



Land Development Services

Technical Bulletin

Subject: Designated Plans Examiner (DPE) Second
Submission Procedure in ProjectDox

Date: 4/29/22

No.: 22-02

Summary: This technical bulletin documents and clarifies the current procedures for the second submissions of Designated Plans Examiner (DPE) ePlans in Fairfax County. No changes to the current process are being introduced, though this document is intended to reduce any process inconsistencies, so please review it when submitting.

Effective Date: Immediately

Expiration Date: Policies related to [ProjectDox](#) in this technical bulletin will expire with the retirement of the ProjectDox system once the Fairfax County [Planning and Land Use System \(PLUS\)](#) launches this fall.

Background: Fairfax County offers expedited plan review as described in Chapter 117 of the County Code in partnership with the Engineers and Surveyors Institute (ESI). More information about the program can be found at <https://esinova.org/jurisdictions/fairfax-county/>. The ESI Technical Bulletin, “Fairfax County’s Expedited Site and Subdivision Plan Review Process” dated September 9, 2018, defined the steps associated with the submission and approval of DPE plans in Fairfax County. That document was created before digital plan submittal and review. The subsequent ESI Technical Bulletin “Interim Procedure for Fairfax County DPE ePlans Submission of Site Plans, Site Plan Revisions, Minor Site Plans and Minor Site Plan Revisions” clarified how to complete some of the DPE process steps while working with Fairfax County ePlans. Now that all major site plans are submitted and reviewed digitally through ProjectDox, there is a need to streamline and summarize the DPE second submission procedure to ensure expedited review. This policy complements ESI policies and provides guidance on how the DPE process is followed in our ProjectDox platform.

Procedure:

Before the second submission of a DPE plan in ProjectDox:

1. The applicant (hereinafter “engineer”) completes the “Applicant Response” column in the Changemark Report. This action serves as the comment response letter (CRL). Separate letters are not a replacement for completing the “Applicant Response” column in ProjectDox. Engineers must:
 - Provide a detailed response to each review comment (including outside agency comments), describing how each review comment will be satisfied.
 - Identify comments/responses to be discussed at the Post-Submission Conference (PSC). Replying “To be discussed,” without any further explanation, is not an acceptable complete response. Provide detailed responses

on how comments are intended to be addressed. If the comments require clarification, state that with detailed questions in the applicant response.

Once all responses are complete, the engineer requests a PSC by submitting a [Meeting Request for Site-Related Plans](#). The same form can be found on our [Meet with Staff](#) page.

In the “Meeting Request” form, under “Description of Project,” provide a brief description of the project and identify any design changes that occurred after the first submission.

- Attach supporting documents such as exhibits, sketches, narratives, letters, etc.
- The first desired meeting date must be **at least three business days** after request submittal to provide time for the staff to prepare for and arrange the meeting.

Requesting a PSC via email is not acceptable for DPE plans.

Outside agency approvals and responses to outside agency comments can be in progress while the PSC is scheduled and conducted.

2. The site reviewer schedules the PSC after receiving the request.
3. In preparation for the PSC, reviewers evaluate all responses and may identify additional comments to be discussed at the PSC.
4. At the PSC:
 - The engineer and reviewers discuss the comments/responses and reach agreement on how those comments will be addressed on the second submission plan.
 - The second submission review time is decided.
 - It is determined whether a pre-second submission meeting is required.
5. The engineer, **within five business days** after the PSC, must:
 - Update the Changemark Report responses by adding the “Resolution” that was agreed to at the PSC within the “Applicant Response” field in ProjectDox. The resolution is in addition to the initial responses to the comments that were discussed. The resolution responses serve as the “PSC Meeting Minutes.” Please see the following example of an applicant response to a Changemark.

Example Changemark Response & Resolution Formatting after PSC:

| Changemark: | Applicant Response: |
|--|--|
| Provide two benchmarks with descriptions outside of the limits of disturbance. (PFM 2-0208.11) | <p><u>Initial response:</u> Two benchmarks have been provided and descriptions have been included. TO BE DISCUSSED.</p> <p><u>Resolution:</u> Both benchmarks shall be outside of the limits of disturbance.</p> <p><u>Final response:</u> <i>(this will be filled in prior to resubmission of the plan)</i></p> |

- Notify the site reviewer by email that the resolutions have been added to the Changemark Report and are ready for review. In the notification, the engineer must state the agreed upon second submission review time and whether a pre-second submission meeting is required.
 - It is not required to submit a separate document of changemarks and responses. Responses within ProjectDox replace separate reports.
6. The site reviewer verifies if the resolutions in the “Applicant Response” correctly reflect what was agreed upon and responds **within five business days** after the receipt of meeting minutes, with comments or acceptance of the meeting minutes.
 7. The engineer uploads the acceptance email in the “Documents” folder in ProjectDox.
 8. Following the PSC: If agreed upon in the PSC, the engineer schedules a pre-second submission conference before the resubmission of the plan to the county.

Using the “Meeting Request for Site-Related Plans” is strongly encouraged but not mandatory for this meeting. The engineer should update the Changemark Report by adding the Final Responses to Changemarks discussed and notify the reviewer at least three business days prior to the meeting.

The purpose of any additional pre-second submission conference is to:

- Quickly familiarize the site reviewer with changes on the final plan, and
 - Reach consensus with county staff that the plan can be resubmitted, and review can occur within the agreed upon timeframe.
9. The engineer finalizes the Changemark Report:

Comments that were discussed at the pre-second submission conference should have the “Initial Response,” a “Resolution” and a “Final Response” as in the example above.
 10. The engineer verifies that all outside agency approvals have been entered in the Discussion Board. The second submission of a DPE plan can occur only after approval from all involved outside agencies are on the Discussion Board. Copies of cover sheets signed by the outside agencies are not required for ePlans.

- The engineer must make sure that any design changes that might have impact on outside agency initial approval is reviewed and approved by the applicable agency.
 - The agency will update the “Discussion Board” in ProjectDox with the new date of approval.
11. The engineer updates the “Certificate of No Change” on the cover sheet with the outside agency final approval date.
 12. Ancillary agency (e.g., Fairfax County Department of Transportation, Fairfax County Park Authority, Department of Planning and Development, Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District, etc.) review comments that are provided separately to the engineer may be repeated by the site reviewer as Changemarks.

The engineer should provide responses to ancillary agency review memos or emails prior to plan resubmission. Provide these separately uploaded in the ProjectDox “Documents” folder.

Proffer related requirements must be resolved to the satisfaction of ancillary review agencies when they are responsible for verifying proffer compliance. See the Proffer Compliance Matrix for information about what staff are responsible for reviewing specific proffers.
 13. Resubmit the plan into ProjectDox. LDS Site Application Center distributes the resubmitted plan to ESI for DPE review before review agencies. Note that this is a change from prior procedure for paper plans where ESI review occurred prior to submission to Fairfax County.

If you have any questions, please contact Kati Bárczay, PE, in the Site Development and Inspections Division (SDID) at katalin.barczay@fairfaxcounty.gov or 703-324-1720, TTY 711.

Approved by: Matthew Hansen, PE, Director
Site Development and Inspections Division
Department of Land Development Services
12055 Government Center Parkway
(703) 324-2268, TTY 711