

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
1	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	WAS A STRUCTURAL GRID CONSIDERED FOR THE CONCEPTUAL DIAGRAMS THAT REQUIRE A DECK FOR PARKS OR FIELDS? COLUMN PLACEMENT FOR SHORT OR LONG SPAN STRUCTURE WILL IMPACT THE DIAGRAM AND CIRCULATION AREAS.	No specific structural engineering was made for any of the concept options. We know that the column spacing will need to accommodate the large turning movements of vehicular circulation and have assumed, for now, that a post-tensioned structural slab will be needed to account for a large column spacing.
2	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	WAS THE APPROXIMATE AREA REQUIRED FOR STORM WATER MANAGEMENT CONSIDERED WITH EACH CONCEPT?	No stormwater management design was prepared for any of the concepts. We know that there will need to be considerable storm water management facilities for any of the options, and have assumed that these would be structural facilities under the pavements and /or green roofs on the buildings.
3	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	TRACTOR/TRAILER TRUCKS ARE SHOW AT OVER 60' IN LENGTH. WHAT ARE THESE TRUCKS USED FOR? 3.1. IF FOR SALT DELIVERY CAN THE CONTRACT HAULER USE SHORTER TRAILERS i.e.: 26' TO 28' TRAILERS OR THE EQUIVALENT STRAIGHT TRUCK (5 TO 6 AXLE TRUCKS)?	<p>The 60 ft. length reflects the dimensions needed to accommodate tractor trailers. The County owns and operates tractor trailers to haul leaves from the site to the Trades Center. The length of these tractor trailers is approx. 55 ft. In addition, the County contracts with vendors, who use large dump trucks, mostly tractor trailers, to deliver salt; these vehicles are the same length.</p> <p>Currently, the County contract does not allow the County to stipulate the type of vehicles that our salt vendor uses for deliveries. We are one of many customers receiving salt and our contract hauler takes the needs of all of its customers into account when determining its fleet requirements.</p>

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
4	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	<p>WILL TRUCK PARKING SPACES BE USED ALL YEAR LONG FOR SNOW REMOVAL TRUCKS OR OTHER COUNTY VEHICLES OR WILL THEY BE EMPTY FOR THAT DURATION?</p> <p>IS THERE A PLANNED USE FOR ANY OF THE NON-PARK PROGRAM AREAS FOR THE TIME OF YEAR BETWEEN APRIL AND NOVEMBER?</p>	<p>Snow response implements, such as plows and spreaders will be stored year-round. Trucks and other County vehicles are not expected to be stored (on or off-season) at the site other than in direct support of winter storms (i.e. during and immediately before and after storms).</p> <p>The County does anticipate utilizing operational space during the off-season for unprogrammed uses such as intermittent contract lay-down or staging. Such unprogrammed uses are anticipated to be intermittent and would be constrained to typical business hours.</p>
5	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	<p>ORIGINAL SALT STRUCTURE WAS 37' HIGH. PLS. EXPLAIN THE HOW THE VARIOUS HEIGHTS BEING USED FOR SALT STORAGE IN THE CURRENT SCHEMES WERE ARRIVED AT AND THE HEIGHT SHOWN FOR COVERED AREA AT 45'+ FOR CIRCULATION AND PARKING AREAS SHOWN IN CONCEPT "A" WERE ARRIVED AT.</p>	<p>The heights shown in the drawings reflect estimates only and are intended to serve as conceptual plans. More detailed dimensions will emerge later in the design process. However, it should be noted that the salt storage piles can be upwards of 30 feet or more on average, and there must be additional clearance above top of the salt pile to accommodate for movement of the loader equipment, lights, etc.</p>
6	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	<p>IS THERE A SUMMARY TAB AVAILABLE FOR EACH SCHEME LISTING SQUAREFOOTAGE OF PAVING, SQUAREFOOTAGE OF BUILDING UNDER ROOF (ROOF OR STRUCTURE ABOVE), CUBIC YARDS OF EXCAVATION REQUIRED FOR EACH CONCEPT, OVERALL SITE AREA CONSUMED FOR LEAF/SALT OPERATION VS PARKS/MEANINGFUL OPEN SPACE. 6.1. A SUMMARY TAB WOULD BE HELPFUL TO EVALUATE EACH SCHEME'S IMPACT TO THE SITE.</p>	<p>Calculations will be provided showing the existing amount of open space and the proposed amount of open space, with the amount of proposed open space devoted to park facilities broken out as a subset of that quantity. Additional calculation will be provided showing the approximate amount of disturbed area for each scheme.</p>

