

## **26<sup>th</sup> Street & Old Dominion Drive Master Planning Task Force Meeting #2 Summary**

December 6, 2018, 7-9:30pm

Marymount University, Rowley 107

### **Task Force members in attendance:**

Mike Hogan, Michael Canwell, Anne Wilson, David Palmer, Al Diaz, Susan Cunningham, Kathleen Mc Sweeny, Elizabeth Gearin, Margarita Brose, David Howell, Sarah Messvery, Kit Norland and Alisa Cowan

### **Staff attendees:**

June Locker, Lisa Wilson, Matt Mattauszek, Michelle Congdon, George May, Bethany Heim, Greg Emanuel, and Mike Collins

### **1. Chair updates and opening remarks**

- a) Public comment – 16 public speakers are welcome to make a statement later in the meeting
- b) Review of Task Force schedule
- c) Chair's Updates:
  - i. Noah met with Missionhurst, who appreciate the invitation but prefer not to get involved in the planning process, nor have any interest in leasing/selling their property
  - ii. Upcoming meeting on 12/20 will include:
    - 1) JFAC presentation on compatible uses for the 26/OD site, many of which represent interim needs for the County and APS.
    - 2) Guiding principles
  - iii. Project website includes meeting materials, FAQ, and additional resources
  - iv. Staff will post a recent document prepared by the Donaldson Community for this site
  - v. Cox Graae & Spack Architects were introduced as consultants for this Task Force
- d) Referencing 2015 comments from County Board Chair Mary Hines, Noah reminded the group of an earlier commitment for a 1-acre park on this site
- e) Request made to staff to notify the Task Force if/when new material was posted online
- f) Question: When is the demo of the old salt dome happening. Answer: Staff will provide an update once this information becomes available (and before any demolition work begins)

### **2. County Presentation 1: Operational Requirements**

- a) Mike Collins – County's operational objectives for this site
- b) Shani Kruljac– overview of current leaf storage & mulch operations
- c) Mike Collins – overview of current salt operations
- d) Michelle Congdon – overview of long-term DES program needs for this site
- e) Questions:
  - What is the required area for the Brine operations? Answer: 500 SF plus circulation and loading area; brine trucks are dedicated and the same size as the salt trucks

- How can we wrap our heads around the sizes of the elements? Answer: Task Force will be doing an exercise which will have scaled models of the elements. Staff clarified the shape/height of the salt tank dictates the amount of salt storage it can accommodate.
- Does the 30-40% reservation for site circulation and buffers only apply to the salt operations? Do the leaf/mulch operations not need as much additional circulation? Answer: Staff explained potential for shared circulation between the facilities based on final location and expressed a preference for operations to be located with street frontage where site access utilizes less space.
- Where do drivers park POVs now? Answer: Staff confirmed they don't mobilize out of the northside (drivers park at Trades); Following a 12-hour shift, they leave.
- Will the north side location duplicate the snow center at Trades? Answer: Staff indicated the northside would just represent a satellite center for snow ops (at a much smaller scale).
- Will you be moving the dispatch to the north as well? Answer: Staff confirmed the dispatch would not be split and remain at Trades.
- Can you give us an example of a "major mobilization" occurrence? How many such activations took place (# of days)? Answer: Staff will prepare a historical summary of activations and days of operations.
- The figures for leaf storage (16 leaf collections and 25 trucks) – do they represent the overall County? Answer: Staff confirmed these figures only represent the north side of the County.
- What is the life span of interim salt structure? Answer: This is already on the FAQ.
- Will the administration office only be used during the snow ops? Answer: Admin office is anticipated to also be used by other department like police; breakroom area could also be used for training or community uses
- Has a tree study been done? Will it include trees that have been taken down as part of the interim salt structure construction? An accurate tree inventory will prove very useful for any environmental protection plans for this site. Answer: Staff will work with consultants.
- Can we elaborate on the staff area (how many people)? Answer: Staff confirmed the space would include 1 office with 4 people; briefings and training would occur in the same space.
- What is the minimum amount of parking for all the trucks? Answer: 24 truck spaces plus 10-12 additional spaces for the drivers (if off-site, should be within walking distance and not rely on shuttle service)
- Can the County simply move forward with existing conditions un-changed? Answer: Expanded operations are needed to improve service in the northern half of the County.
- Shared parking does not always work. It would be helpful to know concerns with potential partners located nearby and apply any lessons learned.
- How do you use a VBox? Answer: Currently with a stand.
- Does the County have a use permit for the leaf site? Answer: Yes
- Please consider all beneficial uses for this site. Look ahead 50 years, and consider the engineering and functional aspects of the site? What is the trend for these operations and how may they be impacted by autonomous vehicles? How could that inform our master planning process? How do other jurisdictions handle their leaf operations? Answer: Thus far, staff has observed a shift to relying on brine (and less on salt), however, there have been no further developments in the combination of chemicals used to treat roads.

