

## ENGINEERING STANDARDS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: December 7, 2017

Time: 2:00 P.M.

Location: Herrity Building, Room #604  
 12055 Government Center Parkway  
 Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5503

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE						
	PRESENT	ABSENT	NAME	REPRESENTING	VOTING (V)	NON-VOTING (N)
1.	x		Theodore Britt	Virginia Society of Professional Engineers, Northern Virginia Regional Council	V	
2.	x		James Clark	Heavy Construction Contractors Association	V	
3.		X	Bill Ewing	Citizen at Large	V	
4.	x		Maya Huber	Citizen's Committee on Land Use & Transportation	V	
5.	X		Paul Johnson	Northern Virginia Building Industry Association, <b>CHAIR</b>	V	
6.	x		Michael Kitchen	National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, Northern VA	V	
7.	x		Robert Kohnke	Northern Virginia Soil & Water Conservation District	V	
8.		x	Bryan Layman	Associated Builders and Contractors, VA	V	
9.	x		Mark Liberati	Virginia Association of Surveyors, Mount Vernon Chapter, <b>SECRETARY</b>	V	
10.		x	Robert Meredith	League of Women Voters	V	
11.	x		Dr. Robert Norwood	Citizen at Large	V	
12.	x		Paul Noursi	Citizen at Large	V	
13.	x		Ned Poffenberger	Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations	V	
14.	x		Robert Scheller	Washington Area Council of Engineering Laboratories	V	

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE						
	PRESENT	ABSENT	NAME	REPRESENTING	VOTING (V)	NON-VOTING (N)
15.	x		Keith Sinclair	Engineers & Surveyors Institute, <b>VICE CHAIR</b>	V	
16.		x	Bruce Titus	Fairfax County Bar Association	V	
17.	x		Chad Crawford	Department of Public Works & Environmental Services, Maintenance & Stormwater Management Division	N	
18.	x		John Matusik	Land Development Services (LDS), <b>TECHNICAL ADVISOR/ADMINISTRATOR</b>	N	
19.	x		Saundra O'connell	Department of Planning & Zoning	N	
20.	x		Kevin Nelson	Virginia Department of Transportation	N	

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE		
	NAME	REPRESENTING
	Ellie Coddling	Director, Code Development and Compliance, LDS
	Danielle Badra	Technical Writer, SCRD, CDCD, LDS
	Thakur Dhakal	Engineer IV, SCRD, CDCD, LDS

1. **Information Distributed.** The following information was made available for the meeting on December 7, 2017:

- the meeting agenda for December 7, 2017
- the draft meeting minutes of September 7, 2017
- Power Point: An Update on Adding Flexibility to the PFM
- Power Point: Summary of Proposed Formatting Changes to the PFM
- Handout: PFM Flex Project Themes & Ways to be Involved
- Minor Site Plan Amendment: Overview of Editorial (reformat text) Changes, & Increased Thresholds

2. **Administrative Items.**

- The meeting minutes from September 7, 2017, were approved.

### **3. An Update on Adding Flexibility to the PFM**

John Matusik, SCRD, presented the PowerPoint “An Update on Adding Flexibility to the PFM.” Highlights of the PowerPoint and PFM initiative are below.

#### **Background Information:**

- An initiative to implement tactical recommendations to improve the speed, consistency, and predictability of the county’s review process, i.e., align with Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan to Facilitate the Economic Success of Fairfax County.

#### **Why Add and What Is Flexibility:**

- “The Public Facilities Manual (PFM) should be a design guide that is consistent and meets the language of the law while providing flexibility for engineering judgment, particularly with regard to new technology and new development situations.
  - In other words, flexibility will be applied in targeted situations such as innovative and urban standards. Not all PFM provisions are flexible.
- The term “flexibility” as it is intended for use in the PFM Flex Project is defined as:
  - The ability to target selective provisions; NOT broad or general.
  - The ability to modify text to respond to altered circumstances or conditions; allowing alternative designs that meet the intent.
  - According to Gartner, “Flexibility” means, “adding the qualities of agility, ease of use, and consistency to the PFM.”
  - Ensuring relevance to respond to evolving and urbanizing development patterns.

#### **Themes of PFM Flexibility Project:**

##### 1. Clarity

- Add tables/diagrams to simplify complex information.
- Add indented outline formatting.
- Update outdated cover art.
- Update/remove the index.
- Remove outdated/extraneous text and redundancies; remove outdated provisions and plates.

##### 2. Interactivity

- Add applicability section; update foreword/introduction.
- Update definitions and move into first section.
- Add internal and external hyperlinks.
- Incorporate information by reference to other codes as the source of regulation (VDOT, ZO, subdivision ordinance, CBPO, etc.)

##### 3. Adaptability

- Minimize mandatory requirements by changing “Shall” to “Should,” where appropriate.
- Allow LDS Director to waive/modify “shall,” in unusual cases; Allow LDS Director to add to or update non-technical provisions and plates that do not require legislative action.
- Expand use of alternatives to design standards.

#### 4. Urban

- Eliminate the need for Service Drive Waivers in areas where design guidelines do not call for them.
- Update the PFM to align with VDOT standards, such as the urban design guidelines and multimodal standards.
- Consistency between VDOT Road Design Manual and PFM.

