

| #  | CATEGORY            | QUESTION/COMMENT  | RESPONSES/NOTES  |
|----|---------------------|---|--|
| 1  | Land Acquisition    | What is the cost of an undeveloped acre of land in Arlington? Task Force member recalls Dept. of Parks & Rec provided this information as part of an earlier process.   | Reponse pending  |
| 2  | Communications      | How did we notify affected neighbors (of this process)? Certified mail?   | Staff worked closely with the 4 adjacent civic associations along with key stakeholders. County website - A project page was created to provide updates and a calendar of events/meetings open to the public. Listserv - residents can sign up for project updates from the task force and previous subscribers from the Salt Tank Interim structure project will also receive updates on the master planning process. |
| 3  | Open Space/Parks    | How big is Oak Grove Park (near W-L?) I ask because the layout there offers a great deal in terms of playspace, a walking trail, and a practice field, with plenty of unprogrammed open space and vegetation. Other parks might offer similar examples of how these multiple desired amenities have been achieved on similarly-sized parcels.                     | The park is approximately 3.4 acres and the playground is approx. 4,000 square feet, the shade structure with seating is approx. 350 square feet, and the practice field is approx. 34,000 square feet.  |
| 4  | Master Planning     | Can we get excerpts, or an online version with hotlinks, to the relevant planning documents that will guide our thoughts on this site?  | Yes. Staff will prepare a list of documents and post on the task force website.  |
| 5  | Facility Operations | Can we ask DES staff to walk us through everything on the site now? I wonder if some of the extraneous stuff others think is being stored on site is actually part of operations? Perhaps the gravel is for the trucks?   | Yes. This will be part of Meeting #2 content.  |
| 6  | Open Space/Parks    | If other partners, outside County agencies, are working with us, is it reasonable or feasible to expect partnering on expenses? For example, for a field?   | Yes. This is reasonable and feasible. There are examples at Long Bridge and Barcoft (See detailed examples as part of the comprehensive response).   |
| 7  | Facility Operations | Could the temporary facility be used elsewhere in the County, for something else, in 5 years? For example, could it be disassembled and relocated to house the salt in the southern part of the County?   | It is feasible but may not be cost effective. Factors to consider are capacity needs, site conditions of new site, timing of reuse, and storage logistics of structure.  |
| 8  | Facility Operations | Can we hear more about perimeter barrier options? And thinking big – not just what the County has done, or tried on site, but perhaps what’s been done in other jurisdictions to mitigate sound or light?   | Yes. Will be discussed in later meetings.  |
| 9  | Facility Operations | Given the issue raised by (I think) Pamela about the poor soil conditions adjacent to the site, can we ask a representative from Virginia Cooperative Extension (perhaps the area agent, Kirsten Buhls) to undertake a soil sampling test and make some recommendations? She is a local expert who is, since she has not been involved to date, rather objective. | Environmental testing will be conducted in the project planning and feasibility stage.   |
| 10 | Open Space/Parks    | And similarly, can we explore working with the County’s native plant nursery and our volunteers in tree stewards and master naturalists for some plantings in the interim – understanding that CIP funding is likely to be at least 5 years out?  | This is possible, however, the plantings should be limited to areas identified in the Master Plan as having vegetation and will not be disturbed during the construction process.  |
| 11 | Facility Operations | Could staff confirm the location, nature, and intensity of the lighting currently on the site (associated with the Salt Dome that will be removed) as well as any changes planned to support the interim structure (currently under construction)?  | Yes. Lighting specs and layout will be provided and posted on the task force website.  |
| 12 | Facility Operations | Are there any plans to use the site (during the "interim period") for contractor or County laydown/material staging?  | Intermittent contractor staging and laydown area is a consistent need in the County to minimize construction costs and delays. Staff believes it is important to consider all appropriate County or privately owned sites – including the 26th & OD site for staging and laydown areas as needs arise. As currently configured, the site could only provide staging and laydown area during non-winter months.         |

