Note – For a more detailed summary of the meeting, please see pages 3 - 5 for the Task Force Secretary’s meeting minutes.

The members from the Task Force in attendance were:

- Charlie Hall, Chair
- Sue Kovach Shuman
- Barry Christopher
- Kevin Warhurst
- Michael Downey
- Al O’Neill
- Ken Quincy
- Flint Webb
- Julie Hirka
- Meg Irish
- William Smith
- Alison Barkan
- John Elzroth
- Michael Hayes
- Antonio Oliver
- Dwayne Jefferson

In addition to the Task Force members, Tim Sampson, representing Inova; and, Elizabeth Baker and Tara Berger representing Fairview Park were present. Staff from Fairfax County included Aaron Klibaner, DPZ; Meghan Van Dam, DPZ; Sharon Williams, DPZ; Corinne Bebek, DPZ; Brian Schoester, Jessica Gillis, FCPS; John King, FCDOT; and Michael Wing, Providence District Office. Supervisor Smyth from Providence District was also in attendance.

Comments from Task Force Chair: Charlie Hall stated that the task force has been asking many questions, resulting in a highly informed task force, and also reminded the group that they should share their likes and dislikes in order to get a better understanding of the group’s reactions to the presentations.

Tabling of Meeting Minutes from Meeting #5 (01/08/19): A motion was made to table the meeting minutes from the previous meeting until the Task Force secretary, Michael Downey, submits his meeting notes to County staff. Motion was approved with no issues.

Meghan Van Dam, Branch Chief with the Fairfax County Department of Planning & Zoning (DPZ) reviewed changes made to the Study Process Overview Schedule, explaining that the transportation analysis presentation has been moved to April and an additional meeting was added to allow for more time for task force discussion on the impact analysis and recommendations. There are still two carry-over meetings that can be used as needed if further discussions and presentations are needed. Planning staff are currently aiming to publish the Staff Report for the study in June. The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors public hearings are anticipated in summer 2019.

Aaron Klibaner, planner with the Fairfax County Department of Planning & Zoning (DPZ) made a brief presentation of the Public Facilities impacts analyses provided by the Fairfax County Fire & Rescue, Police, and Wastewater Management services departments. The locations of the fire station facilities as well as their areas of service were explained. Both Fire & Rescue and Police stated that increased development on the nomination sites would likely increase demands for
service and affect response times. In regards to wastewater, the Merrifield area is served by the Alexandria Renew wastewater treatment plant. The plant has the capacity to serve the projected needs of the area through 2045. For all of these subject areas, further evaluations of the proposed development impacts will be done during the rezoning application process to best determine future needs and impacts for Public Facilities.

Questions and discussion ensued about the meaning of the information provided and how the task force should use the information provided. Several Task force members asked about the quantitative impacts that development would have on response times for both Fire and Police departments. Mr. Klibaner explained that these data heavy assessments will take place during the future rezoning application process. A discussion occurred about Comprehensive Plan policies regarding public facilities and the type of analysis conducted during the planning study versus the rezoning process.

**Brian Schoester, staff with Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS)** presented on the impacts analysis for Public Schools in the surrounding area. Mr. Schoester discussed the latest school projections from the new Capital Improvements Plan (2020-24) and provided general information on the elementary, middle, and high schools serving the area as well as the nomination sites. The current student capacities for schools in the area were shown along with enrollment projections for the 2024 school year. The estimated students that would be added by development on the nomination sites was discussed as well as general management strategies and pending improvements to the local schools.

A question was raised about the accuracy of school projections and what FCPS plans to do about schools that are over capacity. Mr. Schoester explained that FCPS has found that their countywide projections are accurate within 1% and their site-level projections are accurate within 5%. In regards to school overpopulation, it was explained that student populations are being redistributed and that several schools already have renovations underway.

**Elizabeth Baker from Walsh Colucci and John Amatetti from VIKA Engineering** presented on various subjects regarding Fairview Park. Ms. Baker explained that a revised concept for development would be presented on February 5th, which will include planned environmental and parks improvements. Mr. Amatetti covered the history of the site including previously approved development plans. Particularly focusing on the lake, it was explained that the lake is considered a regional pond and was created with a hard dam. Any future development will be subject to updated stormwater regulation, which could improve flooding on the site. Future stormwater strategies will be integrated as the development concept plan is further developed.

**Tim Sampson, outside counsel for Inova** discussed in further detail planned stormwater, trails, and park space improvements for the Inova Center for Personalized Health (ICPH) site. Water-retention infrastructure, activity focused walkways, and multiple park spaces were shown. Concept mockups and examples were shown to those in attendance. These plans have been made available online.