#### 5. Innovative

- Allow for innovative practices.
- Allow the use of emerging technology to address specific challenges in land development.
- Expand the use of urban standards and practices, and be consistent with the Board endorsed guidelines in CRAs/CRDs; consider how to allow them in the rest of the county.

#### **Stakeholder Engagement Process:**

- External Stakeholder Committee- Industry representatives.
- Internal County Advisory Committees- Technical, Policy, Innovative, Steering.
- Industry Partners- ESRC, NVBIA/NAIOP, ESI.
- Additional County Outreach- Land Use Aides, SDID, CTSC, BD, Fairfax First Blog.
- Public Outreach- Public website, feedback form, meeting minutes, PowerPoints, email address, zMOD Citizen Advisory Group

#### **Next Steps & Schedule:**

- Public Website
- Future State Roadmap
- Amendment Development Process
- Required Amendment Vetting Process
- Public Hearing Process

A question was posed to explain the term “interactive.” Interactive, as is addressed in the themes handout, “influencing each other, involving the actions or input of a user; user-friendly.” It was explained that “interactive” essentially means “user-friendly” and that the main goal there was to make the PFM more easily navigable.

A question was posed to ask if links to definitions would be included in the PFM. It was explained that links to new definitions will be a priority 2 item, but links to current definitions in the PFM will be a priority 1 item.

A question was posed to ask “what is innovative?” An explanation and discussion of what is and what is not considered innovative developed. This is an area that will likely receive feedback in the future and should be considered further.

A suggestion was made to add to the themes handout definition of urban something related to re-development, not just development. Proposed new text would read, “Creating a unified county approach to developing and re-developing districts and areas of the county to meet urban standards and practices.”

A question was posed as to whether these slides could be emailed to the ESRC. The response was to redirect attention to the Themes Handout where the PFM website link and email address could be located. Also, advice was given to google “Fairfax County PFM” to reach the website. ESRC was advised that this PowerPoint and the Formatting PowerPoint are available on the PFM website.

A question was posed, “Why isn’t the PP Pipe Innovative?” This resulted in a return to the question of “what is innovative?” Same results, further consideration is needed.

A question was posed, “What is the timeline for completion?” The response, as was briefly touched on in the final slides of the PowerPoint, is approximately December 2018/January 2019.

Any questions should be directed to John Matusik at [John.Matusik@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:John.Matusik@fairfaxcounty.gov).

#### **4. Summary of Proposed Formatting Changes to the PFM**

Danielle Badra, SCRD, presented the PowerPoint “Summary of Proposed Formatting Changes to the PFM.” Highlights of the PowerPoint and PFM initiative are below.

##### **Suggested Formatting & Layout Changes to the PFM are as follows:**

- Adopt an indented outline.
- Incorporate hyperlinks.
- Maintain hyperlinks, annotations, interpretations, and versioning.
- Update the cover art.
- Remove the index and the appendix.
- Move equations/code reference table to PDFs accessible via the PFM webpage.
- Update the definitions and move to the first chapter.
- Update the foreword/introduction.
- Include an applicability section in the first chapter.

A suggestion was made to make a PDF option available of the PFM website that would include the entire PFM, rather than having separate PDF chapters to click through (the way it is currently set up). Also, a suggestion was made to color-code the internal versus external hyperlinks so that these are easily distinguishable.

A question was asked regarding the index, however, it was determined that the question mostly related to the Table of Contents. It was resolved that the index would be removed from the PFM because internal navigation devices are replacing it, such as searches and hyperlinks. The Table of Contents will remain and will have more interactive features making it more user-friendly.

Any questions should be directed to Danielle Badra at [Danielle.Badra@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:Danielle.Badra@fairfaxcounty.gov).

## **5. Minor Site Plan Amendment: Overview of Editorial Changes & Increased Thresholds**

Thakur Dhakal, SCRD, presented a PowerPoint slide “Site Plans/Minor Site Plans Exemption.” Highlights of the PowerPoint slide and PFM initiative are below.

### **Proposed Amendment to ZO Article 17-104, Para. 16:**

- Increased the allowable disturbed area and Gross Floor Area (GFA) to be considered exempt from requiring a site plan/minor site plan.
- Reorganizes text for clarity.

### **Regulatory Impact**

- Expedites the land development process by expanding the exemptions for site plans/minor site plans:
  - 250 square feet (sq. ft.) disturbed area to 2,500 sq. ft. disturbed area.
  - 250 sq. ft. GFA to 500 sq. ft. GFA
  - 500 sq. ft. GFA to 750 sq. ft. GFA for alterations to provide accessibility improvements.

A point was made that the definition of land disturbance should be clearly identified. Different interpretations exist between E&S and SWM definitions of land disturbance. It was clarified that the specific type of land disturbance was identified by the specific section the amendment relates to. Another point was made that the amendment should align with other ordinances regarding the 2500 square feet.

Any questions should be directed to Thakur Dhakal at [Thakur.Dhakal@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:Thakur.Dhakal@fairfaxcounty.gov).

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:06 p.m.

Mark Liberati, ESRC Secretary

---

by John Matusik  
Acting ESRC Technical Advisor/Administrator