs of projects.

Ms. Kirkman stated she would be glad to amend her motion to remove that suggestion and make that as a separate motion if that would facilitate it.

Mr. Rhodes stated he had two items and that was one concern he had that it might complicate the number of projects they could do based on the logic of the list. The only other one was they had a big list and any of them would be good and they all were going to make a difference. From a procedural standpoint he would be more inclined if they were looking at substituting because he was good with any improvements on the road so he had no problem with Decatur Road either. But just from a procedural process, since they were pulling all those from that list that had long been identified he would be more inclined towards one they were substituting from there.

Mr. Howard stated that was his point as well.

Ms. Kirkman stated in terms of looking at the Youth Driver Taskforce it was really clear that that was a starting point. If they were going to start pulling off projects, the list they had in front of them was the only clearly defined list. If they went to the Youth Driver Taskforce report there were all kinds of lists but they did not match up against projects. There were different ways of looking at the projects and she assumed that the reason why these projects made it onto the list was because they matched up across several indicators.

Mr. Rhodes stated he thought it was a longer list Fulton would have that they used for when the Transportation Commission tried to work on the first set and so they tried to refine it. He stated she was absolutely correct on the Youth Driver Taskforce, they were just identifying areas to look at further and possibilities and then they tried to put a definition and some degree of fidelity on them when they worked with the Transportation Commission efforts.

Ms. Kirkman stated if it was going to muddy the process she would again be glad to amend her motion to take off the Decatur Road project. She was just concerned that they had houses burning to the ground because the truck cannot get there.

Mr. Di Peppe stated regarding the first bullet to fully fund the projects with bond revenues on the Youth Driver Taskforce projects, he thought the reason that bullet was in there was they wanted as a Commission to make sure those projects that were identified under the Youth Driver Taskforce projects actually got addressed. He was a little concerned that maybe he was not understanding that and he did not want 40% of those projects to disappear.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Ms. Kirkman stated the problem with the \$16.9 million for the bond proceeds was only a portion of the \$30 million that was needed for the projects and the Board was relying heavily on revenue sharing projects which were a competitive process. Although some of these may have been competitive there were no guarantees and she would really like to see these done. What she would suggest in terms of the process was maybe they could make that as a separate recommendation so they did not try to get into the money side of things of figuring out X number of dollars here but that the Board re-examine this to see how they could more fully fund these.

Mr. Fields stated more importantly they had a substitute motion on the floor to move forward on the recommendation of the Youth Driver Taskforce as presented before them. They need to dispose of that motion before they move forward unless someone had a substitute to that substitute which was always possible.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would like to ask Mr. Howard because Ms. Kirkman said that would he be alright with it if she took off that recommendation about Decatur Road. The point was because he did not want to get into specifics telling people where to spend the money.

Mr. Howard asked if it was only Decatur Road or was it the list.

Ms. Kirkman stated she would be willing to amend her first motion to read that they recommend inclusion of every project on the list except for the spot improvement for Brooke Road starting at Raven Road and terminating 0.5 miles east of Raven Road and except for the Sanford Drive project.

Mr. Howard stated because they believe those had been completed.

Mr. Fields stated or would be completed through means other than the bond referendum.

Ms. Kirkman stated that was if she had the opportunity to amend the motion but they had another motion they had to deal with first.

Mr. Howard stated he would withdraw his substitute motion.

Mr. Rhodes agreed.

Ms. Kirkman stated she wished to amend her motion to read that they include all of the projects on the list except for the spot improvement for Brooke Road starting at Raven Road and terminating 0.5 miles east of Raven Road and except for the Sanford Drive project. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Fields asked if they wanted to have a separate motion on the concept of fully funding the projects with bond proceeds.

Ms. Kirkman made a motion that the Planning Commission encourage the Board to re-examine their entire list of projects in order to fully fund the remaining ten projects on the Youth Driver Taskforce with bond referendum monies. She felt like the priority at this point in time to be safety projects. Mrs. Carlone seconded.

