

MARKUP FOR FAIRFAX COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FY 2017
– 2021 (With Future Fiscal Years to 2026)

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing and Workshop held on March 3, 2016)

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some narrative and several motions that I'd like to read. Before we go, I have a second and then a discussion, if that would be all right. The Fiscal Year 2017 to 2021 Capital Improvement Program serves as a planning instrument to identify needed capital projects and to coordinate the financing and timing of these improvements. With this in mind, the Planning Commission kicked off the review of the CIP by hosting a workshop on Wednesday, March 3rd. The Commission had the opportunity to hear from 12 speakers about CIP projects and also held a public hearing that night to solicit feedback from residents of the County. On March 9th, the Planning Commission hosted a committee meeting about the CIP program to provide an opportunity for Planning Commissioners to ask questions and clarify the status of projects within this year's program. With this background in mind, Mr. Chairman, I'd now like to make a series of motions regarding the CIP. To begin, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE ADVERTISED FAIRFAX COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2021, WITH FUTURE FISCAL YEARS TO 2026. I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES TO INCREASING THE ATHLETIC SERVICE FEE, AS PROPOSED IN THE 2017 ADVERTISED BUDGET PLAN. The athletic services fee is proposed to be increased from \$5.50 to \$9.50 per participant per season and from \$15 to \$25 per team per tournament for rectangular field users. Planning Commission members have expressed concern regarding this increase and recommend the alternative options be considered. In addition, the Planning Commission notes that medical studies have been inconclusive with regard to the health impacts from the use of crumb rubber on synthetic turf fields. However, there are increasing concerns regarding the possible health and environmental effects. The Planning Commission recognizes that there is a coordinated federal government study scheduled to examine this issue, but this may take time. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT COUNTY STAFF REVIEW THE LONG-TERM FINANCIAL AND RISK IMPLICATIONS OF THE USE OF CRUMB RUBBER ON SYNTHETIC TURF FIELDS, SHOULD FUTURE HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS CONCLUDE THAT THE USE OF CRUMB RUBBER ON SYNTHETIC TURF FIELDS IS HARMFUL TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND/OR THE ENVIRONMENT. In addition, the Planning Commission had a number of questions related to the School Board's CIP, indicating a need for further understanding about the long-term formula used to determine school capacity requirements and the implication of this formula on both future and existing school sites. The Planning Commission would like to see – have further discussion and discuss the definition of capacity and how it influences CIP decision-making in the future. And the Planning Commission shares and supports the goal of providing excellent school facilities for residents and would like to provide sound recommendations regarding long-term planning. Therefore, I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS STAFF MEET WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S SCHOOLS

COMMITTEE IN ADVANCE OF NEXT YEAR'S CIP WORKSHOP. And finally, while the Planning Commission supports the Human Services' top priority projects, including the shelters and community centers proposed for the 2016 Bond Referendum, it also recognizes the need for renovation and/or expansion of the CSB's residential treatment facilities. There are currently more than 100 individuals on the waiting lists for these facilities. The Planning Commission appreciates the plans for renovating these facilities in the future. However, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ENCOURAGE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO EXPLORE OPTIONS TO SUPPORT INTERIM OUTPATIENT SERVICES TO ASSIST WITH THE WAITING LIST AND THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR RESIDENTIAL SERVICES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Migliaccio: I second his motion, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Strandlie: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioner Migliaccio and – I'm sorry – Ms. Strandlie. Let's see, do we have any discussion? Yes.

Commissioner Hurley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support the motion, but with three specific comments. First, I understand the need for school renovations, but I question keeping in the CIP planning and construction of school in areas in which current data show no significant projected overcrowding. Second, the definition of "overcapacity schools" may become a critical issue if the new proffer law is interpreted to mean new housing will only provide school proffers if local schools are overcrowded. And third – and perhaps, most critically – additional data from the Community Services Board indicates 102 people are currently on the wait list for inpatient treatment and, I quote, "in Fiscal Year 2015, three people died who are on the waiting list for services and one experienced a serious suicide attempt," end of quote. But to me, these numbers indicate an urgent need for additional CSB residential treatment facilities. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay, thank you. And Commissioner Strandlie?

