

26th Street & Old Dominion Drive Master Planning Task Force

Meeting #1 Summary

November 1, 2018, 7:00pm – 9:00pm

Marymount University, Rowley 107

Task force members Attendees:

Margarita Brose; Kit Norland; Mike Hogan, Anne Wilson, Alisa Cowan, Elizabeth Gearin, Sarah Messvery, David Palmer, Kathleen Mc Sweeny, Michael Canwell, Rob Topp, Susan Cunningham

Staff Attendees:

June Locker, Lisa, Matt, Michelle Congdon, Jessica, George May, Bethany, Zach, and Kris Krider

1. Welcome and Introductions by Noah Simon
 - a) The ask – “Think of this a challenge not a problem”
 - b) Noah Simon met with each member of the task force prior to first meeting and public; review the agenda
 - c) Discussed issue with parking for the meeting, started late because of lack of parking
 - d) Introduction of each member
 - e) Reviewed time line and website information
 - f) Process for posting materials on the website
 - g) Reviewed the charge
 - i) Option to fill the remaining ‘at large member’ spot
 - ii) Other potential uses – intentionally left vague
 - iii) Deliverables of task force – recommendation of options, master plan, and report to the Board
 - iv) Include Capital cost planning
 - v) Product will be the basis for other processes
 - h) Questions:
 - i) Q/ Mike Hogan – Do we need to provide alternates? A/ Noah – no
 - ii) Q/ Susan – Does the \$2.4M CIP budget include cost for the temporary structure and how much is the temp. structure? A/June – yes includes temp. Cost of temp \$1.5M
2. Arlington County Presentation on Site – by Matt Mattesuak
 - a) Relationship of the site to surroundings
 - b) Existing conditions
 - i. Zoning, parcel information (how did the property lot sizes come about and why are they irregular sizes – more information at the January meeting on the history of the site), SF
 - ii. RPA
 - iii. Topography
 - c) Existing Zoning Districts
 - i. Regulations
 - d) General Land Use Plan (GLUP)
 - i. What is the difference of semi-public and public?
 - ii. Lee Station Reservoir - what is on the site? Water reservoir tanks on site and cell phone tower
 - e) Transportation Plan (MTP)
 - f) Adopted Policies
 - g) Previous Community Input

- h) Questions: Commitment from Noah to turn around comments in a week at most by the next meeting.
 - a) Lighting on site – What is existing and what will be added with the temp structure? What is the impact of the lighting on the neighborhood and graphics of the night vision on the structure? Modeling asked for how the temp lighting will be and recommended new lighting from the group.
 - b) Is the salt dome only used during the winter?
 - (1) No, use but to reload the salt – daytime operation
 - (2) Will there be a generator?
 - Loud and noisy and bad for the environment
 - c) Laydown space – is it part of the program?
 - d) Current conditions of the RPA and what that means was requested? Who is talking about the RPA?
 - e) Re-cap of the last 60 years of history that we are not aware of? Other commitments made
 - f) Sunshine laws – more than two people can't talk about the project, FOIA doesn't apply, 3 days of advanced notice for the meeting and subcommittee members

3. Erik talking points

- a) Bring your own perspective and larger view overall
- b) Work together and collectively win for everyone
- c) What is the budget and if we removed money from the CIP to build the temporary what is left?
- d) Proper planning for the CIP to increase funding as necessary to develop the site
- e) Task force not to focus on budget – but be reasonable
- f) Other potential uses of the site? Creative thought process to propose options, efficiency, shared amenities...
- g) Realization of what land we have and what uses go in each
- h) Recap of JFAC Needs Assessment on the horizon to create great space for immediate needs that can grow into future uses
- i) Questions:
 - (1) How constrained are we to the charge and queuing 30 vehicles? Should that be literal? Answer: Board adopted that charge and you should follow but can ask questions and part of the charge to understand the charge. Good justification why the Board would take this recommendation over the staff. Placeholder you need to evaluate “Up to” leeway for analysis
 - (2) Will there be someone here to talk about the actual operations of the salt truck loading, waiting, ... What is important to the truck drivers? Answer: Yes, there will be someone present to answer any operational questions
 - (3) Take into account Public Spaces Master Plan (POPS Plan) – Take it into consideration and acquiring property – stay with public owned parcels and not into the realm of other properties that we may want? Two scenarios – one for current owned properties and one expanding the site
 - (4) Interim facility is based off of a 5-year replacement for a 5-year limit with storm water management exception approval. Manufacture up to 20 years. What is the environmental exception was made on the temp facility?
 - (5) What will happen to the recommendation as the report is complete?

- Board will make an adoption of the master plan and it will go through the CIP process for funding every two years (over a series of many years).
- Cannot commit to what the implementation term will be and what the financial status of the County will be
- Interim conditions till the site can be built out?

4. Public Comment:

- a) Have we considered that the temp structure stays since we already spent the money on it and it will feasibly last?
- b) Encouraged by content and direction from staff and members
- c) Deliveries are sometimes at night during emergencies and it is disturbing but we know it is necessary and was there when we bought our houses. Lighting points in the houses and that boarder is not planted with a screen. Has the soil been tested since nothing grows there and leaks and leaches for decades?
- d) Can the salt structure serve another purpose moving forward? Or be a long-term solution?
- e) Will there be a porta-potty on the site this winter? People are urinating everywhere and it is not humane.