

**AT A JOINT MEETING OF THE DUMFRIES TOWN COUNCIL AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD FOLLOWED BY A TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION, HELD ON MAY 21, 2013, AT 6:00 P.M., IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 17755 MAIN STREET, DUMFRIES, VIRGINIA:**

**THERE WERE PRESENT:** Mayor Gerald Foreman  
Vice-Mayor Willie Toney (arrived during ARB discussion)  
Charles Brewer (arrived during ARB discussion)  
Kristin Forrester  
Helen Reynolds  
Gwen Washington (arrived during ARB discussion)  
Derrick R. Wood (arrived during ARB discussion)  
Daniel Taber, Town Manager  
Christine Sanders, Town Attorney

**THERE WERE ABSENT:** None

**THERE WERE PRESENT:** Jennifer Stringfellow, Chair  
Timothy Jabs  
James Ksanznak  
William O'Kelly Russell

**IN RE: CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Mayor Foreman called the meeting to order. Dawn Hobgood, Town Clerk, took roll call.

**IN RE: MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER AND REFLECTION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

There was a moment of silent prayer and reflection, then all in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

**IN RE: ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD (ARB) UPDATED DESIGN GUIDELINES – LAURA O'DELL**

Ms. O'Dell explained the ARB was at the meeting to discuss the proposed Design Guidelines to get feedback and direction from Council.

Mayor Foreman asked for edification as to why the Council did not approve the Design Guidelines.

Ms. O'Dell indicated the ARB did not get a clear enough answer as to why the Design Guidelines were not approved.

Mr. Taber thought part of the concern Council had was whether the Design Guidelines should be recommendations or set standards.

Mayor Foreman noted another issue was the historic district boundaries.

Ms. Forrester added her understanding was that some of the Council Members did not want to approve them because of the historic district overlay. Her issue still is whether the guidelines are a requirement or suggestions. She was told it was suggestions. She felt if the guidelines were suggestions

that Council would not need to endorse them. If the ARB was going to require an applicant pick from the list then Council would need to approve them.

Ms. O'Dell indicated that was an option; however, the Design Guidelines have been adopted by Council and readopted after each update. She recommended continuing with the same practice.

Ms. Washington did not understand the breadth of the historic district. At one time, the historic district was just the Route 1 corridor, Main Street. She asked what the rationale was for extending it back again. Her main concern is the time it takes to be able to do anything. For example, building a deck could take several months to get approval from the ARB.

Mr. Toney's main concern is the area designated as the historic district.

Mayor Foreman asked when the historic district was voted on.

Ms. Stringfellow noted it was voted on in early 2012. She recalled the ARB had been working since early 2006 on an area that mainly consisted of Main Street. At that time, the ARB was advocating that a historic survey needed to be done to determine what the Town's historic resources were. During that time Ms. Sandlin, Economic Development Director, and Mr. Moss, a previous Zoning Administrator, had found out that a previous Council had voted to change the boundaries, but there was never an actual vote taken to change the ordinance.

There was a brief discussion about historic district boundaries and that in order to change them the zoning ordinance would have to be amended, which should not keep the Council from adopting the proposed Design Guidelines.

Mayor Foreman recalled the Council vividly discussing the boundaries the last time it came up. He requested the minutes be pulled and emailed in order for Council to refresh their memory about the discussion and vote.

Ms. Forrester asked to move the Design Guidelines to the regular meeting for a vote and schedule a separate discussion about the historic boundaries.

Ms. Washington agreed the boundaries were a different discussion; however, since the boundaries are not changing there has to be something done with the timeline in place now for people who want to do improvement projects to their homes.

Ms. Stringfellow noted that once an application comes in for a certificate of appropriateness (COA) it is discussed and voted on at the next meeting unless there is not a quorum. The ARB meets on the second Tuesday every month. The ARB cannot control if the property owner is not informed in a timely manner of what the process is. The process is readily available through staff and on the website.

Ms. Washington was hearing it would take four weeks maximum. She personally waited eight to ten weeks to get something approved that was just redoing something that had already been done. This is the concern people have who do not live along the Main Street corridor.

Ms. Stringfellow reminded everyone that if you are repainting the same color, making a minor repair to a board that broke or fell, or something like that with like materials you do not have to come before the ARB. If a property owner wants to make substantial changes that are in public view that is when you would need to come before the ARB.

Ms. Forrester proposed, to address the concerns of Ms. Washington and herself, that Council adopt the Design Guidelines, then anyone who comes in and uses the suggested Design Guidelines that Ms. O'Dell be given the authority to administratively approve the COA as long as there is no deviation.

Mr. Jabs asked why the Council would need the ARB if guidelines were in place and approval would be given administratively.

Ms. Forrester explained there would be things outside the guidelines the ARB would need to review and approve. She reminded everyone the guidelines are not a requirement, but suggestions.