Mr. Fields stated this was recommending given the competitive nature of revenue sharing funds and the primary necessity for the safety issues if possible the Planning Commission would say to look at possibly reorganizing the bond proceeds. Remembering that the bond question would be did they want to authorize the county to borrow up to \$70 million. Specific projects were not going to be listed on the question as far as he knew. He stated these were all conceptual in nature. However, it was important to note that projects, when the bond would be articulated and actually placed for referendum and the following information that was directed to be sent to the citizens from the County government by the Board of Supervisors, the inclusion of actual named projects would get peoples' expectations up. While the Youth Driver Taskforce may be a little more abstract, they wanted to be sure to make

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

sure that their recommendation included the Board's necessity to not raise peoples' expectations beyond what was reasonably achievable. He stated they were just trying to say if possible to see if they could fully fund these with bond proceeds.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the implication was so that they get done.

Mr. Rhodes stated he had no problem with anything that was trying to move forward in getting these done. He thought each effort has always built on the other and tried to approach it more effectively and he knew they were trying to find an effective balance and any recommendation to make it the most effective outcome was a positive recommendation.

The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Fields stated they were now coming to the larger road projects that were level of service flow oriented. Safety was always a factor but these were driven specifically by congestion and flow issues.

Ms. Kirkman stated she was going to make a motion that they include these roads with the following changes. She asked for clarification on procedure.

Mr. Fields stated as they did in the last one, he thought rather than make a very long motion he thought it would be perfectly in order for her to make a quick presentation on her thinking and then make the motion rather than make a motion that would go on for ten minutes. He stated not that she was trying to do anything wrong but he thought procedurally present her concept of the flow projects and then make a motion and then they could discuss it.

Ms. Kirkman stated she was going to make a motion to suggest a series of changes and this was based on the transportation work she had been involved in and after having studied various level of service maps and reports and everything else. The first recommendation she like them all to consider was that currently what was proposed on the flow projects was to widen VDOT Route 17 and VDOT Route 610. She agreed that clearly improvements were needed to those sections. They were already operating at levels of service that were problematic, however, she also believed that widening the road was not the answer. Instead, when they would look at those improvements they would really need to look at a different engineering approach to these things. She stated for example, studies had shown that a four-lane limited access highway could accommodate the same level of traffic as a six-lane highway. The reason why she was suggesting that the Board reconsider how they were approaching these improvements was that they will never be able to make these roads wide enough to accommodate the ever increasing demand on those roads. When they looked at the flow maps that were generated from their modeler for 2006 it was clear what was happening, people were coming off of 95 and going west on Garrisonville Road and going west on Route 17. That demand was only going to grow and they could only make those roads so wide. She stated she would make a recommendation that they have that improvement but they look at different kind of improvement. Secondly, she hoped they would consider making it clear that on the improvement to Route 606, Ferry Road, they it would include sidewalks and bicycle paths that were needed in that area.

Mr. Fields stated he did not have any problems personally to include that. He asked Fulton if VDOT built a road nowadays was the bike lane and pedestrian sidewalk part of the process. He stated like with the Cool Spring Road and Deacon Road widening, if they attacked a road widening now, even if to take a two lane with no shoulder to a two lane with shoulder that would trigger the bike path and pedestrian.

Mr. deLamorton stated that was correct.

Mr. Fields stated he did not mind including that in the motion but he felt he was sure in this day and age the pedestrian and bike component was essentially always included as part of the package and that was significant.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Ms. Kirkman stated on the two Route 630 projects, she would recommend changing from a widening to four lanes to a two-lane reconstruction. The Telegraph Road project was added at the very last minute and it was operating at a level of service A right now. The concern was safety improvements. She stated she was at the committee meeting when that was added and it was added at the very last minute. The discussion was around safety improvements but it was really written up as a major reconstruction. She had several concerns about that. There were a lot of houses that sit right on top of the road and they would have to be taken in order to reconstruct the road. What she would rather see was a better assessment done of specific spot safety improvements rather than a blanket reconstruction of the entire road. Lastly, what she would recommend was removing the section of Truslow Road from Cambridge Street to I-95. That was operating at a level of service A right now and instead adding the section of Truslow Road from Berea Church Road to Plantation Drive which was currently operating at a level of service D. She believed that made it a higher priority in terms of reconstructing any portions of Truslow Road. She stated just after having been to these meetings and having done a lot of study of the materials, those were the suggestions she would make.

Mr. Fields asked if she wanted to move that the recommendations on the major road projects be amended with these specific points.

Mr. Rhodes asked if they could discuss them before they make a motion. Telegraph Road sounded like an interesting modification. He was not sure whose areas the Cambridge/Truslow and Truslow/Berea were.

Ms. Kirkman stated from Cambridge Street to I-95 was in the Falmouth district and from Berea Church Road to Plantation Drive was in the Hartwood district.

