



TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION

Monday, May 4, 2015 @ 7:00pm
Front Royal Administration Building

Town/Staff Related Issues:

1. Continued Discussion of Chapter 148 Draft Code Amendments – *Director of Planning/Zoning*
2. Discussion of House Bill 2 & the Town's Proposed Typology Category – *Director of Planning/Zoning*
3. Humane Society's Request for Trolley Use – *Town Manager*
4. Meter Service Adjustment Request - 1100 N Royal Avenue – *Jeff Grim – Town Manager*
5. Sewer Backup Protection Program - 809 Happy Creek Road – *William Kinsey – Town Manager*
6. Continued Discussion of a Budget Amendment for Snow Removal Costs – *Finance Director*
7. Ordinance to Amend 158-6 - Adoption by Reference of State Motor Vehicular Laws – *Town Attorney*

Council/Mayor Related Items

8. Liaison Committee Meeting Items for May 21
9. Council Discussion/Goals (*time permitting*)
10. Closed Meeting – 1) Personnel Matter and 2) Public Contract Pertaining to Possible Acquisition of Land and Investment of Public Funds

Motion to Go Into Closed Meeting

I move that Council convene and go into Closed Meeting for the purpose of 1) assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining, or resignation of specific public officers, appointees, or employees of a public body, pursuant to Section 2.2 3711. A. 1. of the Code of Virginia; and, 2) the discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds, pertaining to the possible acquisition of land for a public parking lot, improvements, and other land which would enhance the Town's downtown recreational opportunities for the public, and discussion of the terms or scope of such contract, where discussion in an Open Session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body, pursuant to Section 2.2- 3711. A. 29. of the Code of Virginia and the discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, pertaining to the possible acquisition of land for a public parking lot, improvements, and other land which would enhance the Town's downtown recreational opportunities for the public, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711. A. 6. of the Code of Virginia.

Motion to Certify Closed Meeting at its Conclusion [*At the conclusion of the Closed Meeting, immediately re-convene in open meeting and take a roll call vote on the following:*]

I move that Council certify that to the best of each member's knowledge, as recognized by each Council member's affirmative vote, that only such public business matters lawfully exempted from Open Meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Action as were identified in the motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the Closed Meeting by Council, and that the vote of each individual member of Council be taken by roll call and recorded and included in the minutes of the meeting of Town Council.

1

Continued Discussion of Chapter 148 Draft Code Amendment

Town of Front Royal, Virginia Work Session Agenda Form


Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: Continued Discussion of Chapter 148 Draft Code Amendment
Director of Planning & Zoning

Summary: At the March 16, 2015 Town Council Work Session, Town Council met and discussed citizen input received as part of the public hearing associated with Chapter 148 of the Town Code. During the work session Town Council primarily discussed road widths, although there are other comments that were provided, and are noted in the attachments with recommendations. The same attachments included at the March 16th Work Session are included with this coveragepage.

An additional option that Town Staff would recommend for consideration is a requirement/allowance for narrower intersection street widths. This would allow for pedestrian crossing areas to be shorter and safer, and would have a minimal impact on street maintenance and emergency vehicle access concerns. Below is example language and illustrations.

Residential intersections street widths shall be reduced to twenty-seven feet (15' receiving lane and 12' through lane) with bulb-outs for sidewalk ramps to enhance pedestrian safety. In addition, bulb-outs for mid-block crossings will be required at a minimum of every eight hundred (800) feet to coincide with the dedication of a ten foot ROW for public pedestrian walkways connecting adjacent streets or other public and private areas.



Council Discussion: This agenda item is scheduled for a work session review on 05/04/2015.

Staff Evaluation: Planning & Zoning Staff will be available at the work session for questions.

Legal Evaluation: The Town Attorney will be available at the work session for questions.

Town Manager: The Town Attorney will be available at the work session for questions.

Budget/Funding: N/A

Council Recommendation:

- Additional Work Session Regular Meeting No Action
Consensus Poll on Action: ___(Aye) ___(Nay)



Name	Section	Lines	Comment (Summarized)	Proposed Language	Staff Response
David Vazzana	148-820.A.	1637-1646	<i>Pushes legal limits/misleading</i>	<p>(4) On-site road improvements shall be required for new subdivisions or developments based on the requirements of this chapter, and shall be evaluated based on what is needed to safely accommodate the proposed traffic volumes at build-out of the subdivision or development.</p> <p>(5) In accordance with Virginia Code §15.2-2242.A.4, the Town may require certain off-site road improvements that are reasonable and necessary, the need for which is substantially generated and reasonably required by the construction or improvement of the subdivision or development. Off-site road improvements may include, but are not limited to, acceleration and deceleration lanes, a center turning lane, a parallel service drive, reverse frontage lots, and/or the dedication of additional right-of-way.</p>	<p><i>Draft Rewording:</i></p> <p>(4) On-site road improvements shall be required for new subdivisions or developments based on the requirements of this chapter, and shall be evaluated based on what is needed to safely accommodate the proposed traffic volumes at build-out of the subdivision or development.</p> <p>(5) In accordance with Virginia Code §15.2-2242.A.4, the Town may require accept voluntary funding for certain off-site road improvements that are reasonable and necessary, the need for which is substantially generated and reasonably required by the construction or improvement of the subdivision or development.</p>
David Vazzana	148-1100.A.	4600	<i>Clarify that it is not \$250 per variance</i>	9. For processing as Subdivision Variance - \$250.00	<p><i>Draft Rewording:</i></p> <p>9. For processing as Subdivision Variance or Special Exception - \$250.00 per application submission, not per variance or exception standard.</p>

Name	Section	Lines	Comment (Summarized)	Proposed Language	Staff Response
------	---------	-------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------

David Vazzana	148-890.A.	2818-2823	<i>Should not pay until final plat or construction whichever is later.</i>	B. No site development plan, subdivision development plan, overlot grading plan 2818 and/or final plat that is subject to a development surety shall be approved, nor a building or 2819 land disturbance permit issued for development, until the development surety instrument 2820 for that particular development, or phase of development, has been submitted and certified 2821 by the Director as being consistent with the indemnification and other requirements and 2822 format of the Town.	<p>Once a subdivision plat is recorded all ROW shown on the plat is dedicated for public use and a responsibility of the Town. The development surety is the only protection that the Town has that the roads will be completed by the developer.</p> <p>If the development surety is not required at the time of final plat recordation the Town is at greater risk because the developer could go bankrupt or disappear after the lots are sold.</p> <p>Some localities require that the roads in subdivisions be constructed and accepted for public use before any permits are issued. This is not proposed because the Town understands that it is difficult for a developer to finance road construction entirely up front.</p> <p>A preliminary plat can be applied for to obtain a vested right in the project and does not require bonding. Furthermore, a subdivision can be broken down into different phases to provide greater flexibility.</p>
---------------	------------	-----------	--	--	--

Name	Section	Lines	Comment (Summarized)	Proposed Language	Staff Response
David Vazzana	148-840.D.	2092-2219	<p><i>This is an additional layer of gov't oversight.</i></p> <p><i>Should be removed.</i></p>	See draft code.	<p>The requirements are standard engineering practices that are appropriate and consistent with VDOT storm drainage requirements.</p> <p>There is a difference between water "quality" control and water "quantity" control. The Town maintains stormwater facilities and has an interest in ensuring they are properly designed facilities in terms of design (maintenance) and water "quantity" control. The draft ordinance does not regulate water "quality" control, as controlled by the State permitting process.</p>
David Vazzana	148-820.C.2.	1680-1690	<p><i>Minimum ROW should be minimum required to accommodate all necessary elements.</i></p>	<p><i>Summary of Minimum ROW widths:</i></p> <p><i>Alleys: 20'</i></p> <p><i>Local Streets (up to 1,000 ADTs): 50'</i></p> <p><i>Local Streets (up to 2,000 ADTs): 55'</i></p> <p><i>Collector Streets: 65'</i></p>	<p>The ROW widths are reasonable, consistent and not excessive.</p> <p>The difference in what is required and what is the absolute minimum necessary is minimal. For a 36' wide street, the differences can effectively be compared to either a 2 foot wide grass area between the sidewalk and the street, or a 4 ½ foot grass area between the sidewalk and the street. Other reasonable considerations for more space is as follows: mailboxes, signage, redesign options such as median installation if needed in the future, buffering for improved walkability along the street</p>

Name	Section	Lines	Comment (Summarized)	Proposed Language	Staff Response
------	---------	-------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------

					(buffering between traffic), space for snow storage, and easier access and room for utility installation and maintenance.
David Vazzana	148-820.D.	1696-1716	Streets should be narrower. 29' with parking on both sides, 24' with parking on one side.	See separate handout.	See separate handout.
David Vazzana	148-820.M.	1814-1824	This appears to be directed at FRLP and is illegal.	2. Where feasible, each subdivision shall provide two (2) connections to an existing public street where the traffic generated from the subdivision or development is between five hundred one (501) and two thousand (2,000) ADT's. Three (3) road connections shall be provided where the traffic generated exceeds two thousand (2,000) ADT's. In situations where only one (1) street connection is physically possible, due to topography, site distance or road frontage, the single entrance street shall be a four-lane restricted access divided road with a length of not less than two hundred fifty (250) feet for roads generating two thousand one (2,001) or more ADTs, and for every additional five hundred (500) ADTs generated, the four lane divided street standard shall be extended an additional one hundred (100)	The draft code would apply to all future development. The requirement for multiple street connections is similar in scope to those adopted in other jurisdictions and VDOT for the purpose of promoting public safety/access and walkable communities.

Name	Section	Lines	Comment (Summarized)	Proposed Language	Staff Response
------	---------	-------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------

				feet. Streets with two thousand (2,000) or fewer ADTs shall not be subject to this requirement.	
Dan McCarty	148-850.D.	2378-2381	5' Sidewalks Should be Kept	2. The minimum design standards for sidewalks shall be at least six (6) feet in width when abutting the curb, and a minimum of five (5) feet when offset from the curb. For the latter, the land located between the sidewalk and the curb shall comply with the Construction Standards and Specifications.	None – supports draft language / standards.
Dan McCarty	148-820.D.	1696-1716	Streets should be wider, not narrower.	See separate handout.	See separate handout.
Eva Challis	148-820.D.	1696-1716	Supporter of wider streets, not narrower. See the Firewise Community documents she provided under Attachment D.	See separate handout.	See separate handout.
Bill Barnett	148-850.D.	2378-2381	4' is adequate for sidewalks.	2. The minimum design standards for sidewalks shall be at least six (6) feet in width when abutting the curb, and a minimum of five (5) feet when offset	A 5' sidewalk is consistent with VDOT standards. Many other localities require 5', or wider, sidewalks. VDOT requires an 8' wide sidewalk when abutting the street.

Name	Section	Lines	Comment (Summarized)	Proposed Language	Staff Response
------	---------	-------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------

				from the curb. For the latter, the land located between the sidewalk and the curb shall comply with the Construction Standards and Specifications.	The proposed draft amendment is 6' in such cases.
Bill Barnett	148-820.D	1696-1716	Supporter of increased development flexibility and narrower streets.	See separate handout.	See separate handout.
Chris Ramsey	148-820.O.	1951-1969	Against additional regulation on developers. Against 148-820.O. in particular. Should not apply to both streets for corner lots. Against increased sidewalk width. [no written comments]	1. New structures with a front setback of less than 50 feet shall be constructed at least two (2) feet above the centerline grade of adjoining streets, as measured from the front ground floor elevation.	<i>Draft Rewording:</i> 1. New structures with a front setback of less than 50 feet shall be constructed at least two (2) feet above the centerline grade of the street adjoining streets that adjoins the front yard, as measured from the front ground floor elevation.
Joe Duggan	--	--	Against increase in street widths. Concerned about meeting DEQ regs. [no written comments]	See separate handout.	See separate handout.

COMPARISON OF LOCAL STREET WIDTH REQUIREMENTS

LOCALITY NAME	PAVEMENT WIDTH (MIN.)	SIDEWALK WIDTH (MIN.)	NOTES
Town - Current	32' – 500 ADT or less 40' – 500 – 3000 ADT	4'	Includes Curb & Gutter Includes Parking
Town - Proposed	36' – up to 2000 ADT 40' – over 2000 ADT	5'- 6'	Includes Curb & Gutter Includes Parking 32' up to 1K ADT Removed
VDOT	29' – 2000 ADT or less 36' – 2001 – 4000 ADT	5'- 8'	Includes on-street parking – although large rural lots typically have minimal street parking. Does not include curb & gutter
Santa Rosa, CA	30' – less than 1000 ADT 36' - Over 1000 ADT	5'+	Includes Curb & Gutter Includes Parking Width reduce for 200 ADT or less when parking not required
Winchester, VA	36' – category 1 40' – category 2 48' – category 3	4'	Waivers may be granted for street widths by Town Council
Culpeper, VA	Per VDOT	Per VDOT	Curb required along specified streets and as determined necessary
Harrisonburg, VA	26' – under 200 ADT 34' – 40' for 200 ADT+	5'	26' width is approved as a waiver process and requires a parking restriction on one side
Town of Strasburg, VA	34' minimum or larger	5'	Larger street width determined as needed by the Town's Public Works Director
City of Virginia Beach, VA	36'	5' 8' minimum when a shared use path, 10' recommended	30' allowed in a couple scenarios, including a certain type of townhouse development & when no more than 10 lots are on a cul-de-sac, subject to certain minimum driveway standards and minimum lot sizes
City of Gaithersburg, MD	32' – Residential Secondary 36' – Residential Primary	5'+	Planning Commission may reduce as low as 26' upon review of subdivision design
Town of Leesburg, VA	34' – up to 500 ADT 36' – up to 2000 ADT	5'+	Width may be reduced as low as 26' when on-street parking is limited or eliminated

Street Widths Picture Examples


CHESTER STREET

32' Wide



HAPPY RIDGE & GOODVIEW DRIVES

40' Wide



SHENANDOAH AVENUE

40' Wide



SALEM AVENUE

32' Wide

VIRGINIA AVENUE

36' Wide



4 1/2 Foot landscape strip between sidewalk and curb.

KERFOOT AVENUE

36' Wide



No curb on park side

Lee Street

31' Wide



Shenandoah at Lake Frederick

22' Wide, no sidewalks - no parking



A Case Study

STUDY AREA = 151.6 ACRES
NUMBER OF LOTS = 394
DENSITY = 2.6 LOTS/ACRE





PLATE 1 - AS-BUILT CONDITIONS

TOTAL CENTERLINE STREETS = 22,880' = 4.33 MILES
(ALL STREET PAVEMENT IS 40' WITH 80' CUL-DE-SAC)
TOTAL AREA PAVED STREETS = 22.05 AC.

Legend


Street Classifications

FUNCTION

- ARTERIAL
- COLLECTOR (9,499')
- LOCAL (13,381')
- Study Area (151.6 Acres)

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
DECEMBER 2011


TOWN OF FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA



D.G. Merchant, Cartographer

*Town of Front Royal, Virginia
Department of Planning and Zoning*

STUDY AREA = 151.6 ACRES
 NUMBER OF LOTS = 394
 DENSITY = 2.6 LOTS/ACRE



Legend

Classification per Proposed Ordinance

FUNCTION

- ARTERIAL
- COLLECTOR (5,245')
- LOCAL 2: 2000-4000 ADT (8,388')
- LOCAL 1: <2000 ADT (8,247')
- Study Area (151.6 Acres)

PLATE 3 - PROPOSED SUBD. ORDINANCE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS

LOCAL STREET 1: <2000 ADT = 32' PAVEMENT
 LOCAL STREET 2: 2000-4000 ADT = 36' PAVEMENT
 COLLECTOR STREET <4000 ADT = 40' PAVEMENT

TOTAL AREA PAVED STREETS = 19.24 ACRES

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
 DECEMBER 2011
 TOWN OF FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA



D.S. Merchant, Cartographer

Town of Front Royal, Virginia
Department of Planning and Zoning

03/02/2015

ATTN : PLANNING DEPT AND TOWN COUNCIL

I CHARGE YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO CITIZENS/ VOTERS ALREADY LIVING IN AND AROUND WARREN COUNTY.

A TOP PRIORITY 24/7 SHOULD ALWAYS BE ROAD ACCESS.

MY FATHER TAUGHT ME THAT A JOB WORTH DOING WAS WORTH DOING RIGHT.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS ARE GOING TO BE MADE BY SOME.

CORNERS ARE NOT TO BE CUT NOW.

MARK MY WORDS THERE WILL BE ATTEMPTS IN THE FUTURE, DOWN THE ROAD.

OFCOURSE THE SIDEWALKS SHOULD BE 5 FEET WIDE. WE MUST BE PRO ACTIVE AND ANTICIPATE THAT

OUR POPULATION IS AGING. THEREFORE THERE WILL BE A NEED FOR WHEEL CHAIR ACCESS.

IT IS ALSO NOTEWORTHY THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO WALK SIDE BY SIDE ESPECIALLY IF THERE ARE UTILITY POLES IN THE SIDEWALKS TO GO AROUND.

STREETS SHOULD BE MADE WIDER FOR FIRE TRUCKS, POLICE, SCHOOL BUSES, MOVING VANS, EVEN DELIVERY TRUCKS.

THERE NEEDS TO BE ROOM FOR AMPLE PARKING ON THE STREET CURBSIDE.

SINCERELY

DAN McCARTY

PO BOX 1611

FRONT ROYAL VA 22630

FRLP Supplemental Comments on the proposed SLDO

March 4, 2015
The Honorable Timothy W. Darr and Town Council
Town of Front Royal, Virginia

Dear Mayor Darr and members of Town Council,

I would like to thank Council for the opportunity to submit additional comments on the proposed Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO). FRLP has been encouraging the Town to adopt more Earth Friendly design standards for many years. Similar discussions have occurred in communities throughout the nation for decades.

FRLP has limited its comments here as much of what we have proposed in the past would require an almost complete re-write (and perspective) on the part of the Town and we recognize that would be impractical at this point. I am working on many of those now (and on ch. 175) and we hope to discuss these as well with Council moving forward.

Proposed SLDO: General Comments.

I would like to emphasize that in no way would any of these proposed changes prohibit the type of development standards contemplated by the proposed ordinance – our argument is that the proposed ordinance fails to incorporate many accepted design, engineering, and environmentally sound land use and development standards.

In affect, the Town is going against environmentally friendly development techniques accepted by the State and Federal government. Low impact development should be the standard – not the exception. Further, failing to incorporate or allow such things “by-right” in the SLDO will hurt economic investment in the Town. For example, the Federal Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 states that:

“The sponsor of any development or redevelopment project involving a federal facility... shall use site planning, design, construction, and maintenance strategies for the property to maintain or restore, to the maximum extent technically feasible, the predevelopment hydrology of the property...”

Federal law requires this (Low Impact Development Strategies) for all Federal facilities. The State of Maryland requires LID standards as the first option. The state of Virginia agreed to implement LID by 2005 in the 2000 Chesapeake Bay agreement but it was an “unfunded mandate”. Locally, the 1997 and 2007 Comprehensive plan is filled with innumerable recommendations (many of them found on page 25, 26) that direct the Town to reduce developments impact on our natural environment and these ideas were completely left out of the proposed “complete rewrite/update”. The Town’s Comprehensive planning efforts are meaningless without an attempt by the Town to codify those recommendations – that’s how, and why, this “update” began in 2007.

Proposed SLDO Design Standards and the Environment: General Comments.