Mr. Jabs noted the ARB enhanced the guidelines that were already in place to better clarify what the ARB and the Council envisions the Town will look. It is clearer for people looking to do new projects within the Town to give them better guidelines on what needs to be done and what the project is expected to look like. The less clarification you have the more haphazard the projects are. The Town will end up with a mosh of miscellaneous buildings. What the ARB is trying to do is enhance the entire Town and give clarity through the guidelines to make sure everything from this point on falls within the clarification the ARB is trying to give to enhance the Town.

Ms. Forrester did not have any confusion over any of that. She reiterated if the guidelines are suggestions on how to move things faster, so people do not have to dream it up on their own, they would have clear guidance, and Ms. O'Dell should be able to approve that. If it were something outside of that, the ARB would have to review it.

Mr. Ksanznak clarified they are guidelines, which takes away the ability for personal preference of a Board member for colors, etc. He noted the zoning ordinance does allow for an emergency meeting if an applicant has an urgent request.

It was questioned and clarified that a vote cannot be taken on an application through email.

Ms. Forrester asked if an applicant comes forward with a color approved in the guidelines whether the ARB would deny the request.

Mr. Ksanznak felt that was an extreme case; however, it is possible.

Ms. Forrester asked why it would be approved as an option if it could be rejected.

Ms. O'Dell noted that if an approval was done through her and not the ARB the individual would not be eligible for federal and state tax incentives. That is one of the primary reasons to go through the ARB for approval.

Ms. Forrester noted that would be the applicant's option to do.

Mr. Ksanznak mentioned the ARB has never rejected one; however, the ARB has made recommendations for changes.

Ms. Stringfellow used the example of the ACTS building being approved for a different color. The ARB recommended a different color and they went with the different color.

Ms. Forrester noted the ARB needs to think about this because there are two Council Members that are not in favor of leaving the overlay district as it is. She suggested picking five colors and two deck styles or whatever would fit within the boundaries, because none of the houses are historic in anyway. There needs to be something to balance the concerns to streamline the process for people who do not care about any kind of federal paperwork.

Mr. Jabs reiterated that nothing has changed from what was previously approved when it comes to colors.

Ms. Forrester explained the discussion of the boundaries is a concern and will be discussed at the next Council meeting. If the ARB does not want the boundaries to change then everyone needs to try to work around the concerns for facilitating the process. There has to be a simple thing that everyone can agree on for the main projects that are sought.

Ms. Stringfellow noted that typically it is paint colors and signs unless it is new construction.

Ms. Forrester asked why, for simple projects, there cannot be five colors to choose from. If the applicant wants a different color then they will have to go before the ARB. She did not see how that circumvented the need for the ARB.

Ms. Stringfellow noted the ARB would have to vote prior to Council to decide whether to change the proposed Design Guidelines.

Mr. Jabs asked for clarification on what would be approved without ARB review.

Ms. Forrester explained the ARB would pick what projects would be streamlined.

Ms. Stringfellow was hearing that the ARB needed to decide what projects that would be in public view did not need to be reviewed by the ARB for approval.

Ms. Forrester noted it would be conforming to some pre-adopted guidelines by the Council and ARB that Ms. O'Dell could administratively approve.

Ms. O'Dell noted that some localities have a list of major and minor modifications to historic districts. The minor modifications are administratively approved and does not have to go before the ARB.

She suggested the ARB could look at those things that are not as significant as adding on to an existing structure that could be approved administratively.

Ms. Forrester asked Ms. Washington if that addressed her concerns.

Ms. Washington explained her concern is time. When doing a remodeling project in the summer if the application needs modification it goes to the next meeting and before you know it the summer months are gone. People paint their shutters, trim, and deck, or build a shed during those months.

Ms. Stringfellow noted the process is not much different then what residents have to deal with who live where there is a homeowners' association (HOA).

Ms. Washington mentioned that when individuals moved into those neighborhoods they knew there was an HOA. The people in the historic district did not realize they had to deal with any of this. Early on changes were made to the homes that no one had to approve. This is a different situation then someone who moved into an area with an HOA.

Ms. Stringfellow understood that. She reiterated that any changes made before it was realized the boundaries had not changed do not have to come in and get a COA or undo anything that was done.

Mr. Wood thought of the historical district as being Main Street and not the residential area.

There was a brief discussion about the commercial development along Main Street and how the proposed Design Guidelines has a section addressing new construction.

Mr. Brewer suggested that Council add a clause to the Design Guidelines that states any structure built before 1940 fall under the guidelines.

Ms. Stringfellow noted there are some localities that do that and they consider those structures as non-contributing. She cautioned if the Council were to go that route and direct the Planning Commission (PC) to change the zoning that it be carefully worded.

Mr. Foreman asked if there was anything that could be put in place, for when a home sells in the historic district that would let a potential buyer know the home is in a historic district.

Ms. Sanders indicated that there was not. She explained that citizens are charged with knowing the law and that means zoning as well as historic districts. It is incumbent on the individual to due diligence and the law in Virginia is buyer beware.

Ms. Stringfellow suggested having signs to let people know when they are entering into a historic district.

