

**ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

SUMMARY MINUTES

MEETING OF JULY 28, 2011

The meeting was convened at 7:03 p.m. The following members of the committee were present: Chair Julie Palakovich Carr, Dennis Cain, Tom Gibney, Charles Littlefield, Eric Siegel, and Roald Shrack. Soo Lee-Cho arrived at approximately 7:30 p.m. Sean Hart participated via phone and Jason Anthony was absent. Jim Wasilak of City staff was also present. No members of the public attended.

The chair moved to approve the agenda as written. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0, with Soo Lee-Cho absent for the vote and Jason Anthony absent.

Julie Palakovich Carr stated that the purpose of the meeting is to adopt the recommendations for the APFO/APFS with the exception of the schools test recommendations. Committee members noted that it might take some time for the review of the final report. A suggestion was made and agreed upon to use footnotes to cite information sources. Julie Palakovich Carr will circulate the presentation for the 8/3 Planning Commission meeting to members for review.

The Committee reviewed the text of the recommendations produced to date, and made edits as agreed upon by the committee. The following recommendations, categorized by topic area, were adopted unanimously by all nine members, with Jason Anthony voting by mail:

APFO

1. The APFO should be amended to require a public hearing process before any amendment to the APFS can be voted upon for adoption by Mayor and Council.

Transportation

2. The City should engage in master planning for larger geographic areas within Rockville for transportation needs in order to address transportation issues in a more holistic manner, rather than in a piecemeal approach as development projects unfold.
3. In the future, should the Rockville Pike corridor be redeveloped, it should occur in phases; later phases of development should not be allowed to proceed until transportation milestones are met. Aspects of the White Flint and Great Seneca Science Center projects that focus on the requirement for development to occur in phases based on milestones, including but not limited to (1) completion of transportation infrastructure and (2) utilization of mass transit and non-automobile

modes of transportation, are recommended as case studies for review by the Planning Commission.

4. The Planning Commission should evaluate the maximum credit allowable for mitigation of trips, which is currently set at 30%. The current standard provides a disincentive to mitigate greater than 30% of trips.
5. The Comprehensive Transportation Review Methodology should be revised to allow for a greater variety of traffic mitigation options, such as Metro benefits and other options allowed by the County under its APFO.
6. The City should periodically evaluate the efficacy of traffic mitigation options implemented by developers in the City, and update the APFS if deemed necessary.
7. The City should draw upon the data collected by the County and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments in regard to the efficacy of transportation mitigation options.

Fire and Emergency Service Protection

8. The standard would benefit from a complete rewrite to provide greater clarity.
9. The standard should be revised to recognize that the primary demand is for emergency and rescue services rather than for fire service, as defined by “engine” response. In this context, the term “full response” in this section should be redefined accordingly.
10. The Planning Commission should evaluate if the current standard for level of service (response by three stations) is appropriate.
11. For the purposes of applying this standard, response time to a building should be considered the same for all parts of the building.

Sewer Service

12. The current standard is adequately serving the City. The Committee recommends correcting the wording of the sewer service standard (APFS III.E (ii)) to state “sewer service” not “water supply.”

Water Supply

13. The current standard is adequately serving the City. The Committee has no recommended changes.

Waivers to the APFO

14. The APFS provision on waivers should be clarified in regards to whether or not the list of projects eligible for a waiver from the APFO is inclusive of all eligible project types.
15. The Planning Commission should develop non-binding criteria to help guide each Approving Authority’s decision-making in regards to the granting of a waiver. Each Approving Authority should also make reasonable efforts to issue a finding for each waiver granted.

The Committee noted that the report should include findings as to why the number of fire stations for response test is adequate, and to add a definition of full response in that standard.

The Committee continued discussion of the schools test with a review of each committee member's individual recommendations. Those recommendations included such topics as: collaboration on improving the accuracy of MCPS enrollment projections; the Mayor and Council meeting with the Board of Education to convey urgency of school overcrowding issues, particularly the need for the fifth elementary school in the Richard Montgomery cluster; when and how school capacity for approved development should be reserved; when the City's schools test should occur; whether the City can and should collect a schools facility payment from new development; whether the maximum school capacity limit should be increased; within what range exceeding 100% capacity should the schools facility payment be exacted; updating the student generation rates, particularly for midrise multifamily developments and whether a new standard for that unit type is needed; and how to ensure Rockville's needs are addressed on a fair and equal basis compared to the rest of the County.

The Committee decided to meet again on Thursday, August 4. Julie Palakovich Carr will meld all of the individual recommendations together by category for discussion by the Committee at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.