| #  | CATEGORY              | QUESTION/COMMENT   | RESPONSES/NOTES   |
|----|-----------------------|--|---|
| 13 | Facility Operations   | How many salt trucks are expected in queuing on this site? While charge says "up to 30" community members have never observed more than 9 at any given time.   | The number of trucks queuing at any given time varies depending on severity of storm and number of trucks activated; however, at the beginning of any storm, all activated plow trucks (up to 24 at this location) could be queued waiting to be loaded. This may be a combination of vehicles on the site, on the street and/or at other nearby TBD staging locations. Throughout the remainder of the event, trucks will periodically come back to refill, and it would not be expected to see more than 5-10 trucks queuing at any given time. |
| 14 | Facility Operations   | How was the 6,000 T of salt storage capacity determined?   | The 6,000 tons matches the existing capacity on the site. We have historically been able to operate with this capacity although it is less than what other similar jurisdictions use by comparison.   |
| 15 | Communications        | Task Force members requested to hear from snow response operators on what is important to them in the support facility.  | Task Force members will have this opportunity at the Dec 1. site walk through meeting.  |
| 16 | Facility Operations   | How long is the interim facility planned to be in operation?   | The County Board established a target of five years, however, will be subject to available funding.   |
| 17 | Facility Operations   | What is the useful life of the temporary structure?  | The structure warranty covers 50 years while the fabric warranty covers 10 years.   |
| 18 | Stormwater Management | Can staff provide details on the five-year Storm Water Management (SWM) waiver for the temporary salt facility and identify what would be required to meet storm water permit requirements?  | The temporary SWM measures installed focused on conveyance of stormwater runoff to storm structure to mitigate adverse impacts of down stream properties. It does not address treatment of quality or capture.  |
| 19 | Land Acquisition      | Can staff explain in more detail how the existing lot configuration came to be? Was there additional rationale for consolidating the Old Dominion parcels in September? Can staff also elaborate on the irregular sizes of the remaining lots along 26th Street?                 | Yes. This information will be provided at the January 3rd Task Force meeting.   |
| 20 | Master Planning       | Can staff elaborate on the inconsistent application of the "public" land use as shown on the GLUP map? Why are portions of the Marymount campus still shown as "public" and why aren't St. Mary's Episcopal Church and Missionhurst properties designated with the same use?     | Yes. This information will be provided at the January 3rd Task Force meeting.   |
| 21 | Facility Operations   | Will the interim salt storage facility rely on a back-up generator? If so, can staff specify where it will be located, when it might be in use, and how loud will it be during operation?  | Yes, a generator will be provided for both the interim structure and final/master planned salt facility. The generator for the interim structure will be sized primarily for the lights required for night-time storm operations. The generator for the master planned facility is anticipated to power all functions during a power outage during storm operations. Low noise units will be selected, locations for will be provided when selected.  |
| 22 | Communications        | Can staff also confirm if any previous commitments have been made by Board members regarding potential use of this site? Is Mary Hynes' reference to a 1-acre park the only instance?  | Staff will research further and has asked Task Force members to check their Civic Association records as well.  |
| 23 | Facility Operations   | Can staff confirm if the interim storage facility could become permanent? Is the soil and structural foundation designed in a way that could accommodate something long-term?  | The interim storage facility could be come permanent, but would require additional stormwater management facilities.  |
| 24 | Facility Operations   | Can staff commit to providing a porta-potty on-site in time for this winter's operations? Residents have observed truck operators urinating in the public in/around the site in the past and believe providing such an amenity is absolutely necessary during the interim phase. | Yes, temporary restroom facilities will be provided during winter operations.   |
| 25 | Land Acquisition      | How should the Task Force address the possibility of the adjacent single-family property becoming available through future potential land acquisition?   | The Task Force should first focus their recommendations on accommodating all uses within County-owned properties. Additional scenarios could be developed that refer to the potential availability of the adjacent residential parcel, where the Task Force can recommend what/if any uses may be appropriate.  |