The Center for Watershed Protection (www.cwp.org) has an ordinance checklist that grades the impact of a locality's development regulations on the local watershed and provides a good overall assessment on the environmental friendliness of local codes and ordinances. Scores between 90-100 mean the Community has "above average provisions that promote the protection of streams, lakes and estuaries." The proposed ordinance scored below 20 points. Scores less than 60 (the lowest rating category) mean that the "Development rules definitely are not environmentally friendly. Serious reform of the development rules is needed." Resources:

- a. CWP, "Better Site Design" Handbook and "Local Codes and Ordinances Worksheet" (www.cwp.org).
- b. "Model development Principles for the Central Rappahannock", A working group from Stafford County, Spotsylvania County, and the City of Fredericksburg (www.riverfriends.org) - http://www.riverfriends.org/Portals/0/LID_principles.pdf.

Consider using VDOT Standards for Street Width/ R.O.W./ and Entrances.

Adding 7 feet of pavement width to VDOT design standards places an undue disadvantage on development in Town versus in the County or elsewhere in the Commonwealth. The proposed ordinance already references (and requires) VDOT standards 7 times in sections 820.C, 820.D, and 820.M – FRLP believes the design standards in these three sections should be removed and the VDOT standards should be used instead. Specifically, and per VDOT;

- a. 820.C – VDOT - Minimum R.O.W. of 40', or the minimum required to accommodate all necessary elements, as opposed to 50', 55' and 65' as proposed (increased R.O.W. requirements increases a developments "footprint"),
- b. 820.D – VDOT - Neighborhood streets of 29' (parking on both sides) and 24' (parking on one side) instead of only 36' or 40' as proposed, (The Virginia Fire Marshall requires a 15' travel way – i.e. a 29' street has a 7' parking strip on each side and a 15' travelway – and thus meets State Fire safety requirements)
- c. 820.M(2) – The last 2 sentences - this language appears to only apply to the FRLP development. VDOT and the Town will by law require that any proposed new streets, and in this case a development entrance road, will be of sufficient size to meet the proposed traffic volumes – this language requires additional road/traffic capacity beyond that – which is illegal – and unnecessary.

VDOT design standards have been thoroughly reviewed for safety by teams of engineers and design professionals - resources and time that the Town does not have. Further, if a particular road needs to be larger the Town Council can require a larger road during the

plan review and approval process – you have this ability per 148-820.C (3) - which should give Council peace of mind that these standards can be increased when warranted. Again, VDOT standards are minimums – nothing prevents someone from building a larger street if that is what the market wants. We are asking that Council consider VDOT standards to be reasonable. They should be the standard – not the exception. Resources:

- a. Safety should be our #1 priority when designing streets – not speed - See “Confessions of a Recovering Engineer” ([StrongTowns.org](http://www.strongtowns.org)), <http://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2010/11/22/confessions-of-a-recovering-engineer.html>
- b. “Narrow Streets are the Safest”, Better Cities and Towns, www.bettercities.net, (0.32 automotive injury accidents can be anticipated per year per mile on a 24-foot-wide street, compared to 1.21 on a 36-foot-wide street).
- c. “Bad call: Wide streets in the name of fire safety”, Better Cities and Towns, <http://bettercities.net/news-opinion/blogs/robert-steuteville/21128/bad-call-wide-streets-name-fire-safety>
- d. SmartCode Municipality (v. 9.2, table 3B) lists the proposed 36’ wide streets as being appropriate for 15,000 VPD.
- e. Change takes time – and that’s o.k.
 - a. Concern: not enough parking! – The newer subdivisions in Town have 10 times more parking than is needed. Why not let the market/ a homebuyer decide.
 - b. Concern: you have to slow down to pass another car or a school bus on a narrow street! That is the point – to slow traffic down. (i.e. The Traffic circle at Riverton – at first it was confusing to drivers – but now drivers know how to navigate it (and it is efficient))... It’s traffic calming... it is good neighborhood design – neighborhoods designed for people - not cars.

Stormwater Management (840.D):

SWM is heavily regulated at the State and Federal level. The proposed ordinance adds another layer of government where it is not needed. This only makes the process more confusing, more expensive, and less efficient and effective. FRLP believes this section should be removed or simply limited to requiring that a sub-divider meet all applicable State and Federal regulations governing SWM.

In addition, this new oversight from State and Federal government will mean that simply keeping the same design standards will add tremendous costs. The ordinance as proposed essentially maximizes the overall “footprint” of development and the impervious cover of that development. The sub-divider will have to mitigate these impacts – placing another undue cost on a project in the Town versus in the County or the Commonwealth.

Bonding Requirements and Costs:

I believe less Government is generally better government. Regulatory and permitting costs have been increasing significantly over the past 10-15 years. This update is no different. Adding costs at this time is certainly not helpful – Front Royal has seen single digit building permits for five years. Building a home that median household incomes can afford (or building any new home) becomes even less viable with every additional cost. Virginia has the second highest regulatory, permitting, and impact fees in the nation. In my opinion, these are taxes. There is a point at which taxes and fees are so high that it makes no sense to invest in a project in Town – and no one will.

The new bonding requirements should be required only at the time of construction (890.A). Bonding costs are significant and can make or break a project. A sub-divider should not be forced to pay bonding costs until construction begins or at final plat approval – whichever is later.

As per the schedule of “Fees”, I would respectfully request that the Town consider waiving any fees above the initial amount (\$250) for a variance to these standards – or perhaps state that if a sub-divider submits 20 design changes on one project they are only subject to one \$250 fee. In 2012, Council added these “processing fees” – which added \$40,000 in fees for the Town to process plans for the FRLP 150 acre project alone.

In addition to increased costs, development regulations continue to push the limits of the law when it comes to what can legally be required of a sub-divider. There are a handful of regulations (820.A(4)(5), 820.M) which are not unequivocally illegal as written but could easily be applied to force exactions that are illegal. At best, they are misleading.

Conclusion:

There are better ways to develop – and to minimize future Town maintenance costs - they have been contemplated and recommended in the Town Comprehensive Plans for the past 20 years they have just never been incorporated into law – so they are “illegal”.

I hope that Council will keep an open mind to these things as we move forward. There is a big difference between allowing a sub-divider to build 36-foot streets and requiring them to do so. If there are reasonable arguments for using a different standard or design methodology the Town should not be adding unnecessary hoops, expense, and oversight in order to use those standards – and, at a minimum, we believe these standards as approved by the State should pass this test and be allowed “by-right” in the SLDO.

Sincerely,
David Vazzana
202.215.0038

CC: Town staff
Town P.C.

Statement Requested By Mayor Tim Darr at Feb. 23, 2015 public hearing

March 3, 2015

Bill Barnett

Consultant: FRLP

1115 Buck Mountain Road

Bentonville, VA 22610

billbarnett@centurylink.net

Mayor Darr, Town Council, Planning Commission and staff;

Thank you for allowing the public time to give additional input, before acting upon the proposed new sub-division ordinance. This Council is wise to take all the time required to assure we have an ordinance that guides future development. This can be done with safe, livable, people-friendly neighborhoods, while still protecting our environment and not burdening the Town with unreasonable maintenance cost.

I understand the safe thing to do is to stick with what you have done in the past, tweak it here and there, as needed, and move on. The problem is, this way of planning brings your problems of the past into the future. Wide streets and sidewalks in the past were a sign of prosperity. Streets like Manassas Ave. looked impressive and modern, when they were built. Today we know they are unnecessarily wide and result in additional police traffic patrol, (note the electronic speed alert sign used many times there) and much higher cost to resurface. Shenandoah Ave. frequent speeding problems required Council to allow "traffic tempering" devices to slow drivers down upon what looks and feels like a 35mph boulevard. I have no idea why a wider sidewalk is being considered. Bicycles and such are prohibited and surely no one minds going-single file around a wheel chair or stroller. The additional cost of maintenance would be with us forever, with no apparent benefit being met. Most new large developments will surely have bike and walking paths to tie into the Towns impressive network.

Water! Water has always been an issue that requires our very best efforts to manage even as science and experience proves our past methods inadequate. I can remember when many cities dumped raw sewage into waterways (Silent Spring) and the Potomac River was dead around Wash. DC. Today, with the exception of a few new shopping centers and most recent developments, all of our storm water dumps untreated directly into Happy Creek or the Shenandoah River along with the sediment, oil, pesticides, and who knows what else. We recently had a mysterious chemical dumped at a car wash flow directly into Happy Creek. If we stick with the past practices, we will continue to have all the lawns, driveways drain onto our boulevard-sized streets, channeled by curb and gutter into massive underground storm water conduits.

The big difference is, they will no longer be able to "dump" this into out streams untreated, so systems must be built to clean the water before it is discharged. Those systems will become the property of Front Royal, and be maintained forever.

Today, Front Royal has no alternative by-right standards to allow a developer to build an environmentally friendly community. This would be a community where the streets would only be as wide as required by VDOT and curb and gutter would be used only where engineering showed soil conditions required it. Water would be managed where possible with water gardens, ponds, open space (of which there is more because of reasonable street widths), and retaining the natural contour of the land. A community to be proud of!

Caution needs to be used when increasing the cost of development, be it residential, or commercial. The only source for paying for increased and unnecessary impervious surfaces such as wider streets and sidewalks is the person that eventually buys a home or office in the subdivision. All development cost are included in the price of a building. The added cost may be represented by price, house size, landscaping, and community amenities, but it is surely paid for by those that buy the homes. The infrastructure maintenance costs are shared by every Front Royal citizen.

FRLP's property represents a large percentage of Front Royal's land. Help us to make it an integral part Front Royal, that is innovative, environmentally responsible, and a livable people-friendly community. Do this because you are; "looking out for the people, not the developer".

Thank you

Bill

Statement Requested By Mayor Tim Darr Feb. 23, 2015 Part #2

March 3, 2015

Bill Barnett
Consultant: FRLP
1115 Buck Mountain Road
Bentonville, VA 22610
billbarnett@centurylink.net

Mayor Darr, Town Council, Planning Commission.
This is the handout I supplied at the meeting.



[Home](#)

[Project Information](#)

[Site Index](#)

[FAQ](#)

Who are you?

[Elected Official](#)

[Municipal Stormwater
Manager](#)

[Planner](#)

[Builder/Developer](#)

[Engineer/Designer](#)

[Landscape Architect](#)

[Homeowner/General Public](#)

[Additional Perspectives](#)

Case Studies

[Map](#)

[Browse](#)

Toolbox

[Basic Principles](#)

[Strategies for Success](#)

[Frameworks for Success](#)

[Home](#) [Toolbox](#) [Stormwater BMPs](#) [Green Streets Basics and Design](#)

Green Streets Basics and Design

BMPs to Programs

The evolution from centralized stormwater management to greener, more sustainable BMPs necessitates a progression from installing individual practices to implementing broader water quality programs. Conventional end-of-pipe management practices are often installed myopically, focused primarily on collecting runoff from one drainage area. The first applications of stormwater BMPs were similarly applied, focused on addressing runoff from a small area. However, rather than installing a single rain garden or green roof disconnected from a larger network of management practices, stormwater BMPs can be components of broad program initiatives intended to address significant sources of pollution.

Green streets are an example of how individual stormwater BMPs are used as elements of a broader program aimed at mitigating a

[Communication Aids](#)
[Planning/Development](#)
[Aids](#)
[Stormwater BMPs](#)
[Stormwater BMP](#)
[Interactive Model](#)
[Resource Links](#)
[Information Sources](#)
[Funding Sources](#)
[Downloads](#)
[Glossary](#)

significant source of stormwater pollution. Urban roads, along with sidewalks and parking lots, are estimated to constitute almost two-thirds of the total impervious cover in urban areas and contribute a similar ratio of runoff. Green streets use combinations of stormwater BMPs to enhance water quality and improve the design and function of urban roads. WERF defines green streets as those that:

- Mimic local hydrology prior to development
- Provide multiple benefits including
 - Stormwater management and volume reductions
 - Providing a key link in the green infrastructure network
 - Enhancing aesthetics
 - Improving local air quality by intercepting airborne particulates and providing shade
 - Enhancing economic development
 - Improving the pedestrian experience

The use of green streets allows stormwater BMPs to act in a broader environmental capacity than solely managing stormwater. For example, Chicago's Green Alley program, by using light-colored permeable and recycled concrete, addresses urban heat island and material disposal issues simultaneously with stormwater management.

Common Elements of Green Streets

Green streets can incorporate a wide variety of design elements including street trees, permeable pavements, bioretention, and swales. Although the design and appearance of green streets will vary, the functional goals are the same. Green streets techniques will encourage the interaction of stormwater with soil and vegetation to promote infiltration and retention.

Narrower Street Widths

One reason that streets constitute such a significant source of stormwater volume and pollution is the impervious area associated with them. Green streets first reduce stormwater impacts by eliminating unnecessary impervious area. Many urban and suburban streets are sized to meet code requirements for emergency service vehicles, on-street parking, and free flow of traffic. These code requirements often result in streets being oversized for their typical everyday functions. The Uniform Fire Code requires that streets have a minimum 20 feet of unobstructed width; a street with parking on both sides would require a width of at least 34 feet. In practice, many

suburban and urban streets may be much wider than this as local design practices have increased street widths to 40 and 50 feet. There is often a large percentage of street impervious area that serves no practical purpose other than generating stormwater runoff. In addition to stormwater concerns, wide streets have many detrimental effects on neighborhood livability, traffic conditions, and pedestrian safety.

Many communities have adopted narrower street width standards while also accommodating emergency vehicles by developing alternative street parking configurations, prohibiting parking near intersections, providing vehicle pullout space, and using smaller block lengths. A key to identifying and successfully codifying narrow street widths is coordination amongst departments, including fire, transportation, and public works.

Jurisdiction	Street Width (in feet)	Parking Condition
Phoenix, AZ	28	parking both sides
Santa Rosa, CA	30	parking both sides, <1000ADT
	26-28	parking one side
	20	no parking
	20	neck downs at intersection
Orlando, FL	28	parking both sides, res. Lots > 55' wide
	22	parking both sides, res. Lots > 55' wide
Birmingham, MI	26	parking both sides
	20	parking one side
Howard County, MD	24	parking unregulated
Kirkland, WA	12	alley
	20	parking one side
	24	parking both sides - low density only
	28	parking both sides
Madison, WI	27	parking both sides, <3DU/AC
	28	parking both sides, 3-10 DU/AC

ADT: Average Daily Traffic; DU/AC: dwelling units per acre

3/2/2015


To Whom It May Concern

I am very active with the Firewise Communities in Warren County. I wish to go on record in support of the revised subdivision ordinances that are being reviewed by council. Safety is so important in planning any new subdivisions. Roads need to provide adequate room for parking and still allow two way traffic to flow even when emergency vehicles are answering a call.

Private lanes and driveways.

- Private lanes and driveways shall provide a minimum unobstructed width of twelve (12) feet and, where practical, a minimum unobstructed clearance of thirteen feet six inches (13' 6").
- Any private lane or driveway in excess of three hundred (300) feet in length shall be provided with turnarounds. Turnarounds shall be an all-weather road surface and shall have inside turning radii of not less than forty (40) feet, or as an alternative, a "hammerhead-T" turnaround (a "T"-shaped, three-point turnaround) that is no narrower than the road it serves. The top of the "T" shall be a minimum of forty (40) feet long.
- Private lanes that connect with a road or roads at more than one point may be considered as having a turnaround if all changes of direction meet the radii or hammerhead-T requirements for turnarounds. The zoning administrator may permit modification of the turnaround requirements to an alternative that substantially accomplishes the intent of this division, to allow a public safety vehicle(s) to safely ingress and egress during a fire or public safety emergency.
- Private lanes and driveways in excess of two hundred (200) feet in length and less than VDOT subdivision street standards in width shall be provided with turnouts in addition to turnarounds. Turnouts shall be spaced so that drivers can see from one turnout to the next where practical and will be installed at least every four hundred (400) feet, or at the midpoint if the private lane or driveway is between two hundred (200) and eight hundred (800) feet in length. Turnouts shall be an all weather road surface at least 10 feet wide and 30 feet long.

From
Eva Challis





'Speaker Profile' continued from Page 1

WILDFIRE AND LIFE SAFETY - AN ENGINEERING APPROACH

Smalley notes several critical considerations in determining how and when to evacuate. These include officials having a clear understanding as to why total evacuation is necessary; having an established means of egress consisting of a network of roads that are safe, well marked, and wide enough to accommodate exiting traffic and its potential volume; educating residents about procedures; and knowing whether there are any residents who may not be able to act quickly (such as residents of assisted living and nursing facilities, or individuals confined to a wheelchair).

There is also the issue of those in the area who may not be properly informed, such as visitors, workers who are temporarily stationed at local sites or making occasional deliveries, and individuals with cognitive problems who may not understand orders or directions. Lastly, there is the consideration that evacuation may be more dangerous than an alternative. "Many of the lives lost in wildfires in the U.S. and abroad have occurred in the process of evacuation," says Smalley.

He adds, "In the event the decision to stay in place is made, the resident must understand and accept the risks, what to expect, and what to do. Staying in the home is not passive and the resident must be actively engaged in the physical preparation of their home, as well as their own mental and emotional preparation. The fire, when it comes, will be big, hot, and loud - to the extreme.

"The decision is not to be made lightly, nor with the expectation that if they get into trouble, firefighters will immediately come to their rescue. It's not an 'either-or' decision, but a proposition for arriving at a balanced approach to fire and life safety, where life safety is maximized."

Smalley also suggests that focusing on the wildland/urban interface (WUI) as the problem often distracts us from correcting the threat to life safety and homes. "We

must remember that the WUI is a result of many factors. For example, the failure of jurisdictions to support sound community planning, the lack of land use laws and practices, construction shortcomings because of inadequate codes, and the ease with which waivers are given by local boards are just a few of the problems. We might ask ourselves, if we were to focus on these and other contributing factors, what might the interface look like in the next 10 to 20 years?" He points out that it is these very issues that the Firewise Communities/USA Program tackles. "You correct the problems to change the result."

He adds, "All too often, people make decisions based on past experiences, which may not differ widely in the case of wildfires. It's what I refer to as the 'hammer' decision model. If all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. One tool to deal with the WUI is not enough. Through Firewise, communities find they have many more tools and options for protecting themselves, their homes, and their common ground."

Another resource that Smalley recommends is NFPA 550, *Guide to the Fire Safety Concepts Tree*, as a good introduction to helping communities in making important decisions and how to consider them as they relate to designing safety in structures, such as how fire events should be handled, how smoke will be controlled, and what happens to occupants.

He stresses, "NFPA 550 provides guidance for evaluating how fire protection is to be considered, not what is to be done. It is best used in discussion among fire and emergency professionals and their citizens as a way to explore more options for providing safety to lives and property." He adds, "In the WUI, we can learn a lot from the built environment in looking at options available for designing safer residential communities."

In urban settings, for example, fire protection and safety depends on the strict adherence to codes and standards. Many of these codes and standards do not exist or are not enforced in the rural/suburban WUI. What's more, even a huge building can be partitioned to control fire and smoke movement using engineering designs that are based on a great deal of research and experience. And, fire can be controlled and evacuation done safely in a single structure.

In the WUI, there are a mix of fuels presented by vegetation and structures, and the fire front is much larger and not contained as it would be in a structure. Further compounding things, quite often, safety is not the prime consideration in rapid community development and expansion. Smalley notes that in the urban setting, confining a fire can be accomplished by restricting the source of fuel to a room or section of building. Similarly, in the interface, fire breaks such as greenbelts, golf courses and natural water barriers help to provide a sense of compartmentalizing or separation.

"A big difference is the problem that firebrands pose as a threat to homes in the WUI," he says. "Through Firewise, communities learn how to reduce ignition hazards around homes. "Being in the WUI also requires a process of fire protection that is very dynamic, which depends on the chemistry and physics of fire, as well as the creativity that people bring to solving the problem when more than one option is made available."


Smalley suggests talking to local fire and emergency personnel and leaders can be especially helpful in determining the various options and resources there may be within a community. So, too, can talking to each other. "The essence of the challenge is very similar to the dynamics of starting and sustaining neighborhood watch programs," he says. "When you talk to your neighbors, you learn what your shared hazards and common problems are, you get ideas about how to best address those hazards and problems, and you identify who may need assistance in mitigation."