**IN RE: CITIZEN COMMENT PERIOD**

Cleveland Anderson thanked the Council for their negative vote on the Prince William County (PWC) and VDOT engineers proposed flyover. He was glad he was here to hear the confusion between the Council and the ARB about the historical district. He is perplexed about the district since there is only

one building on the Virginia historic registry on Main Street. Other than that, the Town does not have any. The historic district would not be recognized by the Department of Historic Resources because there is not enough historic value here. He felt it was something that needed to be taken very seriously and to him it is just more roadblocks for progress. When he came to the Town yesterday and asked about making improvements to his old house on Main Street he was told he would have to get approval to demolish the building from the ARB. He knew he would have to get a permit from the Town. Every year the Town needs more money, everybody does. The only way to get more revenue is with progress. It is as if no one is on the same path and it seems like the ARB will not give up any power to anyone. He hopes it can be figured out to where everyone is satisfied. Whatever is done he will be satisfied with.

**IN RE: PRESENTATIONS (NONE SCHEDULED)**

**IN RE: INFORMATION ITEM(S)**

**A. TREASURER'S REPORT – RETTA LADD**

There were no questions.

**IN RE: DISCUSSION ITEM(S)**

**A. SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM – CYDNY NEVILLE**

Mr. Taber noted Ms. Neville would be giving a presentation on the two programs; however, the only viable option for this year would be the internship program. The summer employment program would need to get started very early in the next fiscal year in order to give Council the ability to make an informed decision on what the options are.

Ms. Neville explained what was provided to Council was an application for an employment and internship program. The employment program you have an interview and determine which department to work with. The internship program you have an essay, rotate departments, and have a culminating project to work on the last week of the program. One thing not mentioned in the application is having a Council Member matched with a participant to serve as a mentor. The budget allows for five to six participants.

Mayor Foreman read the following statement from the 2020 Vision Statement.

“Through public and private partnerships with County government, faith based organizations and the business community, a summer youth employment program and a targeted internship program offer work experience and vocational training for our youth. These entities also collaborate to offer college scholarships to high achieving graduating high school seniors.”

He asked if any of the program was scoped to the 2020 Vision Statement.

Ms. Neville noted the budget limits what can be done. That is something that can be looked at for planning next fiscal year.

Mayor Foreman noted in the internship program that Town businesses is mentioned twice. He asked why they were mentioned.

Ms. Neville noted that was an error. She needed to remove that since it was decided not to move forward with sending the participants out.

Mayor Foreman questioned whether the word “should” should be shall on the recommendation forms for both programs.

Ms. Neville noted it was a requirement.

Ms. Forrester thought the 2020 Vision Statement has some great dreams and ideas that people put together; however, it is not hold your feet to the fire and this is what it is going to be done. There are things that happen and you realize it did not work well, so let us try something else. She noted that she would not now or ever in the future vote on spending taxpayer money to pay people to work in other people’s businesses. It sounded great but when implemented it does not fall into what she thinks, is the local government’s responsibility. She likes the idea of partnering with other businesses to offer scholarships; however, right now she cannot see the road between where we are and where that exists.

**B. QUESTIONS ON FY13/14 LINE ITEMS 10-472-2802/2803/2807/6000 – MAYOR FOREMAN**

Mayor Foreman sent an email April 7 asking for the itemized expenditures per event held in FY13 and planned expenses for FY14. He received a response and asked if the sheets provided were for FY13 or FY14.

Ms. Neville stated what was submitted is generally, what is spent broken down by event.

Mayor Foreman noted the Fall Festival for FY14 breakdown is \$5,200 and the budgeted amount is \$5,000. He asked if a banner for the Fall Festival needed to be in the budget when a display board is in the budget.

Ms. Neville indicated it probably would not be needed in that case. She noted the amounts is generically what is spent. If for some reason the display board is not up, she will need a banner. She mentioned Mr. Taber could adjust funds at the mid-year budget review.

Mayor Foreman explained the point of his question is more along the lines of there is an item in the budget that is supposed to save money. In other words, there is money budgeted for a display board to save money; however, the banners are still budgeted too.

Mr. Taber explained the sign is being constructed and should be up by the end of June and those expenditures will not be needed. He mentioned FY14 is a tight budget; however, he thinks there needs to be a little breathing room should something not come to fruition. He believes what is being suggested by Ms. Neville is that if the money is not spent that it come before Council at the mid-year budget review for a decision to be made on where the funds should go.

Mayor Foreman understands the fluff; however, in FY13 roughly \$4,000 was spent on the Fall Festival. The request was for \$5,000 in FY13 and the same is being requested for FY14. He pointed out that in FY14, under the Annual Christmas-Holiday Parade, there is \$1,100 for dignitary banners and asked what that was for.

Ms. Neville clarified the banners were for Council, the Board of Supervisor, and the School Board Member for Dumfries.

Mayor Foreman asked about last year's banners.

Ms. Neville explained the banners needed to be upgraded due to the change in Council and in order to get them to look the same they all had to be remade.

