

ENGINEERING STANDARDS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: May 3, 2018

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, CHAIR	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, SECRETARY	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, VICE CHAIR	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), TECHNICAL ADVISOR/ADMINISTRATOR	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
x	Danielle Badra	Technical Writer, SCRCD, CDCD, LDS
x	Don Lacquement	Engineer IV, SCRCD, CDCD, LDS
x	Jan Leavitt	Engineer V, SCRCD, CDCD, LDS
x	Durga Kharel	SDID, LDS
x	Chris Wells	FDOT
x	Jeff Blackford	ESI
x	Shahab Baig	SDID, LDS
	Lorrie Kirst	DPZ, ZAD
	Daun Klarevas	SDID, LDS

1. Information Distributed. The following information was made available for the meeting on May 3, 2018:

- the meeting agenda for May 3, 2018
- the draft meeting minutes of April 5, 2018

- PFM redlined chapter binders/binder inserts for ESRC members with redlined chapters 2 and 8
- SmartSheet printouts for major changes to Chapters 2 and 8 of the PFM
- Power Point: Chapter 2 annotations
- PowerPoint: Chapter 8 annotations

2. Administrative Items.

- The meeting minutes from April 5, 2018, were approved.
- Vote on whether or not to hold the next ESRC meeting for a longer timeframe of 3 hours. The vote decided to host a 3-hour long meeting on June 7, 2018, from 1-4pm.
- Update on the whiteboard that the May 1 amendment to update the introductory language to re-establish the PFM as guidelines was adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

3. Old Business.

- ESRC unanimously voted to approve the proposed chapter amendments to chapters 9 and 10.

4. Chapter 2 annotations

Shahab Baig, Site Development and Inspections Division, presented the PowerPoint “Chapter 2 ESRC Presentation.” Highlights of the PowerPoint are below.

1. Deleted text.

- a. § 2-0103.1C & 2-0103.3:
 - i. Deleted text in conflict with the Zoning Ordinance definition of reverse frontage lot.

2. Deleted text.

- a. § 2-0107.3:
 - i. Recently, GIS started producing 2’ contour interval topography (topo)—most current County topo is at that degree of accuracy.
 - ii. No need to use 5’ contour interval topo anymore.

3. Relocated text.

- a. § 2-0108.4 to 2-0108.7:
 - i. Relocated text is from Chapter 11-0202.

4. Modified text.

- a. § 2-0110.3A(4) to .3A(4)(d):
 - i. Modified .3A(4) to condense the following provisions into specific external references to County Code Chapter 104, and PFM § 11-0102 and § 11-0105.

5. Modified text.

- a. § 2-0203.1 to .1E:
 - i. Condensed the information in this section and subsections by adding “all areas to be disturbed.”
 - ii. Deleted subsections.

6. Relocated text.

- a. § 2-0209:
 - i. Nearly all of this section on tot lots has been relocated into the Recreation section of Chapter 8.

7. Deleted text.

- a. § 2-0210:
 - i. No one uses cut sheets any more. Deleted this whole section due to irrelevance.

8. Modified text.

- a. § 2-0601.1C:
 - i. Updated language of provision to clarify which PFM section this definition applies to—it is pulled out of context directly from Va. Code 15.2-851.1 “Optional Provisions of a Subdivision Ordinance.”

9. Updated numerical value.

- a. § 2-0602.3 & .3A:
 - i. Updated 2-0603.3 from 10 to 20 percent of the amount.
 - ii. Updated 2-0603.3A from 20 to 30 percent of the amount.

10. Deleted text.

- a. § 2-0903:
 - i. Deleted entire section which references and explains the code reference table. The code reference table will be placed online.

11. Relocated table.

- a. Table 2.1:
 - i. In order to make the code reference table easier to update regularly, it is being removed from the PFM and placed online on the PFM website.

12. Deleted text.

- a. § 2-1101.3C:
 - i. Fairfax County Park Authority confirmed that this process does not happen anymore and no one knows where this authority comes from, so this provision should be deleted due to irrelevance.

13. Modified text.

- a. § 2-1302.4A & .4B:
 - i. Language added to provide clarity for the as-built drawing submission process and specify a request for electronic spreadsheets.

A question was asked of the updated numerical values at § 2-0602.3 & .3A:

- But it’s 20% of the initial bond? What is the state requirement on bond release?
 - Doesn’t speak to bond release, just says that particular localities can reduce them-
- Is this documenting something that has been in place for a while or a proposed change?
 - It’s a change based on history over the years—developers are going to default and going across the street after x amount of years—keeps capital facilities from going to the board every year to finish up projects that have been going on for 20-30 years. More of an added protection for the county in the long-run—shouldn’t affect too many developers.

A question was asked of the modified text at § 2-1302.4A & .4B:

- When it says “should be identified”? Where?
 - On the plan, on the as-built plans.
- That’s an easy thing. How often does it get changed? Do you deal with change other than what has been specified very often?
 - It has happened but it is very rare.