### 3. County Presentation 2: Public Space Considerations

a. Bethany Heim - Trail/Trail Head and Public Spaces Master Plan Overview

b. Questions:

- What is level of services? Answer: There is no national uniform level of service standards for parks or recreational amenities across the country. However, there are generally 2 types of standards that communities use to analyze service: population-based standards and access standards. The final draft of the Public Spaces Master Plan (PSMP) defines both.
- What are the level of service maps? Answer: The maps in the PSMP show areas that range which amenities are most needed (limited access is shaded in red with adequate need in shown in white). The maps are based on accessing park amenities using multiple travel networks (road, sidewalks, trails and transit) and 2035 population projections at the Census block level that are expected to gain population greater than the County-wide average.
- Pickle Ball dimensions? Answer: 44 feet by 20 feet and each court would require 3 parking spaces.
- Requirements page – parking requirements for various playgrounds...uses? Impacts of parking on the neighborhood or analysis is being explored? Answer: Exploring park specific parking requirements is not currently on the County's Work Plan.
- Which is considered by County as more important: pickle ball or three uses identified earlier for this area? Answer: The slide with multiple park uses listed refers to park amenities associated with LOS and the 2016 statistically valid survey. The slide that mentions pickleball is a supplement list that identifies other park amenities that DPR is getting a lot of feedback on during the final draft PSMP review process and may be of interest to the Task Force to explore.

### 4. Marymount University Presentation:

a) Questions:

- Where is the leaf storage in Marymount's concept (not shown on the rendering)? Answer: Mulch and leaves operations would be combined together in the southeast corner.
- What is the required square footage of the field? Answer: NCAA competition standards require a minimum size of 115x70 yards for Division III.
- Which sports would utilize the field? Answer: LaCrosse, soccer, and 2 youth sized fields.
- What are your current athletic needs? How will it be financed? What type of turf? Answer: Shuttling athletes to Long Bridge Park is challenging and inefficient (up to 75 students are shuttled daily). Marymount would anticipate a turf field that could be used by multiple sports (competition and practice). Bathroom facilities would be available to County staff.
- Would a field this close to a street need to be fenced?
- Have you considered the topography of the site? Leveling, placement of locker rooms, etc. What are the terms of the Long Bridge agreement with the County? Would Marymount be open to other field types/sizes/amenities beyond the field illustrated in their presentation? Answer: Marymount has only presented a preliminary concept to suggest how a rectangular field would fit within the study area. Many of these elements have not yet been considered.
- Does the field need to be outside or can it be an indoor field?

- What is the space around the actual field and would additional zones be required for access and circulation (outside the area mentioned earlier)?
- If County leagues and teams wanted to use the facility, where would they park? Answer: Marymount can accommodate the parking within their garages across 26<sup>th</sup> Street N.
- Do you have an overlay of the park on the existing site?
- Parking study would be helpful in determining how much parking is open at any given time and season around the site. Does Marymount’s Master Plan (completed in 2010 with update) identify the parking structure’s useful life for both facilities on Marymount property? Answer: 20-year “use and capital expenses” have been invested recently to upgrade the facility.
- If the rectangular field is not feasible, would Marymount have a fallback for other uses such as tennis courts? Answer: Rectangular field is their biggest need at this point, but Marymount could be open to other things.
- Can you utilize nearby APS school fields during school hours instead? Has Marymount engaged other local schools besides APS? Answer: No (likely result in scheduling conflicts).
- Does Marymount have an agreement with Bishop O’Connell? Answer: Marymount has outgrown that space and uses Barcroft sometimes along with the Nats Youth Academy facility in DC (Quincy site fields are no longer used).

#### 5. Public Comment:

- Staff was asked if the circulation was included in the 3.3 acres? Answer: Yes
- Several residents expressed concerns about the negative effects a field on this site would have on the area’s traffic. Current conditions are already problematic, and the roads are not likely to widen. Traffic seems to be worst during the peak AM and PM rush hours.
- Comment: Industrial uses should not all be located at this site. What has these facilities done to traffic flow? What about Buck? No impacts at Buck, why us? Not suitable site for all activity in the charge. Very inappropriate for the neighborhood and traffic flow.
- The County’s augmentation of the facilities on the site sound like “Mission Creep”
- Not a County need it is a want for the County. We shouldn’t be advocating for this use on the site. Park is what’s necessary to serve the Community.
- Why are we not providing “beet juice” (brine), we are providing brine, concerned about lighting associated with the fields and impact to the houses close by.
- Some residents questioned elements of the Task Force’s charge which call for an expansion of County operations on this site (asking if they are absolutely necessary or just “nice to have”). Some also asked if the improved services were dependent on this site? Answer: Staff indicated additional supporting material will be presented at a future task force meeting (in addition to the heat maps demonstrating the volume and origin of complaints during a snow emergency).
- Is Marymount’s field location within the study area a done deal? Answer: No. Marymount was not included in the charge but they were invited to present out of courtesy.
- How much is all this going to cost as a taxpayer? How do we benefit?
- Can we manage parking so that parking is not such an impact to the site? Can the shift change facility be optimized to require less parking by alternating the movement of the staff? Could on-site parking be minimized by identifying other sites for potential partnering.
- Some residents expressed concern about a turf field and its impacts on the Donaldson Run trail

- Cost and time incurred for the shift change – would it be better spent by getting more trucks? Are there any available traffic studies for the adjacent roads? Could the community get something out of Marymount in exchange for siting the rectangular field on County land?
- What are the must-haves vs. the nice to haves? Has DES looked at alternate service metrics beyond complaints? If this expansion of operations is not realized on this site, what would be the overall impact to the task force process? This question of a “return on investment” is important to consider since the operations on this site are based on a need that may only arise a few times each year.