Mr. Rhodes stated he could not picture that but he knew his reaction to the road widenings and he would not be supportive of that modification. He agreed they could not keep beating growth but there were some areas where they were so far behind that there were just some things they needed to do in addition to looking at other things. He would be strongly towards those widening projects and the others he was not sure he knew enough he needed to know.

Mr. Howard asked if on Telegraph Road was where the new middle school had been built.

Ms. Kirkman stated yes and that was why she was suggesting what they needed was a better assessment of which specific safety improvements were needed on Telegraph Road rather than assuming the cost of millions of dollars that the entire road would need to be reconstructed.

Mr. Howard stated he actually drove that road this evening in anticipation of this perhaps coming up. He did not know how they would get buses... there was an elementary school that was also right off of Telegraph Road and now they were going to have additional buses that would go past the one elementary school where the road really winds and turns. There would need to be some trees taken down before the buses start going there. He thought there was a significant implication there for safety for the children on the school buses in light of the fact that apparently that school was going to open. He stated he was not sure how it got on there as it was not in his geography but wanting to understand it he did drive it. He thought a lot of work and effort had gone into this process up to this point. He thought Mr. Rhodes said it very well earlier that one initiative would feed off of another. He stated he would almost want to defer to Mr. deLamorton to say Warrenton Road, as an example, would there be some engineering done prior to work commencing to see what was the best solution at that particular time. They were making a recommendation that he did not think they were qualified to make. With his experience, he would ask Mr. deLamorton if he could explain when something was earmarked to be re-engineered and it was a road the process that would go into that. He knew VDOT standards actually change and they change because the improved ways to put turn lanes in and improved ways for roads to handle capacity such as level of service might be additional medians which was what Ms. Kirkman was talking about. It was not necessarily they were going to widen it automatically or was it.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Mr. deLamorton stated it was not a systematic decision to widen the road. VDOT did conduct traffic analysis prior to or as part of the preliminary engineering phase. That was underway for the Falmouth intersection as they speak. If they travel on Route 1/Morton Road they would see that the counters were taped down to the road. They did conduct traffic analysis the results of which would yield what type of improvement may solve the issue and where the ramps would be, turn lanes, etc.

Mr. Howard stated he had done a great job bringing forth additional issues on some of the roads but he would hesitate to try to support this as part of the recommendation for the bond referendum without truly having additional information in front of him.

Ms. Kirkman stated the project had been put forward to as specifically a road widening and in every discussion that she had heard there had not been any discussion of alternative engineering. She asked Mr. deLamorton if he could clarify if there had been any discussions about, for instance, doing a limited access road for the first couple of miles of Route 17.

Mr. deLamorton stated he did not know specifically if that had been part of the discussion over the last several years to improve 17 or not. That would be a major, major upgrade and a change in the functional classification and would have major land use implications as well. It would create a lot of land locked parcels that would need to be addressed. Specifically, he did not know if that had been looked at or not.

Ms. Kirkman stated that was her concern, what had actually been put forward to them was a road widening. The reason why she said this was in terms of long term planning. She would hate to see money going into road widening when a couple of years from now they were still going to be in the same spot and if they had a better chance to study it.

Mr. Howard stated he thought someone had studied it. He stated Mrs. Carlone said it best if they travel that road at almost any point from June through September they would see an incredible amount of New York license plates and Pennsylvania license plates did come down off of 29 and 28 which was off of some other road from Pennsylvania to avoid coming through Washington and 95 and he saw the volume increasing tremendously. He did not know if road widening was wrong in that scenario because he did think they were somewhat handicapped at the moment because of the intensity in the level of traffic on there today which he would anticipate to grow.

Mrs. Carlone stated on 17 they had several projects right now that would be adding additional lanes and that would help to a degree. The problem was the bottleneck going on to 95 south. She stated there were a couple of large projects that were going to dedicate part of their land and there were some crossovers. She stated what would improve the flow of traffic on 17 was the on ramp onto 95.

Mr. Howard stated it did appear there was a significant amount of funding available or that could be allocated from non-bond sources for that particular route, Route 17 as well.

Mrs. Carlone stated Berea Church Road was a bear with Truslow in general. It needed to be a parallel road. On Truslow Road there was a terrible curve where the tornado went through and it was extremely bad.