Mayor Foreman understood banners for Council. He was asking about visiting dignitaries.

Ms. Neville noted the Town does not cover their banners. Only the Board of Supervisor and School Board member.

Mayor Foreman asked if there was a final figure for the Multicultural Festival.

Ms. Neville believed that was still being closed out.

Mayor Foreman asked, since she is in charge, whether or not she would have a rough estimate.

Ms. Neville explained that some of the items are still coming in as far as bills are concerned.

Mr. Taber noted there was a paid entertainment group that was supposed to perform that did not and might be part of the closing out process. The money was spent but may not have been used since the individual called in sick.

Mayor Foreman asked if there was a stage this year.

Mr. Taber indicated there was a tent this year.

Mayor Foreman pointed out the budget for next year includes a stage for \$500 to \$800. He guessed there was going to be a stage next year. He questioned the money being budgeted and not used.

Ms. Neville noted there is a stage every year.

Mayor Foreman asked if the tent cost \$800.

Ms. Neville explained there was a stage floor underneath the tent.

Mayor Foreman asked if the tourism sign was going to be available next year.

Ms. Neville noted that needed to be decided. She thinks the Town should.

Mayor Foreman noted under the miscellaneous community programs the market manager is budgeted; however, there is a specific line item for it next year.

Ms. Neville explained the first year the market manager was paid out of that line item and this year he will be paid from a grant. In case the grant does not go through it is budgeted.

Mayor Foreman asked if the line item was grant money.

Ms. Neville clarified the line item is not grant money and is there just in case the Town does not get the grant.

Mr. Taber explained on the grants that if they do not come in as revenue there cannot be an expenditure on the other end.

Mayor Foreman pointed out the line item is listed on the narrative as grant money.

Mr. Taber needed to look into that.

Mayor Foreman is seeing a line item in the budget for a market manager and he is seeing it in the Community Services budget too, so it appears that it has been budgeted for twice. He asked for more specificity in the description of the expenditures. The reason is he is looking at \$1,900 that was spent under miscellaneous community programs and he is trying to match that to the expenditures that were provided by the department head and he cannot match them up.

Mr. Toney noted when he asks about expenditures they are large amounts and he has never seen anything as detailed as what was just done.

Council discussed that it is their job to ask questions and be accountable for the budget. It was mentioned that if Council was going to ask such detailed questions about one department it should do it for all of them. It was made clear that Council has asked questions of all the departments and will continue to do so when necessary.

**C. COMMUNITY CENTER USE POLICY – DAN TABER**

Mr. Taber mentioned Council has previously discussed the use of the Community Center about needing to preserve the historical value, how the Community Center had been used in the past, and not wanting to rent the facility out for things like birthday parties. A proposed Community Center Use Policy was drafted and sent to Council asking for comments. The only comment he received was about considering grandfathering current users who have used the Community Center for some time. He asked Council for any recommendations they may have on the proposed Community Center Use Policy.

Mr. Brewer mentioned this was looked at and discussed prior to putting in all of the new blinds, ceiling fans, carpet, and flooring upstairs. Everything was replaced and Council had it certified by a structural engineer. The Council spent in excess of \$20,000. It was rented after everything was done and people were hanging out of the windows upstairs, so instead of costing the taxpayers any more money the Council decided not to rent it anymore. He mentioned Rolling Thunder coming in and someone noticed there was damage to the brand new carpet. It was put off limits. Now it is still being rented out or given access to. He does not know how that came to fruition. He did not think the Community Center should be rented out.

Mr. Toney did not recall the same thing. He noted when the discussion was had about public use of the building there was no decision made that the Community Center should not be rented. There was discussion about a \$1,000 deposit and a \$500 use fee. The fees were to cover any kind of damage and were high enough that individuals would take care of the building. He felt the policy was well thought out and the building belongs to the public. He mentioned the building was just named after a citizen and for Council to say the public cannot use it to him is not being a prudent. He mentioned Town Hall was named after Mr. Porter. He asked if it should be shut down because it is getting wear and tear. He thought it was appropriate to have the policy so that when people use it they are prudent about how they use it. The administration has provided a type of oversight to make sure individuals that use it treat it with the kind of respect it should have.

Ms. Washington commented that viable volunteer organizations should be able to use the Community Center. She was the one who suggested that organizations that have been using the Community Center be grandfathered with the fee being what they have been donating. There are many volunteer organizations that give a lot of money to the community and if not the immediate community to PWC. It is difficult to find places to meet and carry out business for these volunteer organizations. These organizations should be held accountable. She did not think the doors should be closed.

Ms. Forrester was okay with the fee schedule and that maybe a different situation was needed for 501(c) organizations. She did not understand why people would be given the keys. She thought a fee would be paid, which would cover the expense of having some sort of trustee walk them through noting things they see and when they were done do the same that way you would know right then and there if there was any damage. She did not understand the order of priority. In the policy, there is a note that states any long-standing group would have priority, which would trump the priority list. She did not understand the point of a priority list if you had a calendar. She asked if a group in category 3 made a reservation and a group in category 1 wants to use the center whether the group in category 3 would be bumped. If not then there is no priority and it would be a first come first serve basis.