He adds, "You're also well on your way to becoming recognized as a Firewise Community/USA local. And, if you succeed in that, you'll find, as I have, that working with fire protection professionals and citizens who become active in fire prevention and mitigation is wonderful beyond description." 

Karen Gardner is a contributing writer for the Firewise Newsletter and Wildfire News & Notes

Wildfire Planning Strategies For Community Design: A Guide For Southeastern Developers And Planners





Authored by:

Robert F. Brzuszek, Assistant Professor
Chris Company, Assistant Professor
Marc Foster, Graduate Student
Tim Schauwecker, Assistant Professor
Jason Walker, Assistant Professor

Reviewers:

Stephen C. Grado, Professor, Department of
Forestry, Mississippi State University
Jim Smalley, National Fire Protection Association

**Special thanks to those who have
provided valuable information or assistance:**

Edward L. Blake, Jr., The Landscape Studio
Jim Bremér, Florida Department of Agriculture and
Consumer Services
Peggie Calkins, City of Palm Coast, Florida
Tom Crews, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Zeph Cunningham, National Park Service
Kim Fikowski, The Bonita Bay Group
Greg Fretwell, Fretwell Homes
Mike Garrett, City of Ormond Beach, Florida
Mark Jamieson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Kevin Smith, The St. Joe Company
Michele Steinberg, National Fire Protection
Association
Scott B. Taylor, Florida Department of Agriculture
and Consumer Services
Tony Wilder, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Cover photo by Bob Brzuszek.

This report was produced by the Department of
Landscape Architecture, Mississippi State University
with funding from a Mississippi Agricultural
and Forestry Experiment Station grant with the U.S.
Department of Agriculture Cooperative State
Research, Education, and Extension Service
(CSREES).


The information given here is for educational
purposes only. References to commercial products
or trade names are made with the understanding
that no discrimination is intended against other
products that may also be suitable.

Discrimination based upon race, color, religion, sex,
national origin, age, disability, or veteran's status is
a violation of federal and state law and MSU policy
and will not be tolerated. Discrimination based upon
sexual orientation or group affiliation is a violation of
MSU policy and will not be tolerated.

Wildfire Planning Strategies For Community Design: A Guide For Southeastern Developers And Planners

Table of Contents

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Living with fire
- 3.0 Values of wildfire planning
- 4.0 Firewise and regulatory wildfire codes
 - 4.1 Firewise.org
 - 4.2 Model wildfire codes and standards
 - 4.2.1 NFPA 1144 Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire, 2008 edition
 - 4.2.1.1 NFPA 1411 Standard for Fire Protection Infrastructure for Land Development in Suburban and Rural Areas, 2008 edition
 - 4.2.2 The International Urban-Wildland Interface Code™
 - 4.2.3 Florida codes
- 5.0 Wildfire code provisions
 - 5.1 Vegetative fuel clearance
 - 5.2 Roadway and driveway standards
 - 5.3 Building requirements
 - 5.4 Planning and assessment
- 6.0 Case studies of 1998 Florida wildfire impacts in developments
 - 6.1 Site 1: Flagler County Fire
 - 6.2 Site 2: Volusia County Fire
 - 6.3 Site 3: Brevard County Fire
 - 6.4 Case study summary
- 7.0 Smart Growth/Low impact development
- 8.0 Defensive land uses for the outer edge
 - 8.1 Greenbelts
 - 8.2 Firebreaks
 - 8.3 Roads
 - 8.4 Trails and walkways
 - 8.5 Cemeteries
 - 8.6 Pasture
 - 8.7 Airfields
 - 8.8 Utility right of ways and railroads
 - 8.9 Natural creeks, water bodies, drainage ways
 - 8.10 Shaded fuel breaks
 - 8.11 Prescribed burn areas
- 9.0 Recent planned developments for wildfires
 - 9.1 Case study: Briargate, FL
 - 9.2 Case study: River Camps, FL
 - 9.3 Case study: Verandah, FL
 - 9.4 Summary
- 10.0 Implications for Firewise designed communities
- 11.0 References



1.0 Introduction

Community development is rapidly expanding within many areas of the southeastern United States. Urban centers are being pushed outwards into the surrounding forested and agricultural areas. This zone of new development into rural areas is known as the wildland-urban interface (WUI). The WUI interface has been described as "an area where various structures (most notably private homes) and other human developments meet or are intermingled with forest and other vegetative fuel types" (Kline et al., 2004). Many homeowners often prefer living in wooded landscapes which offer quiet privacy, backyard wildlife, and a direct connection to nature. But with these many benefits comes a few responsibilities to living within the wildland interface, one of which is the occasional risk of wildland fire.

Although dramatic headlines and news footage of significant wildfires in the western United States often captures media attention, the southeast is no stranger to wildfire. The southern pine forest which comprises much of the region is ecologically dependent upon periodic fire. Recent fires in 2007-2008 burned large acreages in Georgia, Virginia, Texas, and South Carolina. The wildfires of 1998 in south central Florida were more extreme, and forced the evacuation of 45,000 people and contributed to the loss of 370 homes and businesses (Florida Division of Emergency Management, 2008). This event changed how cities and developers in Florida design for safer communities from wildfire for residents.

Benefits Of Wildfire Planning For Developers And Planners

Planning for wildfire events is just one part of a comprehensive community planning strategy. Other natural disasters, such as hurricanes, floods, and droughts are not infrequent in the southeastern United States. By proactively designing communities in ways that minimize loss, or providing for more immediate response to these hazards, these developments can be a more sustainable in the face of a natural catastrophe. Comprehensive hazard planning provides other benefits. By creating denser development footprints which reduce urban sprawl, the resulting increase in greenspace provides for more recreational opportunity, wildlife and plant species conservation, enhanced carbon sequestration, and opportunities for the creation of

wildfire buffer zones. U.S. EPA Tier II regulations will require new developments ensure that stormwater is not degrading the quality of nearby waterbodies. The provision of greenspace, and its location in community development provides for enhanced water infiltration and water runoff quality, and if managed properly also serves as a wildfire buffer.

Using This Guide

This guide provides information and development considerations for planners and builders within the southeastern United States. While there is a wealth of information already publicly available through Firewise® (Firewise, 2008) and the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA, 2008) concerning architectural standards, landscape and buffer zone requirements, and codes and regulations, there are few publications concerning the organization and placement of land use elements in developments to minimize external ground fire damage. Due to the interaction of fire behavior and severe weather conditions, even with the best of defensible planning measures there is no guarantee of protection from wildfire damage. However, it has been demonstrated in numerous fire events that proper wildfire planning measures have actually saved structures from the impacts of advancing ground fires. Depending upon the location of the community development, weather conditions, topographical features, and surrounding forest fuel load, it is wise to utilize multiple planning strategies to maximize defensible space. This guide provides case studies of fire impacted communities in the southeastern U.S., subdivisions designed with fire safety provisions, and examples of buffer zone strategies that have been effective in various fire events. While many included examples are from the western United States, these land use recommendations are applicable to the southeast region.

2.0 Living with Fire

A persistent issue regarding development in rural areas is the occasional risk of wildfire. Pyne (2001) points out that "we are truly a species touched by fire" and that "every place humans visited they touched with fire." Our ancestors controlled and utilized fire to manipulate their environment and in turn aided the course of human evolution. This use of fire in turn furthered the spread of fire-adapted ecosystems. This anthropogenic fire regime, in competition with lightning-caused fire, remained in place in much of the world until the Enlightenment (Pyne, 2001). In the U.S., by the mid-19th century, the use of fire to manipulate the land decreased as the concerns about conservation became more prevalent (Sorvig, 2001). As a result of this change in philosophy, many landscape level fire regimes were altered. In many cases, the fire-prone (starved) landscapes we see today, including the WUI, resulted from our removing anthropogenic fire and changing the fire regime (Brose et al., 2001). Wildfire risks associated with the WUI are the result of many factors; however, the change in fire regime cannot be over estimated. As the urban, suburban, and rural fringe (exurbs) continue to merge this increases the WUI. This diverse mosaic makes more the potential for wildfire damage. There are many challenges, risks, and rewards associated with development in the WUI. The increased demand of building and inhabitation in these areas is largely spawned from exurban populations seeking a rural woody escape (Monroe et al., 2003; Kline et al., 2004). In planning terms, this is concurrent with sprawl. While there is no standard definition of sprawl, the Vermont Forum on Sprawl defines this type of development as "dispersed development outside of compact urban and village centers along highways and in rural countryside."

3.0 Values of Wildfire Planning

The reduction of wildfire risk is a high priority focus for many communities, state and federal agencies across the Nation. As our Nation's urban cores continue to expand outward from populated centers, numbers of homes and subdivisions infringing upon rural and forested areas are rapidly increasing. Seventeen percent of the U.S. population (56.1 million) lives in non-metropolitan areas that comprise 80% of the total land area. The southern states (USDA Forest Service Region 8

is comprised of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia) contain the fastest growing areas in the U.S. and this region is projected to reach 114 million people by the year 2020 (Cordell and Macie, 2002). The population growth of rural southern counties grew by 7.5% in the 1990's, and this trend is projected to rise on average to 11.5%.

As the population demographics in the South continue to change, the use of prescribed fire is anticipated to become more difficult to utilize and will result in heavier fuel buildups (Southern Group of State Foresters, 2003). Forestry and forestry-related industries comprise the major landholdings in the South (214 million acres), and the USDA Forest Service Region 8 leads the Nation in the number of wildland fires that occur each year. In 2006, 48,000 fires burned over 2.6 million acres in the Southern region. Suppression of wildland fires typically fall upon local fire departments. Due to excessive vegetative fuel buildups from changing land use, fragmentation, sprawl, and additional population densities, wildland fire can sometimes exceed the capabilities of local fire resources (Southern Group of State Foresters, 2003).

Additional factors that may compound future wildfire frequency and intensity are rising annual temperatures. The South's climate is directly impacted by Pacific Ocean El Nino and La Nina temperature fluctuations. In the El Nino cycle the southeastern United States is typically warmer and drier, resulting in drier vegetative fuels. As recently shown in the western states, increasing temperatures are responsible for increased duration and intensity of wildfire seasons (Running, 2006). Increasing annual temperatures are projected for the eastern United States.

4.0 Firewise and regulatory wildfire codes

The fire season of 2000 was one of the worst in U.S. history in 50 years, and more than \$2 billion in federal funds were spent suppressing wildland fires. As a result, the National Fire Plan was borne in Congress through a FY 2001 Appropriations Act. The Act directed that state and federal agencies address the wildland fire problem through hazardous fuels reduction as well as habitat restoration.

4.1 Firewise

As a result of the National Fire Plan, the National Wildfire Coordinating Group was formed from multiple agencies including the USDA Forest Service, the Department of the Interior, the National Association of State Foresters, the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Protection Association. This interagency group prioritized public education and wildfire awareness with Firewise, a program that offers public workshops, instructional media, and accessible resources for landowners, professional planners, researchers, fire agencies, community leaders, designers, engineers, surveyors and others to minimize fire risks on private and public lands. The Firewise

Communities program encourages homeowners and developers to incorporate methods and techniques in both built and undeveloped lands to minimize wildfire damage should it occur. Recommendations developed include land management techniques such as

reducing potential fire fuels around residences, maintaining healthy and well irrigated landscapes, selecting plants and building materials that are not fire prone, and incorporating fire breaks and equipment corridors around structures. An extensive library of resources and information on home protection and community programs is available at <http://www.firewise.org/>.

4.2 Model wildfire code ordinances

Communities are increasingly adopting or strengthening wildland fire ordinances to minimize wildfire damage. The majority of community wildland codes address 1) vegetative fuel clearance around structures, 2) vegetative maintenance, and 3) vehicular access requirements. Primarily, these fire codes and ordinances attempt to reduce damage and the risk of possible injury for homeowners and firefighters in the WUI. Homeowners will better accept community ordinances if there is a high perception of risk and awareness (Gardener et al., 1987). Regulations directed toward development in fire risk areas do not guarantee a community will be free from fire risk, but may reduce the potential for damage. Advantages to implementing wildfire regulations in developments are many, as are the methods for establishing priorities. Wildfire mitigation

may occur in the regulations for new and existing developments, in the development review process, in zoning, covenant or deed restrictions, requirements for fuel modification in high risk zones, and building and construction standards.

Disadvantages to wildfire regulations include potentially higher construction and maintenance costs for homeowners or associations, resistance to adopting regulations by homeowners, possibility of conflict with existing tree or natural resource ordinances, monitoring, administration and enforcement costs, and lack of guarantees that proper maintenance will be kept in the absence of

administration and enforcement.

A methodology on how to develop systems and tools to assess fire hazards was published by the National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Protection Program in 1997 and revised by the National Firewise Communities Program in 2005 to reflect the relationships between

Community Wildfire Protection Plans, Firewise Communities® planning, and hazard reduction considerations for the home ignition zone. This method organizes the hazard assessment process into a series of steps that include: 1) selection of areas to be evaluated, 2) hazard components to be considered in the assessment, 3) ranking of hazard components, and 4) compilation of hazard rankings into a usable format.



4.2.1 NFPA 1144 Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire, 2008 edition

Specific ranking information for landscape and structural features was established through NFPA 1144 Standard for Protecting Life and Property from Wildfire, 2002 edition and previous. Responding to the research and needed focus on preventing WUI disasters in which hundreds of homes are often destroyed or damaged, the NFPA Technical Committee for Forest and Rural Fire Protection revised the document to reflect the approach offered by the National Firewise Communities Program. The new document entitled NFPA 1144 Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire, 2008 edition (National Fire Protection Association, 2008), includes a procedure and details to assess hazards around

existing homes in interface areas and design criteria for new homes. Also included are suggested mitigation measures, based on Firewise concepts that might be offered to residents.

NFPA 1411 Standard for Fire Protection Infrastructure for Land Development in Suburban and Rural Areas, 2008 edition. Likewise, the NFPA Technical Committee revised this document to include the infrastructure elements from NFPA 1144 (2002 edition) because they recognized that the objective should be preventing ignition of structures and that water supplies, road width, and street signage were suppression issues and have little or nothing to do with preventing ignitions. The standard outlines the essential requirements for land use conversion that results in community design and development, including road widths and emergency vehicle accessibility, water supplies, topography, construction materials, and available fire protection strategies.



4.2.2 The International Urban-Wildland Interface Code™

The International Code Council, Inc. (ICC) produced the International Urban-Wildland Interface Code® in 2003. The ICC is a nonprofit organization dedicated to developing single sets of national model construction codes. This ready to adopt wildland-urban interface code is for municipalities and county jurisdictions and bridges the code requirements of the pre-existing International Building Code® and the International Fire Code®. The document provides for the minimum regulations for land use and development in wildland-urban areas. It covers the administration and authority of government, definitions, special building construction regulations, fire-protection requirements, and general requirements.

4.2.3 Florida codes

While the state of Florida does not have a statewide urban-wildland public law, a model ordinance for local communities has been developed through the Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) and the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Wildfire Mitigation in Florida is a comprehensive document for regional communities on land use planning strategies and best development practices in wildland-urban zones.

Counties and municipalities are required through a Florida Statute (Section 163.3167) to produce a Local Government Comprehensive Plan to guide their future development and growth. The plan gives counties and local governments the power to develop guidelines for a balanced future growth and designate the proposed locations for various land uses. Portions of the statute require protection of wetlands and other natural resources, and encourage the protection of residents from wildfire, hurricane, or other natural disasters; including all necessary features for protection such as development and road standards. However, unless plans are made policy, are reflected in local codes and zoning maps and ordinances, and are administered and enforced they are likely to have little if any real effect in achieving the stated goals and objectives of the plan.

5.0 Wildfire code provisions

The authors have previously examined nationwide municipal and county wildland fire codes containing provisions for landscape features and summarized their general requirements for new or existing development (Brzuszek and Walker, 2008). This research revealed 12 ordinance provisions that fall into four categories of vegetative fuel clearance, building requirements, roadway and driveway standards, and planning and assessment. The following is a discussion of these four elements.





Figure 1. Wildfire mitigation zones around structures include zones of managed vegetation, fuel reduction and transition areas (Illustration redrawn by Marc Foster).

5.1 Vegetative fuel clearance

A major provision of many ordinances concerns the distance between heavy vegetation types and the proposed or existing structures. These distances coincide with what firefighters term "defensible space," that is the space that creates a fire break between fuels (between vegetation and structure) and allows firefighters room to effectively fight an oncoming wildfire. Defensible space usually includes multiple zones for fuel modification, ranging from clearing flammable materials immediately surrounding a residence, to measures to protect zones that surround an entire subdivision. Most codes identify a gradient of two or three zones with unique provisions for the establishment and management of these defensible areas.

The zone immediately adjacent to a dwelling is the area of maximum fuel modification and management, and typically extends 30 feet from the structure. The purpose is to reduce the spread of an external fire by limiting the height or spacing of vegetation. Ultimately this regulation would affect any planting plan. High Fire Hazard Area Landscape Guidelines from the City of Santa Barbara, California are based upon the Uniform Fire Code. The code recommends that in Zone 1 (0-30 feet from structures) "Plants should be low growing, irrigated plants. Focus should be on ground covers not more than 12 inches in height or succulents. Use non-flammable materials for paths, patios, and mulch" (Santa Barbara City Fire Department, 2001). This document also lists plants to remove or avoid using in landscape zones because they are more flammable. These include pampas grass (*Cortaderia* sp.), cypress (*Cupressus* sp.), eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.), fountain grass (*Pennisetum* sp.),

and pine (*Pinus* sp.). Many state fire or cooperative agencies offer a recommended Firewise plant list for their area.

The second zone is a transition area to any adjacent woodland. This zone is managed for fuels between the woodland and a structure regardless of property ownership. The extent ranges from 30 to 100 feet; however, in high risk areas the distance may increase beyond 100 feet. In this zone, the edges of tree crowns should typically be separated by 10 feet or more. The 10-foot crown spacing is acceptable on slopes between 0-10%. However, as slope increases, the spacing between tree crowns increases to as much as 30 feet on slopes exceeding 40 % (Eagle County, 2004).

Although ordinances often include these two vegetative modification zones, provisions for the establishment and management of each zone varies. However, the different fuel modification codes share many commonalities including pruning, thinning, and removal of trees, shrubs, and grasses to successfully "fragment" ground and crown fires as they move across a site. Shrubs underneath trees serve as a fire "ladder," where fire spreads into tree crowns from a ground source (e.g., shrubs and low tree branches). Trees may also require pruning (limbing-up) to achieve the same purpose. Additionally, spacing between tree crowns determines the need for pruning or removal to manage a crown fire. Most codes set a minimum distance between tree crowns, usually measured from the edge of the crown to branches of adjacent trees.

In conjunction with codes regulating vegetation fuel clearance, vegetative maintenance is critical for managing dangerous fuel loads in high

5.4 Planning and assessment

Greenbelts are essentially an extension of defensible space with the primary difference being scale. While defensible space often refers to zones within a single property boundary, greenbelts are usually part of a development plan for subdivisions or developments. Greenbelts separate wildland fuels and inhabitable structures. Locating greenbelts involves a thorough understanding of the site and fire behavior, and they must be strategically located to aid in preventing a wildfire from spreading into a residential area. When the area around a single property cannot ensure adequate defensible space, due to a site constraint such as steep topography, requiring a greenbelt is particularly justified. Greenbelts also provide the community with open space for recreation. They might include golf courses, parks, and playgrounds.

Typically, hazard assessments are only required for proposed developments or subdivisions. In the wildfire hazard areas identified, the assessment report must prove that the developer adequately met criteria for reducing or eliminating wildfire hazards at the time of initial development. In most cases, a qualified professional forester must prepare these plans or reports. State and local planning authorities may also have to address conflicting requirements between "firewise" requirements and conservation provisions in codes and laws, such as forest retention requirements.