| #  | CATEGORY            | QUESTION/COMMENT  | RESPONSES/NOTES  |
|----|---------------------|---|--|
| 26 | Facility Operations | I'd like some additional information about the "Debris Management Plan" that was mentioned in the County's presentation. What does it mean that the leaf storage site is a "temporary debris staging area"? Can debris other than leaves be stored there? Is this a change from how the area has been used in the past? | Debris in this context can be anything that is generated from an emergency event. For Arlington, this historically equates to limbs and other woody brush debris, but it can be anything that overloads our residential solid waste collection system and needs to be temporarily staged. The new Debris Management Plan is an update to an existing plan and the parameters of the 26th St Leaf Storage site has not changed with the updated plan. |
| 27 | Facility Operations | What is the salt capacity in the new temporary structure and what color is the canopy for it?   | 6,000 tons, green  |
| 28 | Facility Operations | What is the current lighting at both the salt dome and leaf mulch sites?  | There are no lights on the leaf & mulch site. See below for salt site.   |
| 29 | Facility Operations | What will the new lighting be at the temporary salt facility?   | Wood pole mounted LED down lighting and interior lights  |
| 30 | Communications      | Will minutes of our meetings be posted on the web site, and if so, when?  | Minutes will be posted one week from the date of the meeting.  |
| 31 | Communications      | Will people who have signed up for notifications on the web site be notified when any new information is posted there?  | Yes, we will be transitioning the current listserv about the interim salt tank project to the master planning effort. Approximately 200 people have signed up to this listserv. We will send notices about meetings and send notifications when new information is posted  |

| # |          | WATER QUALITY REQUIREMENTS   |
|---|----------|--|
| 1 | Question | As part of the interim salt structure installation, the County is installing a storm water management system to control runoff, which will rout through a ‘catch basin’ and then to the storm sewer catch basin near 25 <sup>th</sup> St N and Old Dominion. Should this stormwater management installation be in service beyond the five year waiver period that was granted by DES, or even become become the long term salt storage solution on this site, what other features will be needed to comply with our watershed permits?   |
|   | Answer   | The phosphorus removal requirement (water quality requirement) was exempted for the temporary salt facility, the stormwater features that proposed for the temporary salt structure was to mitigate the impact of the runoff volume generated by the new structure. Depends on the future master development plan for the site, some of the newly installed SWM system, including the trenches, berm/swale, storm sewer pipes/structure, could be part of the long term SWM <b>quantity</b> control facility, but are most likely do not qualify as stormwater <b>quality</b> facility since the tested infiltration rate for the site was below the design requirement of infiltration trench. The type and amount of new SWM features are largely depends on the proposed layout, and the impervious increase. |

| #  |          | RESOURCE PROTECTION AREA  |
|--|----------|---|
| 2  | Question | A small portion of the 26th/Old Dominion site is located within the RPA. Task Force members requested additional information on restrictions and limitations when building in/around an RPA.  |
|  | Answer   | In summary, yes, under certain conditions you can build within the RPA.   |
|  |          | At this specific site, building in the RPA would require a formal exception from CBORC . The Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance includes a grandfathering provision, so structures that are currently in the RPA can remain. Existing structures in the RPA can also be replaced through redevelopment as long as impervious cover and encroachment in the RPA does not increase. Redevelopment proposals to replace an existing structure in the RPA that result in an increase in impervious cover in the RPA and/or an increase in encroachment (i.e. a decrease in the distance between the structure and the stream) may also be permitted, but an exception is required. |
| For the parcels at 26th and Old Dominion, no structures are located in the RPA in the existing condition; any proposed RPA impacts would be new impacts. No grandfathering provisions apply. Any redevelopment proposal for these parcels with RPA impacts would require an exception granted by the Chesapeake Bay Ordinance Review Committee (CBORC). There are multiple criteria that have to be met for an exception to be granted by the Committee – one of those is that the need for the exception is not self-imposed. In other words, if there are other feasible development footprints that avoid RPA impacts, it could be difficult to obtain the exception. |          |   |

| # |          | PARTNERING WITH NON-COUNTY AGENCIES FOR PARKS   |
|---|----------|---|
| 3 | Question | If other partners, outside County agencies, are working with us, is it reasonable or feasible to expect partnering on expenses? For example, for a field?   |
|   | Answer   | Yes, the County has partnered with outside agencies on recreational facility improvements. For example, the George Washington University invested \$5 million dollars in the Barcroft Park Field #6 (Tucker Field). In return they receive 600 hours of yearly use for their Division I Baseball practices and games. The County Board approved the agreement in 2011 for a duration of 20 years. Arlington County and George Washington split the maintenance costs based on field usage. Another partnership example is Marymount University, the County Board approved an agreement in 2009 that is valid for 15 years. Marymount made an initial investment of \$1 million dollars in Long Bridge Park Field #1 and subsequent yearly payments for 240 hours of use of the field for its Division III practices and games for Men’s and Women’s Soccer, and Men’s and Women’s Lacrosse. |