Start: 7:12 PM
Adjourn: 9:06 PM
Secretary’s Notes from Merrifield Suburban Center Study Task Force Meeting #6
January 15, 2019

Votes:

Approval of the minutes from Meeting #5 was tabled until Michael Downey submits his notes from the meeting.

Task Force Questions:

Questions following the presentation on public facilities (sewer, fire, police analysis):

- Flint Webb
  - Has the County conducted an analysis of response times for fire and rescue?
    - County: Analysis for this phase is not as detailed as the one that would be considered during a future zoning review
  - Do the wastewater facility projections consider the increased utilization from this development?
    - County: They have sufficient capacity; the potential increased flows are not substantial enough to merit concerns

- William Smith
  - How is the emergency area defined? Does it account for changes in the population?
    - County: Capital public works manages these projections. The analysis is continual and made on a short-range basis. Their projections differ from the long-range projections included in this analysis. The proposed changes to the plan likely aren’t substantial enough to change the projections.

- Al O’Neill
  - Do emergency response times adjust based on increases in traffic volumes?
    - County: They do; also, the county is rolling out technologies to speed response times by adjusting traffic light timing to control traffic flows

- Charlie Hall
  - The capacity assessment seems to be lacking
    - County: Capacity analyses are not performed this early in the process

- Keven Warhurst
  - Mosaic led to increased strain on public facilities. How should we be evaluating the proposed sites and their respective impacts?
    - County: The county can raise concerns when they’re warranted. Based on the commentary received, the scale of the proposed facilities does not justify a need for new large-scale capital expenditures

- Charlie Hall
  - Does the county see any red flags with regards to public facilities?
    - County: No; plus, policy will kick in to ensure that public facilities are robust enough to meet changing needs presented by new development

- John Elzroth
  - Is the expectation that the task force can recommend that the developer provide land for parks or other amenities/assets? Or is that controlled by the county?
- County: Yes, task force can make those recommendations
- Dwayne Jefferson
  - Comment: Not seeing any red flags from the perspective of public facilities
- Antonio Oliver
  - Does new development shorten the projected capacity for the wastewater facilities? Does the county require extra fees for new development?
    - County: County requires a “sewer tap fee” for new developments. Can follow up on specifics

**Questions following the presentation on schools:**

- Meg Irish
  - Are there plans to address existing capacity issues?
    - County: Yes, working with the school board and FCPS
- Al O’Neill
  - Are there any issues with staffing to meet demand?
    - County: Only focusing on physical space; hiring is handled by a different agency
- Flint Webb
  - It seems there may be a need for additional elementary school facilities
    - County: Yes, we agree
- Antonio Oliver
  - How much confidence does the county have in its projections?
    - Answer: We are consistently within a few percentage points of our projections
- Alison Barkan
  - What is considered an unacceptable threshold for overcapacity?
    - Answer: It requires school board input; generally start to require extraordinary action once projections surpass 150%; it’s important to also note that programming affects capacity, so we can move some programs around to free up space in limited instance
  - What are the plans to renovate Falls Church High School?
    - Yes, 2019 bond referendums to renovate
- Charlie Hall
  - How much extra stress will the new proposals put on Pine Springs and Falls Church H.S.?
    - County: They will certainly add stress, but the County has tools to manage and distribute the stress
- Dwayne Jefferson
  - Comment: It seems the county is screaming out for help with regards to schools. At this point, I could not approve the projects in good conscience without address school capacity concerns
    - County: County is looking at repurposing other buildings as schools
- Meg Irish
  - Comment: We’re a wealthy area. Modular schools is not sufficient to serve our students
- Alison Barkan
  - Comment: We are also missing play areas in Merrifield. Children need to be addressed on multiple fronts.
- Dwayne Jefferson
  - Comment: I would like to see how INOVA and Fairview Park could support FCPS, whether through programming, providing capital space, or other options
- John Elzroth
  - How big is Park #2 on the INOVA plan?
    - Developer: Approximate 1 acre
- Charlie Hall
Comment: We should be mindful that the trail on the INOVA site are placeholders until the next round of development. Would like to see opportunities to consolidate the park areas to create more contiguous recreation area.

What % of the site proposal is covered by existing buildings?
  - Developer: Approximately 50%

Barry Christopher

Comment: Suggestion to have Charlie Hall present first during the next meeting since it was tabled this meeting.