Figure 4. Example of a managed greenbelt area (Photo: Bob Brzuszek).

6.0 Case studies of Florida wildfire problems in developments

Protection from wildfire was just one part of an overall regional natural hazard strategy. There was an opportunity for planners to better understand their role in a WUI fire by examining a few case studies of fire damaged communities. Whether planners and builders were involved in the original planning process for these communities or for individual residences; conclusions generated by investigations into these catastrophic events point to areas that planners can best contribute their expertise. The following case studies center on the 1998 Florida wildfires in Flagler, Volusia, and Brevard Counties, with descriptions of how they met community edges.

Florida East Coast Fires 1998

Overview:

In late June 1998 several wildfires began in the area inland of Florida's east coast. These fires spread east rapidly, powered by frontal circulation




Figure 5. Overview of primary concentration of east coast fires, with selection of three case study fire sites affecting residential areas.

winds and assisted by unseasonably dry conditions resulting from the El Nino oscillation. The fires began to rapidly spread toward the populated East Coast on July 1, crossing multiple road rights of way in excess of 100 feet. The advance continued until July 4, when increased humidity and decreased winds slowed the fires' advance. Rainfall began on July 5 and the fires were brought under control. The final wrap-up work of fully extinguishing the fires took another two weeks.

6.1 Site 1: Flagler County Fire

Overview:

This fire began in rural Flagler County in late June and spread east, powered by frontal circulation winds. Over a period of approximately two weeks, the fire spread approximately 14 miles and affected over 41,500 acres. Almost 94% of this area was in Flagler County, with the remainder of the fire extending northwards into southern St. Johns County. Fifty-one buildings were destroyed by the fire, with more than 45,000 residents temporarily displaced during a mandatory evacuation on July 3.


General Landscape Patterns:

The western two-thirds of Site 1 is a mix of upland and wetland forest, with small amounts of cleared or developed areas. Transportation infrastructure was very limited and there was a large roadless area directly west of Palm Coast, between the city and San Mateos. The fire began near the western edge of this roadless area and burned eastwards for up to 10 miles before major roadways and the outskirts of Palm Coast were reached.

There was a network of wetland forests between the starting point for this site and Palm Coast. These wetlands were long, narrow features oriented north-south, perpendicular to the direction of fire travel.

Defensible zones and controls:

The fire crossed four major defensible zones: a 270-foot rights of way, a 180-foot rights of way, the 130-foot U.S. Highway 1 rights of way, and the 180-foot Interstate 95 corridor. Additionally, many other smaller roads, a railway and other potential defensible zones were crossed both before and after the fire entered the populated portion of Flagler County.



Zone Name	Width	Surface	Mobility	Fire Travel
Utility rights of way	270 feet	Grass/Herbaceous	Cleared off-road	10-13 miles beyond
Utility rights of way	180 feet	Grass/Herbaceous	Cleared off-road	8-10 miles beyond
I-95	180 feet	Paved	Roads	2-4 miles beyond
US-1	130 feet	Paved	Roads	0-1.4 miles beyond

Successful defense was implemented along portions of the I-95 corridor, in residential subdivision areas which had implemented fuel reduction controls, and along smaller roadways in areas with relatively more dense (greater than 2 units/acre) development.

Correlating factors relative to successful fire defense:

1. Successful fire defense occurred at or near areas of transition from low-density residential/suburban type land-use patterns to medium and higher-density development.
2. Presence of marsh (emergent wetland types) and open water were associated with fire boundaries. This was in contrast to forested wetland types (see Non-correlating factors below).
3. Increased road density was associated with fire boundaries.

Non-correlating factors to successful fire defense:

1. Low-density residential/suburban areas adjacent to forest areas were often not successfully defended. The majority of this type of area was residential development adjacent to the large roadless areas mentioned above. Lower-density

development suffered greater exposure to and damage from fire.

2. The presence of forested wetlands was not associated with successful fire defense. There are multiple lines of forested wetlands crossing the site. The majority of these run perpendicular to the vectors of fire movement. It appeared that forested wetland areas in drought conditions are not effective as defensible zones or slowing/fragmenting influences relative to wildfire travel.
3. The presence of scrub areas was also not associated with successful fire defense. There are few areas mapped as scrub within this site. Scrub accounts for only approximately 2% of the total site area, with no areas larger than 80 acres.
4. Single, large defensible zones were often breached by this fire. The largest defensible zones within Site 1 were all crossed. In the case of the I-95 and US-1 zones, the fire traveled substantial (> 1 mile) average distance after crossing these zones and moving into new territory.




Figure 6: Case study site 1: Flagler/ St. Johns Counties fire. 1995 land use/ land cover data grouped into categories by Florida Land Use, Land Cover Classification System (FLUCCS) codes.




Figure 7: Roadless areas where Site 1 fire developed prior to affecting the Palm Coast community.



6.2 Site 2: Volusia County Fire

Overview:

This fire spread along an almost 26-mile north-south length of Volusia and Flagler Counties. The east-west width of the affected area ranged from approximately 2.5 miles at the narrowest point to 17 miles at the widest expanse. Over 122,000 acres of land were affected. Over 77% of this area was in Volusia County, with the remainder of the fire extending northwards into southern Flagler County.

General landscape patterns:

As with Site 1, the fires began in wildlands to the west of the developed coastline area. Large, virtually roadless areas to the west of Ormond Beach and Daytona Beach were affected first by fire, which traveled east as it burned through a mixture of upland forests with some areas of scrub and forested wetlands. Almost the entirety of Site 2 is forested area with no major north-south roadways and only 3 east-west roadways along the long axis of this site. The fire began near the western edge of this roadless area and burned eastwards for 7-12 miles before major roadways and the outskirts of Ormond Beach were reached.

Defensible zones and controls:

The fire crossed three major defensible zones: a 300-foot utility rights of way, a 200-foot utility rights of way, and the 180-foot Interstate 95 corridor. Few other potential defensible zones were crossed after the fire entered the populated portion of this site. Approximately 5000 acres were burned on the east side of the I-95 corridor.

Successful defense was implemented in wildland areas near I-4, along and near the I-95 and US-1 corridors, and along smaller roadways in areas with low-density (less than 2 units/ acre) development.

Correlating factors relative to successful fire defense:

1. The interface area between forested and low-density residential development was relatively successfully defended in this fire event. Areas where the wildland interface was adjacent to other higher-density urban development were also successfully defended.
2. Large roads were used successfully as defensible zones. Fire travel was very limited beyond the I-95 corridor and the width of the burn path was substantially reduced.
3. Density of east-west roadways. The narrowest area of east-west burn travel is where US-92 and I-4 converge and are approximately 2-3 miles apart. Burn area limits end abruptly even in the middle of forested areas in this portion of the site and do not extend to near developed areas.
4. Increased road density, including smaller neighborhood roads was associated with fire boundaries. Denser transportation networks allow for more precise positioning and fallback zones for fire control personnel.

Non-correlating factors relative to successful fire defense:

1. As with Site 1, areas of transition from forest to low-density residential/suburban type land-use pattern were not very successfully defended.
2. The Tomoka River and associated bottomlands. These riverine open-water areas and forests were crossed by the fire and the burn area extended up to 2.5 miles beyond.
3. Presence of forested wetlands. There are multiple areas of forested wetlands across the site. Many of these are

Zone Name	Width	Surface	Mobility	Fire Travel
Electric Power Line	300 feet	Grass/Herbaceous	Cleared off-road	2.5-10 miles beyond
Electric Power Line	200 feet	Grass/Herbaceous	Cleared off-road	0.3-3 miles beyond
I-95	180 feet	Paved	Roads	0.3-1.8 miles beyond

large irregularly shaped features in contrast to the predominantly long, narrow features in Site 1. It appeared that forested wetland areas were not effective in drought periods as defensible zones or slowing/fragmenting influences relative to wildfire

travel in this instance. The drought conditions present at the time of this fire may have reduced the any effects the wetlands would have had on mitigating fire damage and advance.




Figure 8: Case study site 2, Volusia County fire : 1995 land use/ land cover data grouped into categories by FLUCCS codes.

6.3 Site 3: Brevard County Fire

Overview:

This fire spread affected a roughly circular area 8 to 10 miles across at the corner of Brevard, Volusia and Seminole Counties. Over 45,000 acres of land were affected. Almost two-thirds of this area was in Brevard County, 33.3% was in Volusia County, and the remaining 0.7% affected Seminole County. A total of 36 residences were impacted.

General landscape patterns:

Like the previous two sites, the fires began in wildlands to the west of the developed coastline area. In this case, the initial affected area was near Lake Harney and was largely comprised of scrub and freshwater marsh areas. As the fire moved east away from the lake and toward the coast there was less marsh and more forest area. Residential areas were affected from near the beginning near Pennichaw in the northwest corner of the site. After moving east from Pennichaw and Lake Harney, there was a large, roadless area extending approximately 6 miles to the I-95 corridor. There was no major north-south or east-west roadways west of I-95 in this site.

Defensible zones and controls:

The fire crossed three major defensible zones: a 160-foot utility rights of way, the 180-foot I-95 corridor, and two small (< 1 mile each) sections of the 100-foot US Highway 1 corridor. Few other potential defensible zones were crossed after the fire reached the I-95 corridor, with only approximately 3000 acres affected on the east side of the I-95 corridor.

Successful defense was implemented along much of the I-95 corridor, along the US-1 corridor in some areas where I-95 was crossed, and in residential subdivision areas, primarily along smaller roadways in areas with relatively less dense (less than 2 units/ acre) development.

Correlating factors relative to successful fire defense:

1. The interface area between forested and low-density residential development was relatively successfully defended in this fire event. Areas where the wildland interface was adjacent to other higher-density urban development were also successfully defended. Large roads were used successfully as defensible zones. Fire travel was very limited beyond the I-95 corridor and the width of the burn path was substantially reduced.
2. Successful defense occurred in areas with increased density of larger roads. Large defensible zones in sequence may have allowed for more effective fire control. In this case the I-95 and US-1 corridors are within 2 miles of each other.
3. There was successful fire defense near waterways and forested wetlands. There is a ditch and wetland system immediately west of the I-95 corridor in the northern half of this site. This may have played a role in the successful defense of this site at and near this area.

Non-correlating factors relative to successful fire defense:

1. Heavy mixing of scrub and low-density residential land-use patterns. The fire ended in areas where low-density subdivision development is immediately adjacent to scrub areas. Very little of this type of land use mixture burned once the fire crossed I-95.
2. There was substantial road access and residential areas near the fire's beginning point near Pennichaw. Despite the fire's accessibility in its early stages, it was not extinguished near the point of origin.

Zone Name	Width	Surface	Mobility	Fire Travel
Electric Power Line	160 feet	Grass/Herbaceous	Cleared off-road	0.5-4.5 miles beyond
I-95	180 feet	Paved	Roads	0.2-1.3 miles beyond
US-1	100 feet	Paved	Roads	0.3 miles beyond




Figure 9 : Case study site 3, Brevard County fire : 1995 land use/ land cover data grouped into categories by FLUCCS codes.

6.4 Summary of Key Conditions and Design Implications of 1998 Florida East Coast Fires

Some key characteristics of the 1998 fires:

1. Severe drought conditions resulting from El Nino Severe drought conditions resulting from El Nino weather patterns. The drought resulted in dry summer thunderstorms with lightning and no rain. Higher than average westerly winds resulting from periodic frontal passage.
2. Ample fuel loads in adjacent wildlands. Typically humidity and precipitation levels are high enough to minimize fire risk in these areas, so fuel management and reduction for these areas was minimal.
3. Weather, fuel and landscape pattern combined to form an excellent environment for firebrand transport and high-intensity fire. Huge areas of dry pine forests to the west, low-density residential development to the east and strong west winds combined to create very intense fires burning through miles of uninterrupted forest then abruptly meeting residential development.
4. Major roads (I-95 and US-1) were crossed, as well as large power line rights of way and many smaller roads.

Conditions supported fires crossing large (100-200 feet wide) road rights of way and cleared utility easements up to 300 feet in width, in addition to covering up to 17 miles of sequential burn distance. The scale of these events was so large that they cannot be fully addressed at the scale of a single subdivision or community. Larger, landscape-level patterns appeared to offer some consistent factors and point toward site-selection and large-scale regional planning as key factors in disaster mitigation under extreme circumstances.

Suggestions for design considerations:

1. Proximity of potential fuel sources, fire-prone habitat types and roadless areas are risk factors in siting communities. All three fires examined had tens of thousands of forested, relatively roadless wildlands adjacent to the sites of affected residential developments. This landscape-level position had a substantial effect on the fire risk of much smaller-scale subdivisions. Examination of fire risk at multiple scales may inform site selection and design processes at the community or subdivision scale. The identification of risk can also inform the planning decisions as to what areas are appropriate for residential development when creating comprehensive plans, zoning ordinances and other codes, and zoning maps. This information can also inform local planning decisions as to what development patterns (i.e. dispersed versus clustered or more compact development) are most defensible and resilient.
2. Weather patterns leading to wildfire events may be very different than prevailing seasonal conditions. Periodic weather patterns, especially those associated with higher-intensity winds need to be examined to determine where exposure to fire risk is the greatest. All three fires examined were affected and driven eastwards toward populated areas by frontal passage winds, rather than normal prevailing winds from the south to southeast.
3. Multiple, smaller defensible zones may provide the best defense in an intense fire event with severe weather conditions. The largest available defensible zones were crossed in all three of the examined fires, while successful defense was mounted in smaller, residential road and open space networks in subdivisions in Flagler, Volusia and Brevard Counties.
4. Wetlands may not necessarily make a difference. Forested wetlands burned in drought conditions and appear to have carried the fire as quickly as upland forests. All fire areas examined had bands of forested wetlands running perpendicular to the direction of fire travel. These wetlands were not the points of origin for the fires, but were crossed after the fires had built some intensity in drier areas. Open marsh areas may serve as a more effective barrier than wooded wetland types, and the possibility exists for converting wetlands intended as fire barriers from forested to open-canopy or canopy-less habitats immediately adjoining existing structures. Local plans and codes should address the appropriateness of allowing development within, or immediately adjacent to, wooded wetlands.

- 5. Use cleared easements and rights of way when possible. During the 1998 fires, these areas contributed to successful defense in many areas. Utility easements can provide hundreds of feet of canopy-free space that can be used for perimeter fire defense. Vehicle accessibility is often problematic on these easements, so measures taken to improve access and manage sapling and shrub growth can enhance their effectiveness in fire defense.
- 6. Incorporate water or emergent wetland features where possible. Canal, river and marsh networks all contributed to successful fire defense in both the Flagler and Brevard County sites. Marsh environments can be built as stormwater controls or created from forested wetlands by canopy reduction. Features having the greatest effect in the 1998 fires were oriented north-south, perpendicular to the direction of fire travel.

7.0 Smart Growth/Low Impact Development

The American Planning Association's Growing SmartSM project recommended that wildfire planning in communities should be part of a larger natural hazards plan that identifies all potential hazards including flooding, wind, storms, or geological conditions (Schwab et al., 2005). In comprehensive community planning, incorporating defensive wildfire measures such as the use and strategic placement of greenbelts that may involve parks, boulevards, playgrounds, recreational or storm retention waterbodies, or golf courses to provide larger measures of protection. Similarly, the location of roadways of sufficient size to accommodate emergency vehicles may also serve as fuel breaks. Proper planning will include multiple egress routes that can be used during emergencies. As Monroe (2002) noted, these planning measures may be difficult to incorporate in established areas or not even considered in the planning phases. By understanding these planning elements as defensible space, planners can better integrate community needs with fire safety. Ultimately, plans should address the fundamental question as to whether or not it is in the interest of public health, safety and welfare to allow further development within fire prone ecosystems, just as plans should address development in areas prone to other highly-predictable risks such as flooding, earthquakes, or landslides.

There are many benefits to comprehensive community planning which include:

- Allowing for an understanding of existing physical, environmental and social conditions.
- Encouraging inventorying and protection of important natural and cultural resources.
- Identifying the potential hazards or limitations for development in certain areas, including wildfire hazards.
- Allowing for future growth projections and infrastructure needs.
- Providing for priorities in the planning and implementation issues of a region.
- Allowing for community input and discussion.
- Balancing multiple planning activities including transportation needs, utilities and management, and economic growth.
- Providing the legal basis for land use recommendations, hazard identification, and local ordinances and policies, and monitoring and enforcement programs.

Many communities across the Nation are concerned about continuation of sprawl growth patterns into rural areas, loss of agricultural and forest land, and wildfire risks in the WUI. While still providing for stronger economic and population growth, concentrating infill development in existing community footprints maximizes current transportation and utility infrastructures, housing opportunities and choices; provides for alternative transportation methods, mixed use development, and revitalized economic stimulus. In essence, these are the principles of Smart Growth. Smart Growth is a comprehensive planning guide that utilizes redevelopment in existing urbanized areas and reduces growth in rural or newly urbanizing lands (American Planning Association, 2002).

Smart Growth utilizes compact building design patterns that reduce the footprint of new construction and impermeable surfaces, allowing developments to preserve more green space. Encouraging the mixed use of taller buildings on less land requires less land for construction and provides cost savings for maintaining roads and other utility infrastructure. The benefits of conserving green space in residential and commercial landscapes are many, and include:

- allowing rain water, building and parking runoff to infiltrate into the ground reducing

- filtering sedimentation and nutrients from runoff reducing water pollution
- providing better opportunities for food, travel and habitat for wildlife species
- providing aesthetic and recreation opportunities for developments
- buffering wind, sun or other climactic effects

States are required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to maintain water quality standards for waters within their jurisdictions under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The Water Management Division of Region 4 (southeastern states) utilizes a watershed approach to manage programs. A watershed approach is a framework for management that promotes public and private sector efforts to address priority problems within hydrologically-defined geographic areas, taking into consideration both ground and surface water flow. The Region 4 Water Management Division recognizes the Southeast as a quickly developing area, and recommends sustainable and green infrastructure programs to maintain water quality. Green infrastructure encourages the preservation of existing forests, floodplains and wetlands in developments, as well as agricultural lands. In developed areas, green infrastructure practices to preserve water quality include the implementation of rain gardens, porous pavements, green roofs, infiltration planters, tree boxes, and rainwater harvesting.

In addition to slowing water runoff to allow for better soil infiltration, vegetative buffers also remove pollutants such as soil sediments and excess nutrients (Bolund and Hunhammer, 1999, DeFries et al., 2004). Studies in Pennsylvania have shown that a 6 meter buffer (20 feet) planted in oats can remove 76% of the soil sediments from runoff (Hellmund and Smith, 2006). Similarly, grasslands are effective at nitrogen sequestering, with 24 foot wide vegetative buffers removing 28% excess nitrogen (Bedard-Haughn et al., 2004). Grassland buffers have less vegetative fuel loads than woodland or shrub vegetation types, and cause less severe wildfire control risks. For example, control burns (back burns) are easier to manage than woodland or scrub types.

Utilizing Smart Growth practices to reduce the impervious footprint of developments while conserving green space allows developments to better manage and treat their urban runoff. The preservation and conservation of green space also provides opportunities to create effective wildfire

buffers around developments. Combining green space needs for water quality and fire protection is an easy fit. The outer edge of properties is a critical boundary of the WUI.

8.0 Defensive Land Uses for the Outer Edge

There are three primary categories of how development meets the WUI: 1) the boundary, 2) the intermix, and 3) the island (Schwab and Meck, 2005). These terms refer to the density of building layouts and how they meet woodland fuel types. The boundary refers to a clearly defined development, such as a subdivision, with a dense internal clustering and whose outer edges are adjacent a woodland fuel type. Intermix occurs when structures are scattered intermittently within woodland areas. These isolated properties are preferred by residents who wish to 'be in nature' and offer the most challenges for wildfire protection. An island refers to remnant woodland areas that are bounded and left within a larger developed community, such as a woodlot or natural area within an urban environment.




