

**ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES
STUDY COMMITTEE**

ACTION MINUTES

MEETING OF FEBRUARY 24, 2011

The meeting was convened at 7:00 p.m. The following members were present: Jason Anthony, Dennis Cain, Julie Palakovich Carr, Tom Gibney, Charles Littlefield, Roald Schrack, Eric Siegel, Sean Hart.

The committee reviewed the draft minutes of the February 10 meeting. Denis Cain moved, seconded by Charles Littlefield to revise the language regarding public comments by the chair that would prohibit allowing comments from the public during the meetings. The Assistant City Attorney noted a correction to say that their office would research whether staff must attend the meetings. Denis Cain moved approval of the corrected minutes, seconded by Tom Gibney. Motion passed unanimously.

There followed a discussion on what topics should appear on the future agendas and in what order. There needs to be a meeting devoted to the historic context of how and why the APFO was developed by the City, a meeting devoted to demographics and growth projections, the Municipal Growth Element, and related data. The chair offered a motion to take up the historic context and invite former Mayor Giammo and/or Councilmember Hall to the next meeting. The demographics discussion to be at the March 10 meeting. Seconded by Tom Gibney and passed unanimously. Charles Littlefield expressed a desire to do a survey of the residents and businesses to see what they believe are major concerns that should be addressed.

The committee then continued a review of the Adequate Public Facilities Standards manual. Comments on the Comprehensive Transportation Review methodology were provided by staff from the Public Works department. This included discussion of how traffic levels of service were determined and may be mitigated. The committee requested for future discussion that they be provided with information on the differences between the City and County's traffic tests, and also data on Metrorail capacity projections.

The staff then reviewed the standards for schools, noting the differences between the City and County's methods for determining capacity within the clusters. The committee wants to have information on the components used by the MCPS staff in making their projections and have that available when the MCPS staff speaks to the committee.

The committee took a break to receive staff updates. Susan Swift reviewed the current status of the discussions between the City and MCPS regarding the locating of portable classrooms within the City, and the pending action on Monday night by the Mayor and Council regarding the exempting of portables, or alternatively schools, from the traffic and emergency services aspects of the APFS.

For next week's agenda, the invited guests should be taken first on the agenda.

The committee then returned to the standards and completed the overview for fire and emergency services and water and sewer services. The Public Works staff gave an overview of the system capacity vs. local service reviews that are done as part of project reviews. The committee asked for information on what buildings/structures are now required to have sprinklers. Also, they would like an explanation of what constitutes a reasonable fire-flow reserve as set forth in the manual, and look a clarification of the language regarding the 1000 gallons-per-minute goal. Is it a standard?

The chair offered a motion to adjourn, seconded by Tom Gibney. The meeting was adjourned at 10:17 p.m.