It was clarified that the categories was just to identify groups and was not a list of who has priority.

Mayor Foreman noted there needs to be a statement of "hereinafter referred to as" because the Jefferson Simpson Community and Cultural Arts Center is referred to numerous ways. There are references to rules and regulations and policies and conditions. Might want to change these references to policy. He asked if the \$50.00 security deposit would apply to long-term reoccurring events. This needs to be addressed somehow for those individuals who use it every week. He mentioned maybe making the deposit quarterly.

Ms. Washington asked if the fees were compared with similar facilities available around the area because she was hearing from others the fees were high.

Ms. Sanders explained that staff felt it was exactly the opposite. What staff is trying to do is defray the cost of any wear and tear and the operation of the building.

Mr. Toney asked why the Dumfries Business Association (DBA) and Town businesses were in two different categories.

Ms. Sanders explained the DBA is looked at as sort of a local chamber.

Mr. Taber explained the businesses have individual goals opposed to a group. He asked for clarification on the grandfathering issue.

Ms. Forrester asked if there was any group using the center that is not a 501(c).

Ms. Sanders believed there are.

Ms. Neville noted there is one that comes to mind.

Mr. Foreman thought once the policy was passed that a letter would be sent out to everyone who currently uses the center making them aware of the policy Council approved and to come in within 60 days to get registered. If they do not register that means they do not want to use it anymore and it can be scheduled for someone else.

Mr. Taber explained the guidance he is looking for is if the amount an individual donates now is less than what the policy calls for whether an effective date as to when the new rates shall apply should be given.

Mr. Foreman did not think anybody should be grandfathered a lesser rate. He thought the grandfathering was on the day a group usually uses the center.

Mr. Toney felt there was merit to grandfathering someone in. He is not aware of what people are paying to use the center.

Mr. Taber asked Council if they wanted to see a list of the current users. He used the example of an individual who provides painting lessons. The students taking the lessons pay a fee. The individual has donated some paintings that are displayed in Town Hall and on occasion will provide a check for a small amount of money.

Mr. Toney wanted to be fair to people. The rules are being changed while I am already being in the game, but you do not want to grandfather me in. He felt a period of time should be provided at least in order to meet the requirements and be prudent.

Ms. Forrester was sympathetic to that concern; however, she did not think that could be accommodated long term and did not think that was fair. She did think that a period of time should be provided in order for the individual to find another place if they choose not to use the Community Center.

Mr. Taber asked whether it should be 6 months or 3 months.

Ms. Forrester did not have a preference on a timeframe.

Mr. Taber noted the changes would be made and brought back to Council for consideration.

**D. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSPORTATION SECTION OF THE TOWN'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – GREG TKAC**

Mr. Taber mentioned Mr. Tkac would be available for questions. He explained the matter was brought before Council previously and did not vote to move it forward for a public hearing. What this is meant to be is more of a placeholder rather than a specific thing stating there will be a traffic light at this intersection that will go across the road into here. We want to put the Comprehensive Plan (CP) in a position so that when developers are talking about doing things staff can tell them to look at the CP. This lets developers know that they will be responsible for paying for the traffic light and things. It is not to mean a decision is being made today about a specific location for a traffic light. Staff is trying to deal with what we know since a proposed development is coming. The Council's displeasure with the design has already been expressed to the developer.

Mr. Tkac explained staff would be on a lessor ground to talk about the Town's desires by not having the Potomac Shores development mentioned in the CP. We know it is coming. It is inevitable. It needs to be in the CP in order to enter into discussion with the developers at the appropriate times.

Mr. Foreman asked what bicycle facilities the Town has that are mentioned in the transportation section.

Mr. Tkac indicated they are part of the plan. He noted the areas being changed are highlighted.

Mr. Foreman understood that. He noted if the CP was going to be changed it needed to be done right. He mentioned there is a paragraph about a debris wall and the Town has a sound wall.

Mr. Tkac noted the transportation section of the CP is due in this budget cycle to be completely amended. The only thing that staff wants to do with this document is change Harbor Station to Potomac Shores. Staff is well aware of what needs to be changed; however, if there is a list of changes Council wants he was happy to write them down.

Mayor Foreman pointed out there are things in there that mention 2011, 2012, but then the buses are mentioned with 2007 statistics. The 2013 numbers should be in there. If Council is only looking at three lines, he wanted to know when it was coming up for a rewrite.

Mr. Tkac noted it was scheduled in the budget and if Council approves the budget, the rewrite will start right away.

Mayor Foreman asked what month he was going to see the rewrite.

Mr. Tkac did not want to commit to a month.

Mayor Foreman indicated the rewrite would be seen sometime in the next fiscal year.