Figure 10. Categories of the wildland-urban interface (Illustration redrawn by Marc Foster, Florida Department of Community Affairs, 2004).

8.1. Greenbelts

Vegetative fuel clearance is the most common management method of creating defensible wildfire barriers. California requires a minimum of 30 feet of managed vegetative fuels from any structure (CA PRC 4291, 2005). For high fire hazard areas, 100 to 200 feet of managed vegetation may be required. Both NFPA 1144 and UWI codes include language for the creation of defensible vegetative zones (NFPA 1144, 2005; ICC, 2003). It should be noted that when such requirements are applied to individual structures within new developments the regulations have the potential to inflate lot size and further exacerbate sprawl. The promotion of compact development patterns that result in buffers around defensible neighborhoods is a better approach not only in terms of reducing sprawl, but also the facilitation of fire defenses as human resources will not have to be scattered to defend myriad stand alone dwellings and other structures. While these codes account for individual structure protection and subdivision standards including minimum road widths for emergency vehicle access, there are relatively few regulatory codes enacted for entire development standards. Although these are general recommended widths, provision for maximum defensible space and multiple protection strategies are best. Severe wildfires under windy conditions have been known to jump fuel clearance zones exceeding 200 feet wide, or may create 'spot' fires, which are burning embers carried by winds across fuel breaks.

Providing greenbelts at the outer edges of developments have been shown to be effective in

preventing or slowing advancing groundfires. Greenbelts are managed vegetated buffer zones between developments and the WUI. The use of greenbelts or parks for fire control is well established, as evidenced in the early 20th century developments of Delaney Park Strip in Anchorage, Alaska; or Hogans Creek parks in Jacksonville, Florida. Greenbelts may include a variety of land uses including ballfield areas, walking trails, golf courses, pastures, parks, cemeteries, reservoirs, agricultural land, and other land uses. These managed lands should be considered in areas that abut forest lands or primary areas from which wildfire danger could travel. Greenbelts can incorporate natural buffer features such as streams or lakes, wetlands (effectiveness dependent upon water level, soil moisture, and other conditions) as well as utility corridors and other managed rights of way.

Establishing greenbelt zones in developing areas may be accomplished through a number of planning vehicles. Transfer of development rights allows landowners to sell or donate their development rights for undeveloped land to a government or organization. Landowners still retain title to the land and can sell it at any time; however the agency retains easement of development. Tax breaks for keeping the land as a conservation area are usually available to landowners. Zoning restriction is another comprehensive approach to area planning, and can specify areas for sensitive land conservation, water quality protection, green space, or fire hazard zones. Zoning can also establish an urban




Figure 11. (Illustration by Marc Foster).

growth boundary. Placing restrictions on urban growth footprints can provide incentives to better infill development and reduce urban sprawl. This is likely to be the most effective approach in the reduction of development in fire-prone areas, and is more legally defensible and enforceable.

Stevenson Ranch in Los Angeles County, California was in the direct path of the 2003 Simi fire, and escaped fire damage while surrounding subdivisions were impacted. This planned development was built to Los Angeles building and fire codes and included a 200 foot wide greenbelt around the subdivision. The maintained greenbelt contained irrigation systems and included fire resistant plants. A Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) report on the fire event noted that the outer greenbelt as well as 100 foot greenbelts between homes enhanced fire protection as well as the use of fire resistant plant materials and fire resistant building materials (FEMA, 2007).

Maintained buffer zones are also credited with wildfire saves for The Bridges, The Crosby, Cielo, Santa Fe Valley and 4S Ranch subdivisions in the 2007 Witch Creek fire in San Diego, California (Weisberg et al., 2007). None of the homes in these five subdivisions were lost while surrounding subdivisions suffered severe damage. One hundred feet of thinned vegetation was required around the structures as mandated by regulation. Maintained greenbelts, or vegetative clearance zones, have also been credited with other saves, including the 6,000 home Tahoe Donner subdivision from the 2007 Truckee fire. A prepared firebreak outside of the residential zone slowed the wildfire to allow firefighters to gain control (McCormick and Russell, 2007).

The Shelter Bay community in Skagit County, Washington was identified as a high fire risk community due its proximity to wildland fuels and surrounding landscape features (Titus and Hinderman, 2007). In addition to the residential area, the community included beaches, recreation areas and greenbelts. Greenbelt tracts make up 25% of the community lands and are of varying acreages. Vegetative management and thinning are conducted within these greenbelt tracts, as well as Firewise® plantings providing for a firesafe wildlife habitat enhancement. In addition to greenbelts creating a fuel break from advancing fires, greenbelts can serve as defensive points for firefighters to set backfires (a fire set along the inner edge of a fireline to consume fuel in the path of a wildfire).

8.2 Firebreaks

Permanent firebreaks may be established into greenbelt areas to provide zones of cleared vegetation. In the 2007 southern California fires, firefighters reported that firebreaks that were created using a bulldozer two lanes wide (18 to 20 feet) were effective to slow wildfire advance (ICTR, 2007). The Florida Department of Environmental Protection recommends firebreaks of 12 to 15 feet wide, dependent upon adjacent fire hazards (State of Florida, 1999). While plowed or disked firebreaks can cause soil erosion and water diversion, vegetated or grazed firebreaks may also be used. Vegetated firebreaks were recommended to be at least 10 feet in width, and maintained through occasional mowing (AFC, 2006). After plowing or disking, seeding is implemented using groundcover species that retard fire or provide enhanced wildlife habitat. Grazed firebreaks provide for livestock feeding and are seeded with bahiagrass, grains, ryegrass or legumes. It was recommended for grazed firebreaks to be at minimum of 16 feet in width (AFC, 2006).

8.3 Roads

Both improved and unimproved roadways have been utilized to stop advancing groundfires or for defensive backfiring. While public roadways outside of developments may serve as firebreaks, the location of interior roads may serve as additional protection. Outer perimeter roads are often used in residential subdivisions and their widths and rights of way can serve larger traffic amounts as well as buffer wildfire. Two lane subdivision roads are often specified at 24 feet in width, which is often wide enough to stop a small advancing grassfire. For areas of higher fire risk, mown rights of way along roadsides will add further fuel clearance. For unimproved access roads the Alabama Forestry Commission recommended that access roads serving as a permanent firebreak be at least 10 feet in width with a maximum grade of 10% (AFC, 2006).

Zeph Cunningham of the National Park Service mentioned that during the Quarry and Peavine wildfires, firefighters successfully used the Blue Ridge Parkway as a firebreak to allow wildfires to burn up to the road, or to backfire from it (Cunningham, 2007). While the road rights of way management along the Blue Ridge Parkway varies along the 470 mile long two lane roadway, vegetation management also varies from between 100 and 500 feet from the road centerline.



8.4 Trails and Walkways

Bike and pedestrian trails may also serve as effective fuel breaks. The South Tahoe Greenway Multi-Use Trail Project will link Meyers, California to Stateline, Nevada (Tahoe, 2006). The bike trail provides a non-motorized alternative transportation corridor through South Lake Tahoe. The trail consists of a 10 foot wide paved path with 2 foot wide cleared shoulders on both sides. To serve as a fire break, forest thinning for fuels reduction will occur within 150 feet from the trail centerline.

A new residential community in Florida, Verandah is a 1,456 acre master planned community in Lee County (Section 9.2). In addition to a number of Firewise® design principles, the incorporated nature trails in the development also serve as additional fuel breaks.

The Ortega Road Fire Break in San Juan Capistrano, California serves as a portion of the Mesa Loop Recreation Trail. This 15 foot wide dirt trail runs for five miles along the outer edge of the Ortega Highway, and allows users to experience the area's sage scrub, grassland, and oak woodland plant communities.

8.5 Cemeteries

Cemetery green space has served to stop previous wildfires. In 1991, Mountain View Cemetery in Oakland, California served as a public refuge from the firestorm in the Oakland hills. Evacuees from the fire gathered in the cemetery with their belongings to watch the fire. With the wide expansive cemetery green space and sprinkler systems, the fire stopped at the cemetery edges.

In some cases, cemetery grounds can help preserve original plant community remnants. Prescribed burning is used to maintain an original stand of tallgrass prairie at Prospect Cemetery Nature Preserve in Paxton, Illinois. Regular fire applications are used around the cemetery as additional defensible space. Many cemeteries utilize mown perimeter firebreaks to prevent any cemetery damage.

8.6 Pastures

The 108 Mile Ranch Community Association in British Columbia, Canada is a residential community that comprises over 1500 acres. In addition to community lakes and golf courses, the development contains an exterior greenbelt used for recreational trails and as a firebreak. The greenbelt is managed

for fuel reduction, and also includes extensive horse pastures and an air landing field (108 Mile Ranch, 2008). While pastures may be of various dimensions, they are typically not less than 80 to 100 feet in width, offering a substantial zone of fire protection.

8.7 Airfields

Small landing strips and airfields are amenities provided in some residential subdivisions. For safety and noise reasons, these airstrips are usually located away from main residential areas in the outer greenbelt. Access roads and taxiways at airports make excellent firebreaks. Fifty foot wide mow strips along the edge of runways are not uncommon for small airstrips, which creates a buffer zone exceeding 100 feet in width.

One of the first airparks in the country (1941), the Carmel Valley airport encompasses 25 acres of open space. The airfield served as a firebreak for the surrounding village, and also as an important staging area for fire-fighters and equipment during fire seasons (Vintage Airfield, 2008).

8.8 Utility rights of way and railroads

Utility corridors and railroads can be effective zones for preventing fire spread (NRCS, 2005). Typically these areas are managed for vegetation on a regular basis through the use of prescribed fire, mowing, herbicides or other means. While they may be useful as firebreaks, vegetation management is often conducted along railways to prevent accidental vegetation ignition from the trains. The California Code of Regulations (Title 14) recommends a minimum vegetation control width of 25 feet from railway tracks, which creates nearly 60 feet of wildfire buffer.

8.9 Natural creeks, water bodies, drainage ways

Taking advantage of existing waterways such as creeks, rivers, bays, swamps, and other wetlands as boundaries for developments can be an effective fire break strategy (NRCS, 2005). Similar to other types of fire breaks, the effectiveness of the drainage way depends upon the amount of permanent water within the watershed. Permanent streams at least 15 feet between banks can be effective for stopping small advancing grass fires. Often in riparian corridors the streambank and first terrace vegetation is protected from disturbance,

resulting in older or mature floodplain woodlands. Thick vegetation along streams can transfer fire across small streams, or spot fires can occur from nearby embers.

In the South, seasonal wetlands such as swamps, sloughs, bogs, and floodplains are often saturated with water in winter months, and can be effective fire barriers. In summer, these ephemeral wetlands can dry and become fire prone. As these are ecologically sensitive landscapes, botanists and biologists should first evaluate important plant or wildlife habitats before vegetation management is conducted. Understory thinning, as described below, can help reduce fire risk in wetland areas.

8.10 Shaded fuel breaks

Shaded fuel breaks are areas within woodlands that are thinned or managed to decrease fuel loads. Typically, heavy underbrush (small diameter stems), low limbs, and limb debris up to 8 feet in height are removed which reduces fire intensity and opportunities for crown fires. Generally, closed canopy woodlands have higher humidity levels, lower temperatures, and less wind speeds which helps moderate fire activity, although extreme weather or fire conditions still creates fire danger. Advantages to using woodland shaded fuel breaks include better public acceptance of maintaining forest systems, less occurrence of exotic invasive species becoming established in clearing management, maintaining cooler temperatures on creeks and waterways, and enhanced community use space.

Numerous fire events have proven that shaded fuel breaks can help slow down fire intensity until firefighters can control it. A 1999 wildfire in Winton, California burned 115 acres until the fire reached a shaded fuel break. Fire crews were then able to gain the upperhand before it reached nearby subdivisions. In dense vegetation or high hazard fire areas, fuel breaks of 300 feet in width have been recommended.

Shaded fuel breaks are effective along narrow roadways to expand the defensive zone. A 2003 fire in the Sawmill-Hungry Guich community east of Bakersfield, California was contained by the prior thinning of roadway vegetation 20 feet on either side of the road.

8.11 Prescribed burn areas

Vegetative buffer zones that are maintained by regularly prescribed fire are also effective ways of mitigating fuel intensity. Grassland fires burn quick and hot, but are of less intensity than dense woodland fires and are easier to control. Maintaining fire management in natural fire ecosystems helps to preserve plant species diversity and certain wildlife populations as well.

A prescribed burn conducted in the Mill Creek Drainage area near Mendocino, California reduced the continuous heavy chaparral and fuel loading. A previous fire in the heavy brush area had burned 26,000 acres and damaged 35 structures. After the prescribed burn, a 2001 fire in the area burned slower and with less intensity and was contained at 10 acres. Tom Crews, USFWS Region 4 Fire Management Officer at Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge in Manteo, North Carolina, relayed that a wildfire in 2000 stopped at a prescribed burn area conducted the previous year. If it were not for the burn management, the main fire could have impacted nearby Manns Harbor Community (Crews, 2008).




Figure 12 (Photo by Bob Brzuszek).

9.0 Recent planned developments for wildfires

Recently developed planned communities in the southeastern U.S. have utilized and incorporated Firewise® design principles. These Florida case studies describe the general layout decisions and community characteristics.

9.1 CASE STUDY #1

Name: RiverCamps on Crooked Creek
 Location: West Bay, Florida
 Type: Residential community
 Development size: 450 homes, 1500 acres
 Owner: The St. Joe Company

RiverCamps on Crooked Creek was a planned residential community located outside of Panama City Beach, Florida. This new Firewise community (the first Firewise Community/USA® in the Florida panhandle) was located on previously managed forestry lands owned by The St. Joe Company. Comprising 1500 acres, the development retained the character of Gulf Coastal edge salt marsh and slash pine savanna communities. In the early planning phases, canopy trees were thinned in developable areas to 100 trees per acre. The Florida Division of Forestry provided wildfire

suppression and assistance with prescribed fire throughout the stages of development. The design and management of RiverCamps incorporated a variety of Firewise® strategies, including mechanical thinning and prescribed burn management for a variety of natural habitat types.

Community Layout and Design

Much of the developed residential space takes advantage of wildfire protection from the natural or constructed waterways which surround the community. Protected by Crooked Creek to the east, West Bay on the south, and the Intracoastal Waterway to the west, the primary wildfire hazard area from surrounding forest lands is from the north edge of the development.

The north property edge used a tri-level series of fire protection strategies. The main entry

RiverCamps at West Bay

General Plan of Development




Figure 13. Master plan for RiverCamps near Crooked Creek (Courtesy of The St. Joe Company).

road to the development was from Highway 388, a two lane county road (100 foot R.O.W.) that runs along the entire north edge of RiverCamps on Crooked Creek, and separated the property from forested lands to the north.

The second level of fire protection inside the north edge road comes from the designated location of fire managed wet pine savanna community. Entitled the 'grass lakes;' this zone of previous slash pine plantation was thinned of dense pine trees and heavy underbrush to create an open grassy understory. For aesthetic purposes, the width of the open pine savanna varied in width from less than 50' to over several hundred feet in portions. Following the clearing of dense pine stands, the site was rollerchopped and prescribed burned. Burns were scheduled at 2 to 3 year intervals to promote naturally occurring grass and wildflower species. Although permanent firebreaks were added in certain defensive areas, the wetland impacts from those firelines required mitigation.

The third level of wildfire protection came from an existing 200 foot wide powerline rights of way. The Gulf Power line ran east-west along the site, with the majority of development on its southern edge. The area was maintained by Gulf Power by the use of herbicides or by mowing to promote a grassland vegetative buffer. Although prescribed fire is currently used at this time, as housing density increases, fuel management may shift to mechanical cutting in all but the permanent mitigation areas (Smith, 2008). Constructed small lakes were scattered through the development as an amenity for

housing clusters and also serve as small fuel breaks. Twenty foot wide roads circulate through the development, and while they do not create a classic outer ring road, they primarily serve in the same fashion.

Vegetative management

In addition to the above mentioned fire management of pine savanna environments, periodic thinning of overstory trees and underbrush was scheduled for regular management or remaining plant communities. In designated management zones, salt marsh wetlands were scheduled for periodic burning, and seasonal marshes and upland and lowland pine areas were maintained through a combination of hand thinning and burning. The only unmanaged woodlands were conserved along the western edge of Crooked Creek.

Other Firewise® Community Design Characteristics

RiverCamps on Crooked Creek offered other incorporated Firewise design principles. Two entrances for the development to Highway 388 provided multiple safety routes during emergencies and alternative access for traffic distribution. Utilities were placed underground for fire protection, and fire hydrants were placed at 1,000 foot intervals throughout the development. Additionally, homes were constructed from fire resistant construction materials. Educational materials were provided for residents and Firewise demonstration projects are conducted periodically.

9.2 CASE STUDY #2

Name: Verandah
Name: Verandah
Location: Fort Myers, Florida
Type: Residential community
Development size: 1,456 acres
Owner: The Bonita Bay Group

Verandah is a master planned residential community located in North Fort Myers, Florida. A recognized Firewise Community/USA® residential area, development was previously a cattle ranch operation prior to opening in 2003. Over 1,400 acres in size, the development was recognized by the Florida Association of Realtors with a Residential Environmental Award for preservation of the area's natural elements. Over 70% of the land was retained for open space; and include nature preserves, parks, lakes and riparian conservation buffers. The development included 480 acres of common space and parks, 416 acres of wetland preserves and lakes, 84 acres of upland preserves, and a 25 to 200 foot wide conservation easement along the Orange River waterfront. Over nine miles of walking and bicycle paths were included in the development, which average four feet in width.

All homes in the development must be certified by the Florida Green Building Coalition which encourages energy efficiency, water conservation, indoor environmental quality, and sustainable building materials. To encourage the use of Florida native plants, 70% of a residence's landscape must contain native species.

Community Layout and Design

Similar to RiverCamps, Verandah takes advantage of surrounding features for wildfire protection. The Orange River bordered the south and west edges of the development, offering protection from scattered woodland patches from the south. The riparian zone of the Orange River varied between 100 and 125 feet in width (Fikowski, 2008). Highway 80, a four lane divided highway, bordered the entire north edge property line. The east edge of the property is bordered by Buckingham Road.

An extensive collection of small lakes and ponds were dispersed throughout the development, which maximized the residential waterfront footage, served as emergency water access, and offers extensive fuel breaks. Also dispersed throughout the development were golf fairways which serve as




Figure 14. Master plan for Verandah (Courtesy of The Bonita Bay Group).

narrow green corridors between housing clusters. Nature trails were incorporated into the woodland strips throughout the development, which average 4 feet in width and also serve as fuel breaks.

Vegetative management

Many woodlands at Verandah were conserved as natural areas with minimum vegetative management. A Firewise plant list was distributed to homeowners for use on individual as well as community properties.

Other Firewise Community Design Characteristics

Multiple entrances provide access to the development, and interior roads were 25 feet wide with 5 foot shoulders. All roadway turnaround had radii of 50 feet to accommodate large emergency vehicles. Street signs were constructed from non-combustible materials and were a minimum of four inches in diameter. All the utilities were placed underground to minimize storm and fire damage.