Mr. Fields stated it was a tough call and Ms. Kirkman's intention was that these roads needed improvements. He was reluctant to simply recommend the four lanes or six lanes. He was certainly comfortable recommending wholeheartedly that all these roads identified, Warrenton Road minus and changes with Telegraph and Truslow, agree that they need tremendous improvement. The Board would have to deal with several factors including fiscal constraints and a lot of other factors as well as just planning. From a planning perspective he would hate to see them getting codified that the lane widening was the answer. He thought there was a lot of flow mechanisms and things they do with barriers and right turn only. It was amazing how much more flow they could get out of a road without changing lanes if they would just prohibit left hand turns but accommodate turning at signal lights. He stated those were the kinds of solutions he had seen being used across the country that he had not yet

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

seen being used in Virginia. He knew that Route 5 in Maryland from Waldorf to DC had specific limited access areas. He stated that may do better than plowing up another set of lanes. His personal view as the big picture recommendation as a Planning Commissioner was that they certainly recommend that these roads be included in the bond project but that they try to articulate their support for a very creative and innovative palate of potential solutions rather than just lane widening.

Mr. Howard stated another great example of what he was articulating was Route 123 as they come off of Prince William County and start heading west where they did do both. They widened lanes and added four left-hand turn lanes on one spot and also put medians in. For about a two or three mile stretch after one big left turn there were no more left turns. He agreed with Mr. Fields wholeheartedly that just widening the road was not the answer.

Mr. Fields stated Route 123 and the Fairfax County Parkway were fairly impressive.

Mr. Di Peppe stated when they sent this they were saying to the Planning Commission what did they think. He welcomed these kinds of recommendations because as a Planning Commission they were saying this was what they were proposing, this was what they were thinking about what they were proposing and these were ways they might be able to improve those proposals. He wanted to reiterate that often times widening roads just get them wider parking lots.

Mr. Rhodes stated but to also assume that those other things were not being incorporated in these projects was not necessarily correct either.

Ms. Kirkman stated they had not heard that those had not been considered yet.

Mr. Rhodes stated he would only add that when they had a truly Comprehensive Plan for the improvement of the roads it was much easier to take all those things into consideration. This was such a drop in the bucket and he looked at the areas they were talking about widening and they could widen it in a smart way but for that mile or two or other he thought they also needed the capacity for where they were at.

Ms. Kirkman made a motion to move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they include Route 17, Route 630 and Route 610 projects improvements with a strong recommendation that they explore a range of alternatives for improving those other than widening or in addition to widening, recommend that they include Route 606, the Ferry Road project as described on the list, recommend that they change the project on Telegraph Road, Route 637, to spot safety improvements based on an assessment of the road conditions, and recommend that the Board remove the Truslow Road project from Cambridge Street to I-95 and instead do Truslow Road from Berea Church Road to Plantation Drive. Mrs. Carlone seconded.

Mr. Rhodes stated for clarification it could be that a portion of those spot safety improvements were a degree of two lane reconstruction.

Ms. Kirkman stated she was sure it included sections of realignments of the two lane road but the way the project was described now it was a reconstruction of the entire segment.

Mr. Rhodes stated to clarify what he heard from that was in reinforcement of the concept of making sure they were looking broadly, though it may be a portion or significant portion of just total reconstruction as stated there but they did not want to be locked into only considering that.

Ms. Kirkman stated it needed to be done based on assessment of what the safety needs were which was not done when this was put on.

Mr. Rhodes stated what he heard on the strong endorsement of looking at all the alternatives would not necessarily say they were recommending clearly that they should not widen those roads, it was just that they look strongly at the whole range of them.

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

Ms. Kirkman stated it was saying they were recommending widening or not widening, that there were improvements needed and that they explore a range of options.

Mr. Howard stated to add to the discussion on Telegraph Road it was really dangerous to have a school bus travel past where they did today to go up to the middle school. If they had not driven the road, he suggested they do it and they would get a good perspective of how dangerous that would be with a school bus filled with children. He absolutely could not support moving forward if they were not going to do some safety improvement to Telegraph Road for that particular reason. He was certainly not a proponent of taking anybody's property under any circumstance but he understood that that could be a possibility based on some of the safety requirements. The county put a school there, the county was required to take the appropriate steps necessary to make sure the children arrive at that school safely and they could argue with the school location, which he did, but it was there, it was built, they own it and they were going to occupy it. That road was not a road they wanted to bring school buses on right now. He would recommend everybody, including those listening, to take a ride down that road and they would understand it. He liked the way Mr. Rhodes clarified it and it was in that spirit that he was going to cast his vote for this.