**E. POTOMAC SHORES SUBMISSION TO PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY (PWC)  
– GREG TKAC**

Mr. Tkac noted the developer's latest submission for a conditional use permit (CUP) has been submitted and was provided to Council for review. It was quite a substantial submission. The majority of the submission involved CUP issues dealing with the internal aspects of the subdivision. In the information provided there was an internal and external traffic study. He noted very little of it had to do specifically with issues within the Town. He looked at the transportation section of the CP in detail as it relates to the intersection of Route 234 and Route 1. He heard many concerns in regards to the quadrant intersection. Staff has asked the developer to provide Council a simulation model that will clearly show how the quadrant at the intersection will work. He cannot emphasize enough how strongly he supports the quadrant intersection opposed to a conventional eight-phase traffic signal. There is a significant amount of time saved for the driver when looking at a quadrant intersection. The only alternative he can see to a quadrant intersection is an actual flyover, which is more expensive and would bifurcate the Town. He could highlight the areas that speak to the benefit of the quadrant intersection if Council wanted.

Mayor Foreman read the 20 plus documents that were submitted. He noted that PWC's portion of the plan is fine, which concerns him greatly because that means the developer worked with PWC. Came up with a design that is suitable to PWC, presented it to PWC, and it is in the plan. The plan being proposed here is the quad. He pointed out the following items.

Item 9 – Potomac Shores External Network – March 12, 2013 – page vii – Future Conditions and Development – talks to the proposed improvements to Route 1/Route 234 and Old Stage Coach Road. The Town of Dumfries rejected this plan. As an additional note, Potomac Shores is proposing an additional 3,978 trips during the weekday. NuStar, which is the ethanol plant, is proposing 100 plus trips a day on Possum Point Road. PWC is advertising the north/south corridor to be started, which ends at Route 234 and Route 1. The traffic impact to Dumfries is not addressed. Potomac Shores, the north/south corridor, and NuStar are not addressing it. There needs to be a comment made that not all of these plans are coordinated. The only plan the Town of Dumfries is coordinated in is PWC's 2030 Vision Plan that states Route 1 will finally be done then.

Item 1 – Proffer Statement – April 26, 2013 – page 7 – item 11 – Off-Site Road Improvements - the entire section does not address the Town of Dumfries. It mentions the Route 1 and Route 234 intersection, but it states the plan for that intersection, to include the quad, as approved by PWC Department of Transportation and/or Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). A statement needs to be included that the intersection has to be approved by the Town of Dumfries.

Item 2 – Master PMR/PMD Zoning Plan for Potomac Shores – April 26, 2013 – page 4 – shows the Route 1 and Route 234 as proposed to the Town Council. The document needs to clearly state the proposed plan was presented to the Town Council and rejected.

Item 12 – Potomac Shores Transportation Demand Management (TMD) Guidelines – April 25, 2013 – mentions the public transportation, transit program, etc., it does not address Potomac Shores impact to Route 1, Route 234, and the intersection. It talks about the buses, the transit, the flow it has up and down the Potomac Shores Parkway; however, it does not address the quad.

Sub-Item 1 – Conditions Special Use Permit #PLN2012-00434, Potomac Shores Town Center – April 26, 2013 – there is mention of a traffic impact analysis prepared by Gorove/Slade dated January 8, 2013 which was not provided.

Mr. Tkac noted there are several misstatements that refer to the Town of Dumfries limits being south of Route 234 intersection. It is true west of Route 1; it is not true east of Route 1. A large portion of the northeast quadrant of the intersection is in the Town of Dumfries. It allows for property in the Town of Dumfries to be developed. He was disappointed with the traffic impact analysis speaking to Old Stage Coach Road becoming a cul-de-sac.

Mayor Foreman was concerned with the plan going to PWC and not having it stated anywhere that the Town of Dumfries needs to approve changes to the intersection.

Mr. Tkac was concerned with Old Stage Coach, which is a signalized intersection, becoming a cul-de-sac with no traffic counts showing how Old Stage Coach Road is going to be affected in the out years. Information was not used as part of the study regarding Route 1 becoming six lanes. Preliminary design has started with Route 1 and it would be wise for any traffic impact analysis to take into account the future widening.

Mayor Foreman recommended that until the language is changed in the document, even after submitting the letter that a quarterly brief should be given to Town Council on what changes are being done with the intersection.

Mr. Tkac got the sense that the developer either is ignoring the Town or wants to deal with the Town separately.

Ms. Washington asked what Council needed to do to be added to the approval list. She did not notice anything in the traffic impact analysis of what the impact would be south of the intersection and wanted to know what needed to be done to get that information. She wanted to know what the response was to getting the simulation model.

Mr. Tkac noted the developer was going to provide it, he has not seen it, and he needed to follow up on it.

Mr. Taber would be getting in touch with Susan Roltsch, Assistant County Executive at PWC, to go over the Council's concerns.