9.3 CASE STUDY #3

Name: Briargate

Location: Ormond Beach, Florida

Type: Residential community

Development size: 60 acres, 89 proposed homes

Briargate was a new developing subdivision within the planned community of Hunter's Ridge, located in the western suburbs of Ormond Beach, Florida. Briargate is a recognized Firewise Community/USA® development on 60 acres of land with 89 planned homesites. The Hunter's Ridge subdivision contained a total of 2,280 homesites, situated in pine forests. Hunter's Ridge subdivision was impacted from three separate wildfires during the 1998 wildfire season which consumed nearly 500,000 acres in central Florida. Although the 1998 fires came within 1/4 of a mile from Briargate, the area that Briargate now encompasses was not directly impacted from the 1998 fires, due to utility rights of way located to the west that was used as a defensible zone. The community was designed with Firewise principles in mind, and developers worked with local fire officials and interested home buyers for input as part of a planning committee. The development contained common green space areas of pine forests and hardwood swamps.

Community Layout and Design

Briargate was bordered along its entire north edge by Airport Road, a two lane paved surface with managed rights of way. This was an important defensive element as woodland fuels are located to the north and west sides of the development. Two means of subdivision entry were provided on this road. Bordering the entire west side of Briargate and Hunter's Ridge was a managed 20 foot wide utility line rights of way. The utility rights of way was in a strategic location, as wildland fires typically occur from the west due to predominantly early and mid-day westerly winds (Garrett, 2008). Hunter's Ridge, an extensive subdivision of homes, was located to the south and east portions. An inner loop road, Briargate Look, was a 24 foot wide road that creates an inner ring of protection to homes, as does Thornhill Circle. Briargate, as well as much of Hunter's Ridge, used ponds located in strategic locations to mitigate water runoff as well as provide defensive fire zones. Many of the ponds were oriented in a north/south direction, as were many of the interior Hunter's Ridge development roads, which offered further protection from fires occurring from the west.




Figure 15. Briargate Community Plan (Courtesy of Fretwell Homes).

Developers of Briargate saw an opportunity to save on expenses associated with site preparation while creating a Firewise community. Briargate, as well as surrounding woodland areas, were thinned of trees to 100 trees per acre, which the developer sold for additional income, as well as being managed for wildland fuels. Additionally, development costs were mitigated by the reuse soil excavated from the ponds to be reused in the development. The reuse of soil combined with an agreement to extend buildout timelines for multiple lot development saved the developer from a significant expense of hauling the soil offsite.

Vegetative management

Firewise landscaping was required within 30 feet of all structures at Briargate. This includes tree locations at a minimum distance of 30 feet from structures as well as other trees. Fire resistant species were required, as are irrigation systems within the 30 foot zone. Property owners and the association were responsible for the ongoing maintenance of vegetation within the wildfire protection zone. A management plan was required and approved by the city.

Other Firewise Community Design Characteristics

Briargate utilizes a number of Firewise community principles. The community has underground utilities to prevent damage to lines during wildfires and storms, has a million gallon water tank for firefighting, pressurized fire hydrants with rating of 200 gallons per minute, and conducts regular Firewise community meetings.

9.4 Summary of Firewise planned communities

The design and layout of all three case study Firewise design communities revealed similar techniques for incorporating existing fuel breaks and designing maximum managed buffer space around the development. Although these developments have not yet been tested by a wildland fire, the lessons learned from the design of these communities include:

1. Take advantage of existing creeks and waterbodies as property edges for the development where possible. As shown at RiverCamps and Verandah, these riparian buffers form extensive fire breaks for protection, with no cost for installation or management. The location of the main developments at RiverCamps took best advantage of water protection on three sides of the subdivision, as well as providing community amenities. Orange Creek at Verandah also formed a large property buffer for this community. It was not recommended to widen existing perennial streams due to ecologic and hydrologic disruption. Intermittent streams, hardwood swamps or drainage corridors can utilize shaded fuel break strategies of thinning riparian edges to reduce fire hazards in dry seasons or low humidity conditions. Thirty to 100 feet of vegetation management in these zones will reduce the fuel load risk. As shown in the 1998 Flagler fire, existing waterbodies can stop advancing wildfires.
2. Utilize existing roadways along development edges. All three developments wisely utilize major or minor collector roads as a defensive space. As with creeks, these existing firebreaks added no cost to the development or its continued management. A minimum of two lanes width (24 feet) with managed rights of way (minimum 10 feet) was recommended for roadways.
3. Use existing utility corridors as property edge boundaries or as interior defensible space for housing locations. As evidenced in the 1998 wildfire at Hunter's Ridge, managed utility rights of way can be valuable defensible zones. Briargate and RiverCamps took advantage of these existing narrow corridors to locate their developments along the inner edge for further protection.
4. Develop new ponds, lakes, wetlands, and other drainage features into the community. All three developments contain newly created waterbodies dispersed throughout the subdivisions. Waterfront properties or community common areas were highly marketable amenities for residential sales, and offer numerous other benefits. Developing retention or detention ponds assist in stormwater management by collecting and treating residential runoff. Ponds also allow for better infiltration into ground aquifers and reduce runoff pollution in local waterbodies. Stormwater ponds may reduce flooding potential in low lying areas, and if managed properly offer additional wetland wildlife habitat. As shown in Hunter's Ridge subdivision, orienting subdivision waterbodies along the width of potential wildfire directions may prove an effective defensive measure. Retention ponds also offer firefighters another source of water in a community during fire operations. A grassland or managed woodland buffer strip (30 feet wide) around water bodies will help trap sediments and filter nutrients before reaching the water body.
5. Consider using outer loop roads within the community property. Briargate's use of 24 foot wide loop roads with managed rights of way offer increasing zones of protection for structures from offsite wildfires. Though not a loop road per se, RiverCamps extensive outer road systems serve the same function. As shown in the 1998 Brevard County, Florida fire, large roads and increased road densities were effective at stopping wildfires.
6. Place managed open space amenities along the outer edge of developments. Verandah's Utility rights of way provided additional green space and incorporated into the larger community open space plan. While utility companies typically maintain the rights of way (R.O.W.), communities may provide recommendations for the types of vegetation management and suggested R.O.W. widths. Thirty foot wide corridors were the recommended minimum width for rights of way.

- use of golf course fairways along the periphery of the development, as well as in the interior of the development, offer a good community use while offering fire protection. RiverCamps extensive pedestrian trail systems act as additional firebreaks in both woodland and savanna areas, and provide access to important amenity use points along the Bay.
7. Provide managed vegetative buffer zones along property edges, especially adjacent off-site wildland fuel areas. Briargate's thinned woodland along the western property edge was an important wildfire fuel mitigation buffer and a community amenity. Having routine management of the woodland buffers was important to include in the community homeowners association covenant. Design and location of the open savanna grassland areas at RiverCamps provided an important buffer from neighboring wildland fuels. The continued use of prescribed fire in this area and thinning of adjacent woodlands were important management goals to reduce wildfire fuel loads.
 8. Maximize the number of Firewise community defensive strategies. All three developments use a number of Firewise design principles that address multiple fire risks, ranging from vegetative management to building and road standards. NFPA 1144, NFPA 1141, and the Wildland Urban Interface Code provide a comprehensive list of factors to consider for developing effective Firewise developments. As shown in the 1998 Florida fires, multiple, smaller defensible zones were effective strategies for stopping wildfires. Firewise development does not guarantee prevention from wildfire damage, but lessens the potential impact or severity through multiple measures.
 9. Create and concentrate high density areas of development instead of low density to minimize the developable footprint. As displayed in the 1998 wildfires in Flagler County, Florida, wildfires stopped at the transition from low density to medium and high density areas. The development and enforcement of plans and ordinances that prevent development in areas known to be at high risk of catastrophic wildfire, or at a minimum that require compact, defensible development, is the best approach to new development.
 10. Catastrophic wildfire prevention is only possible at the regional planning level, and not necessarily at individual site levels. The 1998 Florida fires occurred in large roadless areas of heavy fuels. Fuel management to prevent large wildfires occurred at a large landscape level. As utilized in California, high hazard areas of wildfire risk and other potential natural disasters should be identified in regions. Regional planning allows for the best utilization of transportation, economic development, environmental protection, utility corridor locations, climactic and wind patterns, and site selection for safest developable areas.
 11. Work with local fire officials and community stakeholders in the early planning phases. Cooperation between the Florida Division of Forestry and the developers resulted in an extensive mitigation effort prior to property planning at RiverCamps. The planning advisory board at Briargate included local fire officials, homeowners, and the developer to create strategies for wildfire control and community amenities. The inclusion of community fire officials allowed for variances to development, resulting in significant cost savings.

Summary

Wildfire experts suggest three simple approaches to developing within the WUI: 1) design developments that are easy to defend against wildfire, 2) design fire-resistant landscapes and structures, and 3) design developments that incorporate ongoing fuel reduction treatments to reduce vegetative hazard.

Effective development design steps to reduce fire risk include:

1. For a proposed development area, review existing municipal or county regulatory fire codes.
2. An evaluation of fire risk from surrounding properties and their environments. This may be accomplished by contacting your local fire official for an inspection of the area or your state Firewise coordinator. Identify zones that may need protection that abut vegetative fuel areas and complete a risk

- assessment checklist. Review the history of wildfire occurrence in the area.
3. An identification of zones on the property that will offer possible wildfire protection, including existing roadways, railways, utility rights of way, creeks or drainage features, or cleared areas.
 4. The development of strategies for wildfire protection from possible fire areas. These may include the design and placement of roads with cleared rights of way, or other green space options listed in Section 8. Design multiple ingress and egress roads for developments that accommodate access by large emergency vehicles. An identification of drainage areas on the property and location of open green space in these areas to serve as water quality buffers.
 5. The clustering of development into areas that take advantage of the most protected zones.
 6. Proposed development layouts reviewed by fire officials.
 7. An assessment of the existing vegetation conditions and conduct fuel management practices prior to construction.
 8. An incorporation of Firewise design principles into the properties and building construction materials.
 9. The development of fuel management plans for vegetated areas and maintenance schedules. Make sure these are conducted regularly. Have local fire officials inspect development common areas and residential properties for assessment.
 10. The nomination of your development for Firewise Community/USA® recognition. Distribute wildfire education materials to homeowners and alert them to safe Firewise practices on their property. Educate homeowners on the Firewise design and management for the development, including the values of prescribed burning practices or water quality management practices that are being used. Residents will better accept smoke management, savanna landscapes, or buffer zone management when alerted to the important environmental values associated.

10.0 References

- 108 Mile Ranch Community Association Web site. Accessed 5/20/2008 at <http://www.108ranch.com>
- Alabama Forestry Commission (AFC). 2006. Permanent Firebreaks. Forest Management Sheet.
- American Planning Association. 2002. Policy Guide on Smart Growth. Accessed 4/8/2008 at <http://www.planning.org/policyguides/smartgrowth.htm>
- Blake, E. 2008. The Landscape Studio. Personal communication.
- Bolund, P. and S. Hunhammer. 1999. Ecosystem Services in Urban Areas. *Ecological Economics* 29:2.
- Brose, P., T. Schuler, D. Van Lear, and J. Berst. 2001. Bringing fire back: The changing regimes of the Appalachian mixed-oak forests. *Journal of Forestry* 99 (11).
- Brzuszek, R. and J. Walker. 2008. Trends in Community Fire Ordinances and Their Effects on Landscape Architecture Practice. *Landscape Journal* 27 (1)
- California Public Resource Code (CA PRC). 2005. State of California Public Laws, Public Resource Codes, Section 4291-4299.
- Cordell, Ken and E. Macie. 2002. Human Influences on Forest Ecosystems. U.S. Department of Agriculture Southern Research Station General Technical Report SRS-55.
- Crews, T. 2008. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Personal communication.
- Cunningham, Z. 2007. National Park Service. Personal communication.
- DeFries, R.S., J.A. Foley, and G.P. Asner. 2004. Land Use Choices: Balancing Human Needs and Ecosystem Function. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*. 2:5.
- Department of the Interior and US Dept of Agriculture. 2001. Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks and the Environment, 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy.
- Department of the Interior and US Department of Agriculture, National Fire Plan. FY 2003 Programs in Mississippi.
- Eagle County, Colorado. 2004. Eagle County Building Resolutions. 3.12.4.1
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2007. Building Codes Protect Home From Wildfire.
- Firewise Web site. Accessed 5/20/2008 at www.firewise.org
- Fikowski, K. 2008. The Bonita Bay Group. Personal communication.
- Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) and Florida Department of Agriculture and Community Services 2004. *Wildfire Mitigation in Florida*.
- Florida Division of Emergency Management. Accessed 5/20/2008 at <http://www.floridadisaster.org>
- Gardener, P.D., H. J. Cortner, and K. Widaman. 1987. The risk perceptions and policy response toward wildland fire hazards by urban home-owners. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 14.
- Garrett, M. 2008. City of Ormond Beach, FL. Personal communication.
- Grese, R.E. 1995. Inviting the neighbors: the story of a front-yard prairie. *Ecological Restoration*. 13(1).
- Hellmund, Paul, and Daniel Smith. 2006. Designing Greenways. Island Press, Washington.
- Information Collection Team Report (ICTR). 2007. Southern California Fires 2007: What We learned, how we worked. Wildland Fire Lessons Learned Center.
- International Code Council (ICC). 2003. 2003 International Urban-Wildland Interface Code. ICC IUWIC-2003. Washington, DC: ICC.
- Jakes, P. A Model for Improving Community Preparedness for Wildfire. USDA Forest Service.
- Johnson, K. M. and C. L. Beale. 1998. "The Rural Rebound" *The Wilson Quarterly*.
- Kane, R.C. 2003. Prairie Flower. *Landscape Architecture Magazine*. 93(10), 122-131.
- Kline, J.D., Azuma, D.L., & Alig, R.J. 2004. Population growth, urban expansion, and private forestry in western Oregon. *Forest Science*, 50(1), 33-43.
- Lassen County. 1962. Lassen County Setback Ordinance (Ord. 355, Sec. 2, 1962).
- Long, A. 2006. Benefits of Prescribed Burning. University of Florida IFAS Extension FOR 70.
- McCormick, E. and S. Russell. 2007. Fire threatens homes near Donner Lake. San Francisco Chronicle. August 22, 2007.
- Monroe, M.C. 2002. Fire. Human Influences on Forest Ecosystems. U.S. Department

- of Agriculture Southern Research Station
General Technical Report SRS-55.
- Monroe, M.C., Long, A.J., & Marynowski, S. 2003. Wildland fire in the southeast: Negotiating guidelines for defensible space. *Journal of Forestry*, 101(3), 14-19.
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA). 2008. NFPA 1144 Standard for Protection of Life and Property from Wildfire. Quincy, MA.
- National Interagency Fire Center. 2007. Fire information—wildland fire statistics 2006. http://www.nifc.gov/fire_info?fire_summaries
- National Firewise Communities Program, *Frequently Asked Questions*. Available from Firewise Web site, Accessed 5/20/2008 www.firewise.org
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2005 Firebreak. Code 394. Conservation Practices Standard.
- Pima County. 2006. Graphic companion for the 2006 International Wildland-Urban Interface Code for Pima County. Pima County, AZ.
- Pyne, S.J. 2001. *Fire: A brief history*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Running, S. 2006. Is Global Warming Causing, More Larger Wildfires? *Science* Vol. 313, (5789), 927-928.
- Santa Barbara City Fire Department. 2001. *High Fire Hazard Area Landscape Guidelines*. Fire Prevention Bureau, City of Santa Barbara, CA.
- Schindler, B.; and M. Reed. 1996. Forest management in the Blue Mountains: Public perspectives on prescribed fire and mechanical thinning. Department of Forest resources, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.
- Schwab, J. and S. Meck, 2005. Planning for Wildfires. American Planning Association. Report number 5/29/530
- Smith, K. 2008. The St. Joe Company. Personal communication.
- Sorvig, K. 2001. Will wildfire ravage our profession? *Landscape Architecture Magazine*, 91(12): 32-39, 80-81.
- Southern Group of State Foresters. 2003. Fire in the South.
- State of Florida, 1999. Department of Environmental Protection. Firebreaks. DEP 910. September 17, 1999.
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and State of California. 2006. South Tahoe Greenway Multi-Use Trail Project.
- Titus, M., and J. Hinderman. 2007. Safety in Numbers. *Wildfire Magazine*. July 2007.
- Vintage Airfield. 2008. Carmel Valley Vintage Airpark. Accessed 5/20/08 at <http://www.vintageairfield.com>
- Weisberg, L., R. Showley, E. Pierce. 2007. Exclusive Homes Emerge Unscathed as Fire-protection Concept is Tested. The San Diego Union-Tribune.

11.0 Additional Resources

- Relevant research and materials developed regarding Firewise landscaping for the southeastern U.S. include:
- Virginia Department of Forestry. Firewise Communities for Virginia. 2002.
- Alabama Forestry Commission. Firewise Landscaping for Woodland Homes. Document AFC-FP-04, 1999.
- Lippi, C. and Kuypers, M. Making Your Landscape More Resistant to Wildfires. University of Florida Flagler County Extension. July 1998.
- Monroe, M. and Long, A. Landscaping In Florida with Fire in Mind. University of Florida Cooperative Extension Service. January 2001.
- Hagan, B. W. Trees & Shrubs Generally Recognized to be Fire Resistant. CA Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection. 2001.
- Needham, J. Fire Safe Landscaping #17. Tree Notes, CA Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection. January 1996.
- Virginia Firewise Landscaping Task Force. Virginia Firescapes Firewise Landscaping for Woodland Homes. Virginia Cooperative Extension. Pub. 430-300. May 1998.

State Firewise Coordinators are administered through state forestry commissions. For assistance with Firewise® information, contact your state forestry commission.

Becoming a Recognized Firewise Community/USA®




*What is Firewise
Communities/USA®?*

*How Can My Community
Become A Recognized
Firewise Community?*

*What are the Recognition
Criteria?*


*What is the Home Ignition
Zone and Why is it so
Important?*

*What are the Benefits
of Being a Firewise
Community?*



Living with Wildfire

Whether you've lived in the wildland/urban interface for years, or are purchasing or renting your dream home away from the hectic pace of city life, you may be concerned about wildfire. Living where wildfires can occur poses a risk to your property and loved ones — but it is possible to live compatibly with this natural event. Read on to learn more about how your participation in the Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program can make you and your home safer.



What is Firewise Communities/USA®?

Citizen involvement is the cornerstone of the Firewise Communities/USA® Recognition Program. If you are a homeowner or community resident whose home is located in a region susceptible to wildfires, this brochure will offer you relevant information on how you can help your community to become Firewise. As participants in the Program, you and your neighbors will learn how to decrease the risk of losing your homes and to best protect yourselves in the event of wildfire.

Within wildland/urban interface areas, firefighters lack the resources to defend every home that is threatened during ex-

trême wildfires. However, communities whose residents take steps to reduce their vulnerability have a greater chance of surviving a wildfire. Firewise Communities/USA offers residents in fire-prone areas a unique opportunity to implement Firewise practices specially tailored to individual and community needs. You and your neighbors will gain useful knowledge and skills to prepare for a wildfire before it occurs, while also helping you maintain an acceptable level of fire readiness. Firewise homes and communities allow fire fighters to concentrate on fighting the wildfire — which ultimately saves more homes and lives. What's more, even a few preventive

actions can prove critical, because when adequately prepared, homes have often survived a wildfire without the intervention of the fire department.

The Program draws on a community's spirit, its resolve, and its willingness to

take responsibility for reducing wildfire risks by providing the resources needed to achieve both a high level of protection against wildland/urban interface fire and ecosystem balance. The Program utilizes the following three-legged template:

- Wildland fire staff from federal, state or local agencies provide a community with information about living with wildfire with mitigation information tailored to your specific community or region.
- With the assistance of wildland fire staff, you and your neighbors assess wildfire risks around you and devise a cooperative network of other homeowners, agencies, and organizations.
- You and your neighbors identify and implement local solutions.



How Can My Community Become A Recognized Firewise Community?

