

Planning Commission Meeting
March 21, 2012
Verbatim Excerpt

FY 2013-2017 FAIRFAX COUNTY ADVERTISED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(CIP) (W/ FUTURE FISCAL YEARS TO 2022)

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing held on March 8, 2012)

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have a decision only tonight regarding the County's Advertised Capital Improvement Program. Sir, this year's CIP outlines the County's five-year road map covering Fiscal Years 2013 through 2017, with future Fiscal Years to 2022. The CIP serves as a planning instrument identifying needed capital projects and to coordinate the financing and timing of improvements in a way that maximizes the return to the public. This year's review of the CIP is tempered by the ongoing financial environment facing both the local and national economies. With this in mind, the Planning Commission kicked off the review of the CIP by hosting a workshop on Thursday, March 1st. This workshop afforded the Commission the opportunity to hear first-hand from County agencies about their specific CIP-related needs and issues. We heard from nine agencies about projects that are either under construction or planned for the future. The presenting agencies included the Schools, Parks, Fire and Rescue, Police, the Community Services Board, Libraries, Transportation, Waste Water, and Stormwater. The second step in the review of the CIP process was conducted on March 8th, when the Planning Commission held its CIP public hearing to solicit feedback from residents of the County. We had one speaker who testified. His testimony focused on the funding needs of the Park Authority. On March 14th, the Planning Commission undertook the third step in our process by hosting a committee meeting of the CIP to permit Planning Commissioners to ask questions and clarify the status of projects within this year's program. As always, we've had tremendous support from staff during our consideration of the Capital Improvement Program. In particular, I'd like to thank Martha Reed, our CIP Coordinator, and Joe LaHait, the Debt Coordinator, with the County's Department of Management and Budget. In addition, I'd like to thank Teresa Lepe, with the Department of Public Works Building and Design Division. I know my fellow Planning Commissioners also appreciate the time and effort of the representatives of the nine County agencies who made presentations and answered Commissioners' questions during the March 1st workshop. All three public sessions were very helpful and, as you'll hear in just a moment, the discussions contributed to a Planning Commission recommendation regarding the Park Authority. With this background in mind, I'd like to make the following two motions regarding the CIP. 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 2013 THROUGH 2017, WITH FUTURE FISCAL YEARS TO 2022.

Commissioner Alcorn: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Alcorn. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to endorse the recommendations in the CIP and forward those recommendations to the Board for budget consideration, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I further MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AN INCREASE TO THE PROPOSED \$38 MILLION BOND REFERENDUM FOR THE COUNTY PARK AUTHORITY TO BE DESIGNATED FOR LAND ACQUISITION. THIS INCREASE SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO ADHERENCE TO THE COUNTY'S PRINCIPLES OF SOUND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND DEBT CAPACITY RATIOS.

Commissioner de la Fe: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. de la Fe. Is there a discussion of the motion? I have - I have discussion of this motion. When this motion surfaced in committee - and I do want to say parenthetically that as a member of the Committee I was not here for the public hearing, but I did watch it, so I intended to vote, which I did. I abstained on this motion on the increase for funding for the Park Authority. I'm going to support the motion tonight, but I have to say a few things that I hope get forwarded to the Park Authority Board. The Park Authority Board has - - was at one time - members of the Telecommunications Task Force, which is a Countywide task force, to develop a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a Zoning Ordinance to deal with the placement of telecommunications facilities in Fairfax County. And that was back in the late 80's, early 90's. And since then things have grown immeasurably and the demand for adequate telecommunications facilities in the County has grown, immeasurably. However, the Park Authority and the Park Authority Board continuously vote on recommendations to put monopolies on Park Authority land or to put crowns, telecommunication devices on VEPCO Power transmission poles that happen to be on Park Authority easements or easements owned by the Park Authority - - to come out with a policy that states that the Park Authority land is the land of last resort, when in our Comprehensive Plan it says that government property should be considered first and should be the logical placement for these monopolies. I am not saying - and I want it perfectly clear - that every application that comes in for a monopoly on Park land or a monopoly on a VEPCO Power line which is an easement that's owned by the Park Authority should be approved. What I'm saying is the Park Authority should join us in the 21st century and read the EDA report that says Fairfax County wants to attract business. And one of the things that attracts business to this County is to have a comprehensive network of telecommunications. The Park Authority Board's ruling on this policy as the last resort is in contradiction to the Policy Plan of this County. And I would hope that that Board finally steps up to the plate, addresses this in a realistic way, and realizes that they should be in sync with the County's Comprehensive Plan and the Policy Plan. Is there further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion as articulated by Mr. Sargeant, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

//

(The motions carried unanimously with Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

JN