Questions should be directed to Shahab Baig at Mirza.Baig@fairfaxcounty.gov.

5. Chapter 8 annotations

Durga Kharel, Site Development and Inspections Division, presented the PowerPoint “Chapter 8 ESRC Presentation.” Highlights of the PowerPoint are below.

1. Updated title.

- a. “Sidewalks, Trails, Bike Lanes and Recreation”:
 - i. Title of chapter updated to reflect addition of new “Bike Lanes” section.

2. Added text.

- a. § 8-0200:
 - i. Included “Bicycle Master Plan” as a reference in this section.

3. Modified text.

- a. § 8-0201.1:
 - i. Deleted all references to “nonmotorist” in order to avoid ADA noncompliance.

4. Modified text.

- a. Entire Chapter:
 - i. Any reference to “County Trails Planner” has been replaced with “FCDOT and/or FCPA”.

5. Modified tables & modified plate.

- a. Table 8.1, 8.2, and Plate 5-8:
 - i. Modified to reflect a change of mandatory minimum sidewalk width from 4 to 5 feet and of mandatory minimum easement width from 10 to 11 feet.

6. Added text.

- a. § 8-0202.9A:
 - i. Updated this section to include language about other acceptable bridge materials.

7. Modified text.

- a. § 8-0203.1A:
 - i. Replaced “required” with “recommended” because saying “required” is unconstitutional in this context, according to the Office of the County Attorney.

8. Modified table.

- a. Table 8.4:
 - i. Modified table to include “Bicycle Master Plan”.

9. Added section & added table.

- a. § 8-0300:

- i. “Bike Lanes” section added to this chapter. Some of the language is modified from the § 8-0201 “General Information” section.
- ii. Added “Bike Lanes” Table 8.5.

10. Relocated text.

- a. § 8-0400 & 8-0407:
 - i. “Recreation” section renumbered from 8-0300 to 8-0400 because the new “Bike Lanes” section is now 8-0300.

11. Modified text.

- a. § 8-0407:
 - i. “Tot Lots” section moved from Chapter 2 into “Recreation” section.
 - ii. Updated language throughout section for accuracy—replaced outdated language.

A question was asked regarding § 8-0201.1:

- Electronic devices and motorbikes and Segways—might be more of a County Code thing than a PFM thing—might not be able to add this information if it is not available in the County Code first.
- Non-motorized wheelchairs—how do these fit in?
 - These all ended up being P2 items because it is hard to define non-motorized—PFM to decide where to use not who can use.
- Shouldn’t there be a reference to the County policy about this issue?
- If there is one, I don’t disagree with that.
 - P2- Nonmotorist. P1- Try to find a reference to insert here to refer to a County Code/Policy that supports the use of motorized wheelchairs at the least. Something that makes a statement about ADA compliance perhaps?

A question was asked regarding Table 8.1, 8.2, and Plate 5-8:

- I thought I read that 4 feet was allowed in passing zones? Consider moving the change from 4 foot to 5 foot to a P2- Will decide on this item at next month’s meeting.
- I was out with someone who was blind and the curb cut was very narrow—is there any place where the curb cut is defined as width?
 - Yes- the new standard has evolved over the past 20 years since all of the ADA stuff started.

A couple other items were brought to the attention of the Chapter 8 team:

- 8-0202.3C: Got another conflict that says “generally trails must” Either should or generally needs to be taken out and it should be an absolute—I don’t think in this case it should be an absolute. Make this provision into a “must” and strike “generally”.
- 8-0202.7C: Change the “must” to “should” because this provision should be strongly recommended, not required.
- 8-0202.8E: Sight Distance: what sight distance do you use for a bicycle? Depends on the size of the bicycle—do you use the design speed? Usually trails 15mph—AASHTO bicycle guide helps to give guidance.
 - AASHTO reference to be inserted into this provision once appropriate language is developed. They do reference “stopping sight distance”—eye height is 4.5 feet for a typical cyclist.

The same question from the beginning of the Chapter 8 discussion came up again regarding “nonmotorist”:

- 8-0201.1: Nonmotorized: Is there a County Policy that defines this?
 - Matches the Countywide Trails Plan—might not go into defining who pedestrians are—these are just trails adopted on the Countywide Trails Plan.
 - With the Trail—it might not have to be ADA compliant—but is this consistent?
 - Countywide Trails Plan—the conflict is whether or not you are allowing certain people on the trails. Maybe the definition of “pedestrian” needs to be clarified.
 - Provision’s intent is not to say who can use these trails.
 - P1- Remove all reference to nonmotorized/nonmotorist.

Questions should be directed to Durga Kharel at Durga.Kharel@fairfaxcounty.gov.

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Mark Liberati, ESRC Secretary

by John Matusik
Acting ESRC Technical Advisor/Administrator