Ultimately, it all begins with you. Becoming Firewise takes time and coordination with your neighbors and others, but getting started is actually quite straightforward. The Firewise Communities/USA standards offer flexibility in creating the most appropriate plan and actions for your community. You will find that the effort expended reaps many rewards.

Following these steps, your community will be on its way toward becoming Firewise.

- 1) *Contact Firewise* — A community representative (you or another interested member of your community) completes an on-line request for contact by a Firewise representative on the Firewise Communities/USA web site, www.firewise.org/usa.
- 2) *Site Visit* — At an agreed-upon time, your state's Firewise Communities/USA liaison, a specialist in wildland/urban interface (WUI) fire, will visit your area and assess the proposed site. The visit is coordinated with local fire officials.

3) *Community Representatives* — At the same time, your community “spark plug” (again, this could be you) recruits community representatives to create a multi-disciplined Firewise board or committee. This group should include homeowners and fire professionals but may also include planners, land managers, urban foresters and members of other interest groups. Be aware that the development of the Firewise Community plan may take up to six months.

4) *Assessment & Evaluation* — Upon completing a site assessment and evaluation of the community’s wildfire readiness, the WUI specialist schedules a meeting with your local Firewise board to present the assessment for review and acceptance by the board. If accepted, the process continues; if not, it is terminated.

5) *Moving Forward/Creating A Plan* — Your local Firewise board develops area-specific solutions to its WUI fire issues based on the WUI specialist’s report. All members of the Firewise board must concur with the final plan. The recommendations are presented to and approved by the WUI specialist. The specialist may work with your community to seek project implementation funds, if needed.

6) *Implement Solutions* — Local solutions are implemented following a schedule designed by your Firewise group, who will be responsible for maintaining the program into the future.

7) *Apply for Recognition* — Firewise Communities/USA recognition status is achieved after your community submits its application form along with a completed Firewise community plan and Firewise event documentation to your state’s Firewise liaison. *The application form is available online and more information on Firewise Recognition Criteria is on Page 5.*

8) *Renewing Your Recognition Status* — Annual renewal of your recognition is completed by submitting documentation of your community’s continued participation to the state Firewise liaison. *This can be easily accomplished with the on-line form available at www.firewise.org/usa.*

The image shows a sample of the Firewise Communities/USA Application form. The form is titled "FIREWISE COMMUNITIES/USA APPLICATION" and includes sections for:

- Community Information (Name, Address, City, State, ZIP, Phone, Fax, Email)
- Community Description (Number of homes, acreage, etc.)
- Firewise Program Status (Checkboxes for: Firewise Program in place, Firewise Plan completed, Firewise Event documentation, Firewise Board/Committee, Firewise Specialist, Firewise Recognition Criteria met)
- Firewise Program Description (Text area for describing the program)
- Firewise Program Budget (Table for listing items, quantities, and costs)
- Firewise Program Contact Information (Name, Title, Address, Phone, Fax, Email)
- Firewise Program Sponsor (Name, Address, Phone, Fax, Email)
- Firewise Program Approval (Signature and Date of Firewise Board/Committee)
- Firewise Program Approval (Signature and Date of Firewise Specialist)
- Firewise Program Approval (Signature and Date of Firewise Recognition Liaison)


www.firewise.org/usa

What are the Recognition Criteria?

Neighborhoods, subdivisions, and small towns in fire-prone areas of the United States can earn Firewise Communities/USA Recognition status by creating dedicated local Firewise task forces and by implementing Firewise principles tailored to their specific community needs. This nationwide initiative recognizes communities for taking action to protect people and properties from the risk of fire in the wildland/urban interface. Communities create their programs themselves with cooperative assistance from local fire staff and state forestry agencies.

Fire-prone communities earn Firewise Communities/USA recognition status by meeting the following criteria:


-  Enlisting a wildland/urban interface specialist to complete an assessment and create a plan that identifies locally agreed-upon solutions that the community can implement.
-  Sponsoring a local Firewise task force, committee, commission or department which maintains the Firewise Community program and tracks its progress or status.
-  Observing a Firewise Communities/USA Day each year that is dedicated to a local Firewise project.
-  Investing a minimum of \$2.00 annually per capita in local Firewise Communities/USA efforts. (Work by municipal employees or volunteers using municipal and other equipment can be included, as can state/federal grants dedicated to that purpose.)
-  Submitting an annual report to Firewise Communities/USA, documenting continuing compliance with the program.




What is the Home Ignition Zone and Why is it so Important?

The Home Ignition Zone is the key to preparing your home for wildfire readiness. Your home ignition zone – including the condition of the house and its immediate surroundings within 100 to 200 feet and other structures such as garages, decks, porches, or fences that come in contact with the house – is what determines your home's susceptibility to ignition during a wildfire. "The more you can eliminate the things that can lead a wildfire to your home, the more likely your home will survive," notes Judith Leraas Cook, project manager of the Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program. She offers some simple steps for evaluating your home ignition zone and making it a deterrent to the progress of the fire:

- Clear the build up of pine needles and leaves from the base of the house and any connecting structures which could otherwise ignite the home's siding.
- Create a three-foot, fire-free area on all sides of your home.
- Clear gutters of leaves and debris.
- Trim any limbs on trees hanging over the house.
- "Limb up" trees around the house by removing lower limbs that are 10 to 15 feet from the ground.
- Use metal flashing at all connection points of structures, such as wooden fences attached to the house.
- Clear trees and shrubs of dead material and keep them pruned. Space trees and shrubs far enough apart to slow the spread of an approaching wildfire.
- Regularly care for your property to keep it free of all dead leaves and needles.
- Choose deciduous trees, rather than evergreens, when planting close to your home. Sap from evergreens is good fuel for fire. Deciduous plants burn more slowly.



- Install glass skylights. Plastic melts during a fire.
- Store firewood well away from your house, particularly during fire-season.
- Remove excess vegetation along roads and remove chipped wood immediately after cutting.
- Use non-flammable (Class A) roofing materials.
- Plant native wildflowers and fire-resistant plants; keep lawns green and irrigated as they serve as good fire breaks, as do rock gardens and xeriscapes.
- Remember that wide driveways, non-flammable walkways and other pathways can slow or stop the spread of a wildfire.



The national Firewise Communities program is an interagency program designed to encourage local solutions for wildfire safety by involving homeowners, community leaders, planners, developers, firefighters, and others in the effort to protect people and property from the risk of wildfire. The Firewise Communities program is sponsored by the National Wildfire Coordinating Group's Wildland/Urban Interface Working Team, a consortium of wildland fire agencies that includes the USDA Forest Service, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Emergency Management Association, the US Fire Administration, the National Association of State Fire Marshals, the National Fire Protection Association, and state forestry organizations. For more information, visit www.firewise.org.

This publication was supported with funds from Department of Homeland Security/Federal Emergency Management Agency Grant Number EMW-2005-GR-0433; its content does not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Homeland Security or the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

What are the Benefits of Being a Firewise Community?

While the benefits can vary, there are a number of positive outcomes experienced by communities that become members of the Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program. Being "Firewise":

- Creates defensible space that prevents fires from advancing and endangering homes and lives.
- Improves property value while reducing risk of loss.
- Improves community relationships with local fire staff, since firefighters can concentrate their efforts on fighting wildfires rather than devoting often limited resources to protecting homes – which may ultimately be lost if the fire can't be contained.
- Encourages good neighbors, since the more homes within a community that adopt "Firewise" practices, the greater the impact on reducing the heat and speed of the fire.
- Offers peace of mind, knowing that your home is prepared to survive a wildfire in the event one should occur.



Where Can I Get More Information about Firewise Communities/USA?



For more information on the Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program, visit www.firewise.org/usa or contact your state forestry agency.

2

Discussion of House Bill 2 and the Town's Proposed Typology Category

Town of Front Royal, Virginia Work Session Agenda Form

Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: Discussion of House Bill 2 & the Town's Proposed Typology Category
Director of Planning & Zoning

Summary: House Bill 2 (HB2) was signed by the Governor in April of 2014 and is effective as of July 1, 2014. It requires the development of a prioritization process and directs the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to develop and use a scoring process. House Bill 1887 was approved in February of 2015 in association with HB2. It specifies new funding allocation approaches and funding programs under consideration by the CTB applicable to the provisions of HB2. Two programs applicable to HB2 that are defined and assigned an allocation formula in HB1887 include the High-Priority Projects Program and Construction District Grant Program. Both of these pools of money will use the scoring process developed under HB2.

Under the proposed scoring process of HB2, road projects will be evaluated based on the following factor areas: 1. Congestion mitigation, 2. Economic Development, 3. Accessibility, 4. Safety, 5. Environmental Quality, and 6. Land Use Coordination (only for areas with over 200K population). The weight of each factor area is being assigned differently for different areas of the State. This particular methodology was developed with idea that different areas of the Commonwealth have different values as to the prioritization of each factor areas. A table and map of the different areas and categories is attached. The Town of Front Royal is located within Category B.

HB2 was discussed at the most recent meeting of the NSVRC. At the meeting, a representative of VDOT (Terry Short) was of the opinion that it may be beneficial for jurisdictions to change their typology to Category C or Category D. The primary reason for this was explained to be that the Town would likely not score well in Congestion Mitigation, which receives a heavy weight in Category B.

Council Discussion: This agenda item is scheduled for a work session review on 05/04/2015.

Staff Evaluation: Some localities have decided, or are considering to, request that they are included within a different category. The purpose of discussion with Town Council is to determine if it is in the Town's best interest to stay in the assigned category or request a category change. Any such recommendations should be made by May 22nd. The NSVRC is in the process of trying to coordinating a regional response.

Legal Evaluation: The Town Attorney will be available at the work session for questions.

Town Manager: The Town Attorney will be available at the work session for questions.

Budget/Funding: N/A

Council Recommendation:

Additional Work Session Regular Meeting No Action
Consensus Poll on Action: ___(Aye) ___(Nay)

Work Session



Factor Weighting Frameworks

Factor	Congestion Mitigation	Economic Development	Accessibility	Safety	Environmental Quality	Land Use
Category A	35%**	10%	25%	10%	10%	10%*
Category B	15%	20%	25%	15%	10%	15%*
Category C	10%	20%	30%	30%	10%	
Category D	10%	30%	20%	30%	10%	

Note* – For metropolitan planning areas with a population over 200,000 (TPB, HRTPO, RRTPO, FAMPO, RVTPO), the prioritization process shall also include a factor based on the quantifiable and achievable goals in VTrans (referred to as the Transportation-Land Use Coordination factor).

Note** – For Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads construction districts, congestion mitigation is weighted highest among the factors in the prioritization process.


Draft Area Types

Legend

-  VDOT District Boundaries
-  MPO/PDC Boundaries
-  Counties and Cities

DRAFT HB2 Weighting Typologies

-  Category A
-  Category B
-  Category C
-  Category D



3

Humane Society Request for Trolley Use

Town of Front Royal, Virginia Work Session Agenda Form

Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: Humane Society Request for Trolley Use

Summary: The Humane Society of Warren County has requested that the Town contribute the rental rate for use of the VRT Royal Trolley from 8am until 4 pm on Saturday, August 8th for their "Waggin for Dragons" boat race fundraiser. Historically, VRT has charge approximately \$75 per hour for use of the Trolley for special events. VRT has been requested to confirm their current charge. The total estimate amount for the donation request is \$600.00. The Trolley would transport participants and spectators from the Lowe's area of the Riverton Commons parking lot to the event at the Front Royal Country Club.

Council Discussion: Council is requested to consider the request to fund the Humane Society of Warren County.

Staff Evaluation: The Humane Society of Warren County does provide a service to the citizens of Front Royal and assists the Police Department with stray animals.

Budget/Funding: Funding for this request was not included in the FY14-15 Budget; funding was come from the Unreserved Fund Balance in General Fund. The Finance Director will be available to address fiscal issues.

Legal Evaluation: The Town Attorney will be available to address legal issues.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends that Town Council consider the request.

Town Manager Recommendation: The Town Manager recommends that Town Council consider the request.

Council Recommendation:

- Additional Work Session
 - Regular Meeting
 - No Action
- Consensus Poll on Action: ___(Aye) ___(Nay)





1245 Progress Drive
Front Royal, VA 22630
(540) 635-4734 • humanesocietywarrncounty.org

March 25, 2014

Dear Steve Burke,

The Humane Society of Warren County will be hosting the 2nd Annual Waggin' for Dragons boat race fundraiser on Saturday, August 8th at the Front Royal Country Club. This fundraiser is the animal shelters highest grossing community event. Hundreds of participants and spectators come out to see the dragon boats race in support of the homeless animals of Warren County.

We are hopeful that for our 2015 event, the Town of Front Royal would allow us to use the town trolley to transport event participants from the Lowe's parking lot to the Front Royal Country Club. We would need the trolley from approximately 8AM to approximately 4PM on Saturday, August 8th. We will have parking attendant volunteers in place to direct event goers to the designated parking area to avoid a traffic issue at the country club.

Thank you for consideration of this donation. Your gift would support our efforts to raise funds and help us to save the lives of the animals we love so much.

Sincerely,

Lavenda Denney

Executive Director

Humane Society of Warren County is a 501 (c)3 nonprofit organization, Federal Tax ID #54-6044296. No goods or services were received in consideration of this gift.

4

**Meter Service Adjustment Request – 1100 N
Royal Avenue**

Town of Front Royal, Virginia
Work Session Agenda Form

Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: Meter Service Adjustment Request - 1100 North Royal Avenue

Summary: The Town has received a request from Jeff Grim whose wife is operating a retail flooring store at 1100 North Royal Avenue. As the building was previously a laundromat, the building is served by a 2" water meter with the internal piping matching the 2" size of the meter. Large meters are assessed a monthly fee to offset the additional cost that the Town incurs maintaining and replacing later meters that experience high volume use. The business owner has requested that the Town replace the current 2" meter with a 3/4" meter to relieve that owner from the monthly meter fee.

Council Discussion: Council is requested to consider authorizing the replacement of the 2" meter with a 3/4" meter.

Staff Evaluation: Town policy requires that the water meter size match the size of the waterline servicing the property. Town Council has previously authorized deviation from this policy for situations where the current use of a property no longer requires the high volume of water.

Budget/Funding: The Finance Director will be available to address fiscal issues.

Legal Evaluation: The Town Attorney will be available to address legal issues.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends that Town Council consider authorizing the installation of a 3/4" meter at 1100 North Royal Avenue until such time that the site resumes significant water consumption.

Town Manager Recommendation: The Town Manager recommends that Town Council consider authorizing the installation of a 3/4" meter at 1100 North Royal Avenue until such time that the site resumes significant water consumption.

Council Recommendation:

- Additional Work Session
 - Regular Meeting
 - No Action
- Consensus Poll on Action: ___(Aye) ___(Nay)



From: Jeff Grim <jgrim@frontroyalva.com>
Date: September 5, 2014 at 2:55:34 AM EDT
To: Jimmy Hannigan <jhannigan@frontroyalva.com>
Cc: Jeff Grim <jgrim@frontroyalva.com>
Subject: 1100 North Royal Ave

Jimmy,

My wife has rented the building at 1100 North Royal Ave. As you know this building use to be a laundry mat and most recently Black Bottom Barber. She will be using this location as a retail Flooring store. I was made aware the building still has a large tap for water usage causing the bill to be unusually HIGH. There is only a sink and a commode in this building that would require water. I would ask if there is anything that can be done to reduce the unreasonably high water bill since water will be used at a VERY minimal rate. Thanks for any assistance you could give in this matter, Jeff

5

**Sewer Backup Protection Program – 809
Happy Creek Road**

Town of Front Royal, Virginia
Work Session Agenda Form

Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: Sewer Backup Protection Program - 809 Happy Creek Road

Summary: The Town has received an application from the property owner of 809 Happy Creek Road seeking assistance towards the installation of a sewer back flow prevention device through the Residential Sewer Backup Protection Program. The residence at 809 Happy Creek Road meets all requirements for participation in the Program.

Council Discussion: Council is requested to consider the application for the Program.

Staff Evaluation: The application meets all requirements for participation in the program. The estimate for installation is \$2,500, which would result in the maximum award amount of \$750.00.

Budget/Funding: The Finance Director will be available to address fiscal issues.

Legal Evaluation: The Town Attorney will be available to address legal issues.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends that Town Council consider approval of the application as presented to participate in the Residential Sewer Backup Protection Program.

Town Manager Recommendation: The Town Manager recommends that Town Council consider approval of the application as presented to participate in the Residential Sewer Backup Protection Program.

Council Recommendation:

- Additional Work Session
 - Regular Meeting
 - No Action
- Consensus Poll on Action: ____ (Aye) ____ (Nay)





TOWN OF FRONT ROYAL
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
P.O. BOX 1560
FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA 22630-1560
(540) 636-6338 (540) 636-2890 (Fax)

Application for
RESIDENTIAL SEWER BACKUP
PROTECTION PROGRAM

If your home has experienced three or more documented sanitary sewer backups during severe weather events, the following procedures should be followed to request consideration for a grant from the Town to assist with the installation of a backwater valve. The grant shall be 50% of the installation cost up to a maximum of \$750.00

(PLEASE PRINT, ALL LINES MUST BE COMPLETED)

PROPERTY OWNER: William Kinsey
PROPERTY ADDRESS: 809 Happy Creek Rd
MAILING ADDRESS: 39 Skyview Lane
CITY: Front Royal Va 22630
PHONE NUMBER: 540 636 2201 OR 540 671 6770

Eligibility Requirements:

1. Property must be located within the Town limits;
2. Be served by the Town's Municipal Sanitary Sewer System; and
3. Have been subject to three sanitary sewer backup events documented by the Town.

Required Information:

1. A copy of the registered deed, transfer of land, or tax bill confirming ownership;
2. Confirmation from the Finance Department that no outstanding taxes or liens are associated with the property;
3. Copies of three documented sewer backups attributed to weather related events; and
4. Copy of plumber's estimate and proposed backwater valve assembly (Conforms to ASTM A112.14.1)

Applicant's Acknowledgment Statement:

I hereby attest that the attached documents are true copies of the original documents. I further attest that by my signature below, I acknowledge that the installation of the protective plumbing associated with this grant from the Town is not an admission by the Town of liability. I further attest and agree that the Town shall not be held responsible for the failure of the protective plumbing for any reason whatsoever, including but not limited to:

1. Inadequate or improper maintenance by the property owner;
2. Any modification by the current or future property owners;
3. Non-disclosure of maintenance requirements to future property owners; or
4. Equipment Failure

William Lee Kinsey
Property Owner's Signature

3-24-15
Date

Chapter 134 SEWERS AND WATER.

Section 134-24 RESIDENTIAL SEWER BACKUP PROTECTION PROGRAM

A. Each Fiscal Year, subject to annual appropriation, the Town Council may, within its sole discretion, identify and appropriate funds within the Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund of its annual Budget, in a total amount of its sole selection, to provide individual grants not to exceed \$750.00, each, to individual residential sewer customers for the sole and express purpose of providing partial funding for the installation of protective plumbing devices in the private sewer line of each such residence by private contractors of the customer's selection. The sole purpose of such devices shall be to provide full or partial protection from an accidental backflow of untreated sewage into the residence of such customer. When the funds so appropriated in the aforesaid annual Budget have been exhausted, this program shall be terminated absolutely unless and until further funding is expressly approved by vote of the said Council, whether within the same Fiscal Year or in a succeeding Fiscal Year.

B. The Town Manager shall be solely responsible for the administration of the aforesaid grant program, and he shall prepare and submit Regulations to the Council as to how the program shall be operated. Unless and until such Regulations have been expressly approved by vote of the council, the program, itself, shall not exist. At a minimum, said Regulations shall provide that the program shall be operated purely on a first-come first-served basis without bias or favoritism of any kind, that written applications by each and every residential customer shall be required in each case on a form and with such additional information as the said Regulations shall require, and that the said Council shall be the sole approving authority for the award of each said grant by majority vote. Applications which do not comply with the approved Regulations shall be rejected by the Town Manager and shall not be considered by the Council.