Mr. Brewer agreed with making the changes to the document. He did not need a simulation model to get out of Tripoli Heights on a Saturday morning when the traffic is backed up from Fredericksburg to Woodbridge. You cannot get from Woodbridge to Dumfries in under an hour. He knows because he does it every day. The area is over populated now with the current road system, Potomac Shores will just add to that, and the changes being proposed are not conducive to the Town. The developer is only concerned with PWC and not the Town. They were not concerned with the Town the last time they tried to construct the project. This has to be addressed and the Council's point needs to get across to them.

Mr. Tkac noted staff has stressed the needs and desires of the community at every meeting to no avail. He will continue to press the issues.

Mr. Toney wanted to make sure that staff stressed how adamant Council is about the way the document is worded.

Mayor Foreman noted that all of the studies look as though each business has no impact. He pointed out that NuStar's traffic study proposed and approved by PWC only covers the traffic impact from Cock Pit Road to Possum Point Road in PWC, not Route 1, or Route 234. Potomac Shores traffic impact analysis approved by PWC is only for Route 234 and Route 1. The Northern Virginia Transportation Authority's (NVTA) study is only Route 234 to Route 1. PWC's Route 1 Corridor Study shows only impacts to Route 1. You cannot tell him that not one of these impacts the busiest intersection with the highest volume of traffic in Town. Soon to be proposed a 100 plus large trucks hitting Possum Point Road and Route 1. If Old Stage Coach Road becomes a cul-de-sac there will be another 30 trucks a day forced on there with a stop sign. Another 3,000 vehicles going in and out of Potomac Shores. He suggested PWC, Potomac Shores, NuStar, and the money slated for the north south corridor be pulled together to do a traffic study from Possum Point Road to outside the Town's limits, north and west. One study that shows all the impacts rather than four studies. This needs to be submitted in a document.

Ms. Washington felt the Council needed to find a way to make Dumfries important to PWC, because right now Dumfries is being left out. She did not think the Route 1 widening should have jumped over Dumfries into Woodbridge.

Mr. Brewer asked if there was any way the Council could meet with Tom Blazer.

Mr. Taber noted meetings are staff-to-staff and elected official to elected official. He noted PWC would not allow that.

Mayor Foreman suggested asking the elected official come down to talk with Council.

Mr. Taber could ask that Tom Blazer attend with the elected official.

**F. DUMFRIES TOWN COUNCIL 2020 VISION STATEMENT – DAN TABER**

Mr. Taber reminded Council that at a recent meeting several relative questions were asked concerning the goals in the 2020 Vision Statement. He recalled Ms. Forrester alluded to some of the statements in the 2020 Vision Statement being far reaching. It is always good to set a high bar and standard. He got a wakeup call from the questions asked that this needs to be part of a discussion with Council breaking down the vision and addressing it on a quarterly basis to what steps staff has been taking to meet some of the goals. He does not think this has been done since 2008. He mentioned there is a reference to a Green Council, which sounds like a committee. He believed Ms. Barr might have embodied that when she was on Council. He wanted to know if Council wanted to form the committee or remove it from the 2020 Vision Statement. He asked Council to look over the 2020 Vision Statement and a future work session be scheduled to go over the language to determine if anything needs to be changed. He wanted Council to understand he got it from the questions that were asked that a more conscious effort needed to be made to work toward the 2020 Vision Statement. He thinks one of the things that should be in the Vision Statement is setting the goal for Main Street, separate and apart from Route 1 widening. The 2020 Vision Statement mentions the revitalized “old port” and the reality is, in his opinion, that until the issue with widening of Route 1 is taken care of developers are not going to knock down doors and start developing the old port. He thought that some of the items may need to be put into context.

Ms. Forrester suggested considering some of the things to be a 2030 or 2040 extension. She did not want to see the old port revitalization removed; however, nothing was going to happen in the next seven to eight years. She did not want to spread Council to thin since there were a few new committees recently formed; however, she did not want to see the green initiatives removed.

Mayor Foreman asked the questions because the Town Manager and staff need to know what some of their goals are. He was looking at the 2014 budget and none of the 2020 Vision Statement goals are budgeted. He wanted to bring it to everyone’s attention. He noted the Town Manager and staff are evaluated. There is no annual agenda. This is something that can be picked up and each department can determine what needs to be budgeted for. There are items that are very doable by 2020 and there are grants available. In the budget narrative, each department has goals and objectives. He does not see any department setting goals that come out of the 2020 Vision Statement. He was not asking for a rewrite of the 2020 Vision Statement. He will keep asking what is being done to implement the 2020 Vision Statement. He pointed out that staff has not said the 2020 Vision Statement is unobtainable.

Mr. Taber reiterated that updates would be provided on a quarterly basis in the department and Town Manager monthly reports to Council of what steps have been taken toward the 2020 Vision Statement.

Mr. Brewer wanted to see specific things that the Town Manager could obtain in a years' time. He wanted to see something specific the Town itself can complete by 2020. He wanted to see a mission statement or goals and objectives.

Mr. Wood thanked the Mayor for bringing the 2020 Vision Statement to Council's attention. He felt it would help the Parks and Recreation Commission with goals. He mentioned recycling was talked about a couple months ago and educational materials were brought in. He was in favor of looking for grants and getting green certified. He liked the Come Play in Dumfries; Come Stay in Dumfries, which falls into his idea of Dumfries becoming a destination. He was in favor of having a vision and wanted to move forward with it.