Mr. Rhodes asked about Truslow Road and whose district it was in.

Mr. Di Peppe stated it was in his district.

Ms. Kirkman stated it currently functioned at a level of service A and the other section of Truslow Road functioned as a level of service D.

Mr. Di Peppe stated that seemed like a very common sense change to make and he would say to put the money where it was needed the most.

Mr. Rhodes stated with this they would be recommending that they consider changing that project to the other section.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the other section was a much more dangerous part of the road and a much greater need.

The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Fields asked if any Commissioner at this point had any more comments they wanted to make about the Transportation Bond in general, the projects or recommendations. Again, this was advisory so all of their opinions needed to be out on the table.

Mr. Rhodes stated he would just like to commend the committee on their work on this effort. It was desperately needed in the county at this stage they were at to start working on these tools while they were working on many other facets but this was a critical aspect of it.

Mr. Fields agreed this was a lot of good work on everybody's part.

Ms. Kirkman stated she had a further comment on a broader issue related to the bonds that she would like to make. Their responsibility and their charge was to provide recommendations regarding the projects that were sent to them by the Board of Supervisors and the work she did on this and her motions reflected doing her due diligence to meet that responsibility. Having said that she wanted to be clear that her motions were only a comment on the proposed plan. They were in no way an endorsement on the bond itself. In terms with that respect, she really thought this was the wrong time to be asking taxpayers to ante up \$70 million for large road projects. People were really hurting out there and the last thing they needed was a big property tax hike to pay for these road projects. Until they did a better job of managing growth and they had seen some reluctance by a majority of the Board to do that she thought they should really be focusing on spending their taxpayer dollars on high priority

Planning Commission Minutes

June 25, 2008

safety projects that were low in cost and could have an immediate and safe impact and that was why she fully supported the Youth Driver Taskforce component of the bond.

Mr. Rhodes stated he would reinforce that while some of the projects were for flow they would have a significant improvement on safety as well. He did not disagree that they were challenging times but certainly cash was not all needed at once and they would be done incrementally for the funds to be received and so that would spread this out over a period of time.

Mr. Howard stated he would like to thank the committee who did the work on this and also the Board of Supervisors who were able to get this to a concise package that was comprehensive. He thought at this point they would make some of the changes that Ms. Kirkman just mentioned in terms of low hanging fruit, big improvements in a safe way to improve congestion and long overdue in the county. He was looking forward to better roads that were safer and could hold more capacity.

Mr. Fields stated he would like to add that he agreed they had done the task set before them. He thought his request to the Board of Supervisors and this Planning Commission and all citizens would be to support and also think about the commensurate land use changes and land use decisions that needed to be made that truly were the key component to the transportation future of this county. It was far more significant to develop the tools and implement the tools to manage their future land use patterns so they were not faced in the future with the constant series of needs to go to general obligation bonds for transportation. He stated everybody was trying to do the best they could to come up with a solution but the idea of having to spend Stafford money on the state's road system because the state had failed miserably to live up to its obligation to build its roads was not a pleasant position for any of them to be in. It needed to be clear to the public from many levels and anybody involved that they were all attempting to make the best of a very bad situation. They had been dealt a hand that was not really equitable to the citizens. He did not think they should ever forget that this Transportation Bond was couched in an act of sheer desperation and it was not what they should be having to consider. That was not a criticism of the work that the Board did, they were all just trying to make the best of a bad situation.

Ms. Kirkman stated she had one item before they adjourn. They had originally voted to cancel their second meeting in July and their first meeting in August. Since they had now scheduled a meeting for the second time in July she would like to suggest to the Planning Commission they cancel their second meeting in August so they would have the first and second meeting in July and August off unless there was some pressing matter that staff was aware of.

Mr. Harvey stated he was not aware of any pressing matters unless something would come up from the Board.

Mr. Fields stated there was always a possibility they would have to call a meeting anyway under those cancelled terms. This was simply scheduling a four week break all during the month of August.

Mr. Howard stated he actually agreed with Ms. Kirkman.

Ms. Kirkman made a motion to cancel both meetings in August. Mr. Howard seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

SECRETARY'S REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Planning Commission Minutes
June 25, 2008

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:46 p.m.

Peter Fields, Chairman
Planning Commission