C. The Town shall make no payment to any approved grant application under this program, regardless of the approval of the grant by Council, unless and until the work to install the device has been completed after the applicant has obtained all necessary permits and completed all required inspections of the work, to specifically include testing of the device where required, and the applicant has submitted final accounts to the Town Manager for the cost of the work which he has approved.

(Ord. No. 2-11 Added Entire Section (A-C) 1-24-11-Effective Upon Passage)

RESIDENTIAL SEWER BACKUP PROTECTION PROGRAM PROGRAM REGULATIONS

The Town of Front Royal recognizes that the sanitary sewer system may experience period of overcapacity during severe weather events. During these periods, our residential customers may experience sewage backing up into their residences. The Town's Inflow & Infiltration Abatement Program attempts to locate and repair locations where extraneous water enters the sanitary sewer system. Until such time that this Program resolves this problem, the Town shall implement a relief program to those residents that experience a minimum of three documented sewer backups due only and specifically to severe weather events.

- A. Eligibility – The provisions of the Section apply only to those properties meeting all of the following conditions:
 - 1. residential units within the Town of Front Royal;
 - 2. properties served by the Town Municipal Sanitary Sewer System; and
 - 3. properties with a minimum of three sanitary sewer backup events that are documented by the Town of Front Royal.

- B. Application – The owner of an eligible property as described above may apply to the Town for a grant to pay for a portion of the cost of the installation of protective plumbing to help reduce the potential risk of flooding from sanitary sewer backup, by filing with the Town Manager an application which contains the following:
 - 1. a copy of the registered deed or transfer of land or tax bill confirming the applicant as the registered owner of the property;
 - 2. confirmation that there are no outstanding taxes or liens in respect of the property for which the application is made;
 - 3. copies of at least three documented sewer backups attributed to weather related events;
 - 4. a copy of the proposed backwater valve assembly; and
 - 5. a completed application and acknowledgement form in the prescribed form.

- C. Amount of Grant – The amount of a grant approved under the Section shall be:
 - 1. the lesser of 50% of the cost of the work; or
 - 2. \$750.00.

- D. Priority – Grant allocations shall be considered by the Town Council on a first come, first served basis to a limit no to exceed the annual budget allocation for any given calendar year.

- E. Delayed Applications – An applicant who does not receive a grant in any year because of insufficient funds in the current program will be notified and advised to resubmit the application in the following year by the Town Manager.

- F. Review & Approval – The Town Manager, or the authorized representative, will review the grant application for completeness and compliance to the prescribed requirements. The Town Council shall approve all grant awards by a majority vote.

- G. Acknowledgement – The property owner shall
 - 1. acknowledge that installation of protective plumbing is not an admission by the Town of liability; and
 - 2. agree that the Town shall not be held responsible for the failure of the protective plumbing for any reason whatsoever, including but not limited to:

- a. inadequate or improper maintenance by the property owner;
- b. any modification by the current or future property owners;
- c. non-disclosure of maintenance requirements to future property owners; or
- d. equipment failure.

H. Non-Compliance – In the event of non-compliance by the applicant with the provisions of this Section, the Town may withdraw its approval of the grant.

I. Payment – Payment of the grant by the Town shall be made only after the work is complete and only after:

- 1. the applicant has submitted final accounts for the work and the acknowledgement and agreement required by this Section; and
- 2. confirmation has been received by the Town that:
 - a. any necessary permits were obtained;
 - b. the inspection and testing of the completed works has been carried out where required; and
 - c. the work was completed in accordance with the approved proposal.

Approved by Council: 5/9/11

WARREN COUNTY, VIRGINIA
LAND RECORDS

000086 JUL 18 8

Consideration: \$130,000.00
Appraised Value: \$140,000.00 - *saw appraisal (xft)*
Assessed Value: \$173,900.00

Tax Map ID(s): 20A8-21-Q-1

Grantee Address:
38 Skyview Lane
Front Royal, VA 22630

Prepared (without title examination) By:
Sean A. Everhart, PLC
P.O. Box 1539
Stephens City, VA 22655

Return To:
MBH Settlement Group, L.C.
1516 North Shenandoah Avenue
Front Royal, VA 22630
File No. FRO0806007

Title Insurance Underwriter:
Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Company

DEED

This Deed is made this 17th day of July, 2008, by and between Francis Eugene FLETCHER JR., married, and Billy Ray FLETCHER, unmarried, Grantors, and William L. KINSEY and Elaine S. KINSEY, husband and wife, Grantees.

WITNESSETH:

That for and in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars (\$10.00), cash in hand paid, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Grantors do hereby grant and convey, with General Warranty and English Covenants of title, in fee simple, unto the Grantees, as tenants by the entirety with common law right of survivorship, all the following described real property together with improvements thereon, situate, lying and being in the Town of Front Royal, Warren County, Virginia:

Lots 1 and 2, Block Q, MARLOW SUBDIVISION, as dedicated, platted, and recorded in Plat Book 1 at Page 149 among the land records of Warren County, Virginia.


AND BEING the same property conveyed to Francis Eugene Fletcher and Katherine M. Fletcher, as joint tenants with the common law right of survivorship, from H. H. Marlow and Minnie T. Marlow by Deed dated July 17, 1969 and recorded July 18, 1969 in Deed Book 169 at Page 270 among the land records of Frederick County, Virginia. The said Francis Eugene Fletcher departed this life on or about November 3, 1987, thereby vesting Katherine M. Fletcher as the sole surviving tenant to the subject property (see List of Heirs Real Estate Affidavit recorded in Will Book 19 at Page 198 in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Warren County, Virginia). The said Katherine M. Fletcher, also known as Katherine Margaret Fletcher, departed this life intestate on or about August 6, 2006, thereby vesting title to the subject property in Francis Eugene Fletcher Jr. and Billy Ray Fletcher, her heirs at law (see List of Heirs filed in Will File 0600126 in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Warren County, Virginia).


This conveyance is made together with and subject to easements, conditions, restrictions, and rights-of-way of record, if any, contained in the instruments forming the chain of title to the property conveyed herein.

WARREN COUNTY, VIRGINIA
LAND RECORDS

000087 JUL 18 2008

WITNESS THE FOLLOWING SIGNATURE(S) AND SEAL(S):

 {SEAL}
Francis Eugene Fletcher Jr.

 {SEAL}
Billy Ray Fletcher


COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA }
COUNTY OF WARREN), to wit:

The foregoing Deed was subscribed to and acknowledged before me, a Notary Public in and for the aforesaid jurisdiction, by Francis Eugene Fletcher Jr. and Billy Ray Fletcher on this 17th day of July, 2008.


Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

Registration Number



INSTRUMENT #080004788
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
WARREN COUNTY ON
JULY 18, 2008 AT 03:07PM
\$140.00 GRANTOR TAX WAS PAID AS
REQUIRED BY SEC 58.1-802 OF THE VA. CODE
STATE: \$70.00 LOCAL: \$70.00

JENNIFER R. SIMS, CLERK
RECORDED BY: SFK





TOWN OF FRONT ROYAL

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
102 E. MAIN STREET
P.O. BOX 1560
FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA 22630-1560
www.frontroyalva.com

KIM GILKEY-BREEDEN
Director of Finance
kgilkeybreeden@frontroyalva.com

(540) 635-7799
(540) 635-2288 fax

March 24, 2015

Re: Real Estate Tax -- Map #20A821 Q 1
William L. and Elaine S. Kinsey
809 Happy Creek Rd.
Front Royal, VA 22630

To Whom It May Concern,

Real estate taxes for the aforesaid property are paid in full and up to date with The Town of Front Royal. There are no outstanding taxes due at this time.

For questions or concerns, please contact the Town of Front Royal Finance Department at (540) 635-7799.

Thank you,

Laura Scholtz
Department of Finance

Real Estate Public Inquiry

Address: 809 HAPPY CREEK RD

	Dept	Ticket#	Seq#	Account#	Due Date	Name	Map#	Balance
Details	RE2010	2915	1	12851	6/5/2010	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2010	2915	2	12851	12/5/2010	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2011	2910	1	12851	6/5/2011	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2011	2910	2	12851	12/5/2011	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2012	2903	1	12851	6/5/2012	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2012	2903	2	12851	12/5/2012	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2013	2876	1	12851	6/5/2013	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2013	2876	2	12851	12/5/2013	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2014	2874	1	12851	6/5/2014	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00
Details	RE2014	2874	2	12851	12/5/2014	KINSEY WILLIAM L & ELAINE S	20A821 Q 1	\$0.00

1

Show Description Show Map#

Total Due:

Note: If payment was received within the past 10 business days, any returned items may not be posted yet.

Previous

809 Haffay Creek Rd.

5/16/14 heavy rains

1/31/13 heavy rains

11/13/14 Rain of week before

- called


W/S Maint. dept.
on 11/13/14

Bill Kinsey

Picked up
Back flow device
in to
11/14/15



TOWN OF FRONT ROYAL
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES



WASTEWATER BACKUP RESPONSE
INVESTIGATION FORM

Date: 1-31-13 Technician J. Thomas

Time Received: 1:20 A.M. Time Arrived: 1:45 A.M.

Crew Members: Brandon P.

Address: 809 Happy Creek

Name: Shane Frankel

Phone: 540 683 1954

Weather: Sunny Light Rain Mild Rain Heavy Rain Other

Sanitary Sewer Main

Indication of Blockage: Yes Description _____ No

Additional Manhole Surcharging Additional Cleanout Surcharging

Additional Properties Impacted Addresses _____

Actions Taken: Flush Main Root Chemical Root Cut Video Inspection

Probable Cause: Debris Rags Grease Roots I&I Unknown

Clean Manhole to Manhole? Yes No Why Not? too much water pipe running full

Further Action Required? Yes No What? _____

Lateral

Indication of Blockage: Yes Description _____ No

Actions Taken: Flush Lateral Root Chemical Root Cut Video Inspection

Probable Cause: Debris Rags Grease Roots I&I Other _____

Clean to Sewer Main? Yes No Why Not? too much water

Further Action Required? Yes No What? _____

Building Damage

Impacted Area: Basement Bathroom Kitchen Other _____

Description of Damage: _____

Depth of Water: _____ Estimated Area (SF) Flooded: _____

How long has/did the backup occur: _____

Previous Backup Problems: _____

Dates of Previous Problems: _____

Did you provide property owner with Wastewater Backup Information Letter? Yes No



TOWN OF FRONT ROYAL
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES



WASTEWATER BACKUP RESPONSE
INVESTIGATION FORM

Date: 5-16-14 Technician Chris Teitel

Time Received: _____ Time Arrived: _____

Crew Members: Matt S

Address: 809 Happy Creek Rd

Name: Julie Hirschberg

Phone: (H) 540-622-2259 (C) 540 551 2554

Weather: Sunny Light Rain Mild Rain Heavy Rain Other _____

Sanitary Sewer Main

Indication of Blockage: Yes Description Main blocked due to rain water No

Additional Manhole Surcharging Additional Cleanout Surcharging

Additional Properties Impacted Addresses _____

Actions Taken: Flush Main Root Chemical Root Cut Video Inspection

Probable Cause: Debris Rags Grease Roots I&I Unknown

Clean Manhole to Manhole? Yes No Why Not? too much rain water

Further Action Required? Yes No What? _____

Lateral

Indication of Blockage: Yes Description _____ No

Actions Taken: Flush Lateral Root Chemical Root Cut Video Inspection

Probable Cause: Debris Rags Grease Roots I&I Other _____

Clean to Sewer Main? Yes No Why Not? _____

Further Action Required? Yes No What? _____

Building Damage

Impacted Area: Basement Bathroom Kitchen Other _____

Description of Damage: water in basement

Depth of Water: 1ft Estimated Area (SF) Flooded: _____

How long has/did the backup occur: _____

Previous Backup Problems: _____

Dates of Previous Problems: _____

Did you provide property owner with Wastewater Backup Information Letter? Yes No

SINCE 1946

TELEPHONE
540-635-3895

WINN PLUMBING, INC.

602 EAST SIXTH STREET

FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA 22630

TO: BILL KINSEY
FOR 809 HAPPY CK. RD.

ESTIMATE TO: BUST UP BASEMENT FLOOR & INSTALL 4" PVC
BACK-FLOW DEVICE IN MAIN SEWER LINE & 4" PVC BALL VALVE,
ALSO INSTALL 4" PVC CLEAN-OUT ON STREET SIDE OF DEVICE, &
VALVE BOX FOR ACCESSIBILITY.

APPROX. \$2500.00

6

**Continued Discussion of a Budget
Amendment for Snow Removal**



Town of Front Royal, Virginia Work Session Agenda Form

Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: Continued Discussion of a Budget Amendment for Snow Removal

Summary: Council began the discussion of a budget amendment for snow removal costs for FY15 at their work session on March 2, 2015. Staff was asked to return to a work session when the snow events ended for the season. Below is a list of expenses:

4500-5478		
Snow Removal		
Budget FY15	75,000.00	
EXPENSES		
Mid Atlantic Salt	(149,458.95)	salt for road treatment
Clatterbuck and Son	(10,975.00)	clearing of parking lots
Univar USA	(1,117.85)	supplies for snow removal
Quality Inn	(201.15)	staff to stay in Town
	(86,752.95)	

Council Discussion: Council takes desired action

Staff Evaluation: Finance Staff are in agreement.

Budget/Funding:	BUDGET AMENDMENT		
	General fund reserves	1000-3510110	86,752.95
	Street fund	4500-5478	86,752.95

Legal Evaluation: Town Attorney will be available if any questions need to be addressed.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends a budget amendment in the amount of \$86,752.95 to cover the remainder of FY15.

Town Manager Recommendation: Town Manager will be available if any questions arise.

Council Recommendation:

- Additional Work Session
 Regular Meeting
 No Action
 Consensus Poll on Action: ___(Aye) ___(Nay)

Work Session

7

**Ordinance Amendment to Section 158-6 for
Adoption by Reference of State Motor Vehicle
Laws**



Town of Front Royal, Virginia Work Session Agenda Form

Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 158-6 OF FRONT ROYAL TOWN CODE PERTAINING TO ADOPTION BY REFERENCE OF STATE MOTOR VEHICLE LAWS

Summary: Va. Code § 46.2-1313 states that “ordinances enacted by local authorities pursuant to this chapter may incorporate appropriate provisions of ... [the State Code pertaining to motor vehicle laws]. ... Nothing contained in this title shall require the re-adoption of ordinances heretofore validly adopted. Local authorities may adopt ordinances incorporating by reference the appropriate provisions of state law before the effective date of such state law; provided that such local ordinances do not become effective before the effective date of the state law. The provisions of this section are declaratory of existing law.”

This has several benefits to localities; it allows localities to write traffic tickets on local summons, and retain the fines generated therefrom, thus helping pay for local law enforcement, keeping localities safer; it helps localities not have to constantly amend its local code of ordinances pertaining to traffic laws to keep in conformity with minor tweaks in the State Code pertaining to traffic laws; and it helps keep local codes of ordinances shorter.

Council Discussion: Council is requested to re-adopt Town Code Section 158-6, which incorporates the State code traffic laws by reference.

Staff Evaluation: An opinion of the Attorney General, 81-82 Va. AG, 272 held “local governing bodies may adopt statutes by reference and may also adopt statutory amendments by reference, provided the amendments to them are adopted subsequent to the statutory amendments.” This means that annually, the Town must readopt Section 158-6 of the Town Code, which legally allows the Town to incorporate all the changes to the State Code traffic laws that have been made during the year.

Budget/Funding: No budget impact.

Legal Evaluation: The Town Attorney will be available to answer additional questions.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends re-adoption of Town code Section 158-6.

Town Manager Recommendation: The Town Manager concurs with staff recommendation.

Council Recommendation:

Additional Work Session Regular Meeting No Action
Consensus Poll on Action: ___ (Aye) ___ (Nay)

Work Session

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION
158-6 OF THE FRONT ROYAL TOWN CODE
PERTAINING TO ADOPTION BY REFERENCE
OF THE STATE MOTOR VEHICULAR LAWS**

BE IT ENACTED by the Town Council of the Town of Front Royal, Virginia, that Section 158-6 of the Front Royal Town Code is hereby amended and enacted as follows:

Pursuant to the authority of Section 46.2-1313, Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, all of the provisions and requirements of the laws of the State as of July 1, 2015, contained in Title 46.2, Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, and Article 2 of Chapter 7 of Title 18.2, Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, except those provisions and requirements the violation of which constitutes a felony and except those provisions and requirements which, by their very nature, can have no application to or within the Town, are adopted and incorporated by reference and made applicable within the Town. References to "highways of the state" contained in such provisions and requirements hereby adopted shall be deemed to refer to the highways and other public ways within the Town. Such provisions and requirements are hereby adopted, mutatis mutandis, and made part of this chapter as fully as those set forth at length herein; and it shall be unlawful for any person within the Town to violate or fail, neglect or refuse to comply with any provision of Title 46.2, Code of Virginia, and Article 2 of Chapter 7 of Title 18.2, Code of Virginia, which is adopted by this section, provided that in no event shall the penalty imposed for the violation of any provision or requirement adopted exceed the penalty imposed for a similar offense under Title 46.2, Code of Virginia, and Article 2 of Chapter 7 of Title 18.2, Code of Virginia.

For purposes of § 4-4 (E) of the Town Code, this Ordinance is deemed routine, and is effective on **July 1, 2015**.

APPROVED:

Timothy W. Darr, Mayor

ATTEST:

Jennifer E. Berry, Clerk of Council

THIS ORDINANCE was approved at the Regular Meeting of the Town of Front Royal, Virginia on its second reading, conducted _____ 2015, upon the following recorded vote:

John P. Connolly	Yes/No	Bret W. Hrbek	Yes/No
Hollis L. Tharpe	Yes/No	Eugene R. Tewalt	Yes/No
Bébhinn C. Egger	Yes/No	Daryl L. Funk	Yes/No

A public hearing on the above was held on _____, 2015 having been advertised in the Northern Virginia Daily on _____, 2015 and _____, 2015. The Ordinance was enacted at the Regular Meeting of the Town Council held _____ 2015.

Approved as to form and legality: _____

Douglas W. Napier, Town Attorney

Date: ____/____/____

8

**Liaison Committee Items for May 21, 2015
Meeting**



Town of Front Royal, Virginia Work Session Agenda Form

Date: May 4, 2015

Agenda Item: Liaison Committee Items for May 21, 2015 Meeting

Summary: Council is requested to add items to the Liaison Committee Meeting Agenda scheduled for May 21, 2015. Items will be voted on at the regularly scheduled meeting on May 11, 2015. The agenda from the March Liaison Committee meeting is attached.

Council Discussion: Council takes desired action

Staff Evaluation: None

Budget/Funding: None

Legal Evaluation: Town Attorney will be available for questions or concerns

Staff Recommendations: None

Town Manager Recommendation:

Council Recommendation:

Additional Work Session Regular Meeting No Action

Consensus Poll on Action: ___(Aye) ___(Nay)

Work Session



AGENDA
TOWN/COUNTY LIAISON
COMMITTEE MEETING
Town Administration Building
102 E. Main Street



Thursday, March 19, 2015
6:00 p.m.

1. Call Order to Order, Timothy Darr, Mayor of Front Royal

1. Leach Run Parkway Project
2. WasteWater Treatment Plant/Septage Receiving Facility
3. Building Inspections Software
4. Residential Parking & Mail Boxes on 13th Street
5. Update from the Development Review Committee
6. McKay Property Update
7. Catlett Mountain Landfill Recreational Use
8. Updates on Warren County's In-Town Projects
9. Avtex Property – Main Street Extension

2. Adjournment

9

Council Discussion/Goals

10

Closed Meeting