Mr. Toney was on the Council when it was developed and the only one on the current Council who actively participated. It was a three-day weekend retreat that five of seven Council Members participated in that cost the taxpayers approximately \$8,000. He thanked the Mayor for bringing it back to the forefront.

Mr. Brewer was the one who did not sign the document and did not attend the retreat. The other person who did not attend, due to a family emergency, was Sue Cornell. He noted Ms. Barr left the retreat early due to a sick cat. He has not seen any of the 2020 Vision Statement implemented.

Ms. Washington liked the document. She noted there are goals in the document that are just written in a more artistic way. She was excited when she read the document and was able to circle a lot of things that have already been done.

Mayor Foreman mentioned the document should be included in Council Orientation.

**G. UPDATE ON ROUTE 1 WIDENING PROJECT – DAN TABER**

Mr. Taber explained several positive steps have been taking place over the past several months regarding placing a State and County focus on the widening of Route 1 within the Town limits. Much of the progress can be attributed to the lobbying efforts of the Mayor getting support from VDOT and State elected officials. VDOT has agreed to apply 1.2 million dollars as of July 1, 2013. The money will be shown in the six-year plan that is currently being updated. The new money combined with what is already there will fund the initial preliminary engineering of the project. After consulting with VDOT and PWC, PWC has agreed to manage the first phase of the project and most likely the entire project with input from the Town. The Town does not have the staff to manage that size project and PWC does have a good reputation with VDOT in being able to manage these road projects. There will be a little gap in time while VDOT and PWC come to an agreement to manage the project but this cannot be done until after July 1, 2013. Once that is done, the Town and PWC will enter into an agreement that will specify the Town's role. An aerial survey has been completed funded by the State. A supporting ground survey is being

worked on now that will supplement the aerial survey. The Town will receive both of the surveys once they are completed.

Mayor Foreman asked what the next phase was for Route 1 and how much the next phase was going to cost.

Mr. Brewer asked if anyone had an estimate on what the total cost of the project will be.

Mr. Tkac noted the preliminary engineering costs are estimated at 4.5 million dollars. Without the cost of utility relocation or right-of-way, the estimated cost is 40 million dollars.

A brief discussion was had about the need for sidewalks along Route 1 between Old Triangle Road and Williamstown Road.

**IN RE: CLOSED SESSION**

Mr. Wood made the motion, seconded by Ms. Forrester, to convene into closed session. The motion carried and the following resolution was adopted by the following roll call vote: Mr. Brewer, yes; Mr. Foreman, yes; Ms. Forrester, yes; Ms. Reynolds, yes; Mr. Toney, yes; Ms. Washington, yes; Mr. Wood, yes.

**WHEREAS**, the Dumfries Town Council desires to discuss a particular subject in Closed Session during the course of its meeting of May 21, 2012; and

**WHEREAS**, the nature of the subject is the discussion of personnel matters. The discussion of same in Closed Meeting is expressly permitted by Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Town Council of Dumfries does hereby convene in Closed Session for the purpose(s) herein expressed pursuant to the legal authorities herein recited.

Mr. Wood made the motion, seconded by Ms. Reynolds, to reconvene into open session. The motion carried and the following resolution was adopted by the following roll call vote: Mr. Brewer, yes; Mr. Foreman, yes; Ms. Forrester, yes; Ms. Reynolds, yes; Mr. Toney, yes; Ms. Washington, yes.

**WHEREAS**, the Town Council of Dumfries has completed its discussion in Closed Session, and now desires to continue its meeting in Open Session; and

**WHEREAS**, each and every member of this said Council who votes affirmatively for the adoption of this Resolution does thereby certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from Open Session were heard, discussed, or considered during the Closed Session, and that the only subjects heard, discussed, or considered in said Closed Session were the matters identified in the Resolution by which it was convened.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Town Council of Dumfries does hereby reconvene in Open Session at its meeting of May 21, 2013 and certifies the matters set forth in Section 2.2-3712(D) of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended.

Mr. Wood made the motion, seconded by Mr. Foreman, to direct the Town Manager to proceed with the contract as agreed to be placed under the consent agenda 6-4-13 for adoption. The motion carried by the following roll call vote: Mr. Brewer, yes; Mr. Foreman, yes; Ms. Forrester, yes; Ms. Reynolds, yes; Mr. Toney, yes; Ms. Washington, yes.

**IN RE:           ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Foreman moved, seconded by Ms. Forrester, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following voice vote: Mr. Brewer, no; Mr. Foreman, yes; Ms. Forrester, yes; Mr. Ms. Reynolds, yes; Mr. Toney, yes; Ms. Washington, yes; Mr. Wood, yes.

Minutes submitted by

Approved by

---

Dawn Hobgood  
Town Clerk

---

Gerald M. Foreman  
Mayor