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you very much. I concur with Commissioner Hurley's comments regarding the school capacity. This has been a very challenging and complex conversation. We don't feel that we have quite the exact answers that we are looking for and I'm looking very much forward to having a conversation with the Schools Committee. I would like to ask Commissioner Sargeant if he would be open to a FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO SAY, "RECOMMEND THAT THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL STAFF AND SCHOOL BOARD REPRESENTATIVES MEET WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S SCHOOL COMMITTEE IN ADVANCE OF NEXT YEAR'S CIP WORKSHOP."

Commissioner Sargeant: I AM CERTAINLY OPEN TO THAT. The meetings are public anyways so they're more than welcome.

Commissioner Strandlie: Great. Thank you. Well we – you know, we'd like to-

Commissioner Sargeant: Absolutely.

Commissioner Strandlie: -give them a personal invitation-

Commissioner Sargeant: They are more than welcome.

Commissioner Strandlie: -and hope that they – they are able to attend. And I also appreciate the effort on the crumb rubber. I've expressed strong concerns about both the health – the unknown health effects, the environmental effects, and the fact that parents have expressed to me – whose children play significant amounts of time on these fields – that they don't really like them anyway. So I appreciate your effort in this regard and I support all the work. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Commissioner Keys-Gamarra.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Yes. Well first of all, I'd like to thank Commissioner Sargeant for putting together such a detailed motion. I did want to speak specifically with respect to the school capacity requirements and the concerns that we had, with respect to the differences between the numbers that were provided last year, as opposed to this year. And I think that the public expects us to have sufficient information and make decisions and I don't believe that that was provided, despite the fact that questions were submitted. So I look forward to having a discussion so that we can meaningfully participate in this process.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Anyone else? Mr. Migliaccio.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say that I share the concerns of my fellow Commissioners that were stated just a few minutes ago. The Planning Commission asks, in our due diligence, simple questions of many agencies. All but one gave adequate answers. It is frustrating to hear Mr. Sargeant need to ask and recommend that the Fairfax County Public Schools and – now with Ms. Strandlie – the School Board meet with the Planning Commission's School Committee next year to get answers. An entity that receives more than 50 percent of the County budget and spends hundreds of millions in capital expenditures should be more responsive. It is not an us versus them. We should be collaborative in our effort on this and I wish that they would come to the table a little bit sooner so we can have all the information we need to make an educated vote and decision. Thank you.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you. I agree largely with the comments of my colleagues. My perspective is that on matters of policy concerning the schools, we ought, generally, to defer to the elected School Board representatives. At the same time, our function in making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on the Capital Improvement Program depends on our independent analysis of what's been given to us about money that's going to be spent over the next several years. And I think this year, compared to prior years, was one filled with question marks – and questions that, I think, were not clearly answered in a way that gives me confidence in where we're going with this. I hope that these comments are received by the people that need to receive them and that, in that spirit, we would get more comprehensive

information for next year that I think would support the numbers that are requested, rather than necessarily expecting us to just take their word for it. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Thank you. Anybody else? Okay. Is there any further discussion? Hearing and seeing none-

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: -the motion – yes?

Commissioner Flanagan: I didn't attend the public hearing or the Committee meetings so I'm going to be abstaining. But I would like to endorse some of the comments – particularly Commissioner Hurley because what she's talking about is good planning. In other words, we're not interfering in the operation of the school system or the decisions that they make in their – in scholastic issues. But I think that the concerns that I heard expressed here are suitable for the Planning Commission to be concerned about.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Thank you. Any further discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor of the – let's vote on all of them together – the motions – the various motions made by Commissioner Sargeant. Seconded by Commissioner Strandlie with the-

Commissioner Migliaccio: I seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: -with the friendly amendment that – and the one that recommends that the Fairfax County Public School staff and members of the School Board-

Commissioner Hart: Migliaccio seconded.

Commissioner Migliaccio: And I second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: I said that seconded too. Okay you – so it's been accepted as a friendly amendment. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? The motion carries. Thank you very much.

//

(Each motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Flanagan abstained from the vote. Commissioner Murphy was absent from the meeting.)

JLC