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
7	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY THE LEAVES CANNOT BE MOVED TO THE TRADES CENTER IN NOVEMBER/DECEMBER.	Use of the site for intermediate storage allows leaf collection to be completed in about 6 weeks. If our crews were required to transport leaves directly to the Trades Center, the leaf collection season would need to be extended beyond 6 weeks. This extension would create several challenges, as leaf collection activities would begin to overlap with our snow response efforts.
8	Andrew Smith (Email, Received March 7)	HAS THE COUNTY CONSIDERED CONTRACTING OUT THE ENTIRE LEAF COLLECTION ACTIVITY IN ORDER TO CONSERVE THE GROUND NEEDED FOR LEAF STORAGE ON THIS SITE TO USE FOR PROGRAM OR PARKS USES?	Historically, using internal resources for leaf collection has been more cost effective than using a private company. One of the ways that we keep costs down is by processing collected leaves into mulch, which is then available to residents for their landscaping and potting needs; it is also used for County parks and school projects. Leaf mulch is provided free of charge and one of the most popular community services offered by our Solid Waste Bureau.
9	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	On p 38 (which will be the meat of our conversation) - Clarify on C " All operations below grade and exposed;" - should that say "at grade"?	For Option C the facilities are shown below existing grade but without roofs, except for the salt storage building, the shift change building,
10	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	On p 38 (which will be the meat of our conversation) - Adjust A to be called Single access all underground, or single access with NCAA field or park. This could be park or field - labeling it as field will get it killed faster. It is one of the more efficient scenarios and should not fall off the table.	Option A shows the proposal from Marymount University for a NCAA size soccer field. The field could also be used for other sports and recreational activities.

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
11	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	On p 38 (which will be the meat of our conversation) - Explain the operational efficiency impacts in detail (would be great if DES staff had a pros/cons for each scenario from service perspective to streamline this conversation)	In evaluating operational efficiency, we consider how each concept affects concurrent use of vehicles or equipment; time needed to accomplish tasks, complexity of tasks, etc. Our assessment of operational efficiency will be included in the materials provided for the March 21 st meeting.
12	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	On p 38 (which will be the meat of our conversation) - Clarify for each scenario how much is accommodated (sf open space, # of trucks on site, etc.) - seems like they aren't all 100% equal?	Calculations will be provided showing the existing amount of open space and the proposed amount of open space, with the amount of proposed open space devoted to park facilities broken out as a subset of that quantity.
13	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	On p 39: - Add - opportunity cost/efficient use of space (e.g. \$4M/acre). E.g. how many uses are accommodated (# of trucks, etc.), what flexibility for the future, etc.	Unclear if this is a question or a comment.
14	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	On p 39: - Consider - flexibility for future uses (e.g. if mulch were moved, if housing or other buildings desired along the point on Old Dom/25th to improve streetscape and commercial interaction?)	This has not been explored as part of the Initial or Refined Concept design and evaluation, consistent with Task Force feedback documented in the "decision justification" matrix and the adopted charge. One of the Refined Concepts does show new structures to better frame this intersection from the County property.
15	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	- Change "Impact on existing trees" to "Opportunity for tree cover (and wildlife)". This is a 30+yr vision; we can and should plant more trees. Saving existing is great, but not the only way to achieve a good outcome.	Will consider adjusting labels as the concepts are finalized based on feedback from the Task Force.

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
16	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	Additional considerations: + Feasibility of lowering 26th and/or Old Dominion - if either grade is dropped to Yorktown level, so lower level entrance is at grade, does this make D more palatable, A more feasible, etc.?	Lowering the grade of existing Old Dominion Drive or 26 th Street is not feasible, primarily due to the impacts it would have create for adjacent property owners and the required design of the roadway.
17	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	Additional considerations: + Can salt storage (top is play structure/sledding/hill) and shift change be both below at service level (e.g. bays) and above grade at park level (bathrooms, meeting area), to maximize shared use?	Shift change building could have a second floor with bathrooms and meeting room that can be incorporated into a park scheme at the level above the operations vehicle areas. Salt storage building could also extend above the operations level to a park level, but would have no facilities available at the upper levels.
18	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	Additional considerations: + what about APS F&O offices and white fleet - we talked about this in-service task force late in the game, didn't get a chance to take a picture. Is there a version that allows that to fit?	This has not been explored as part of the Initial or Refined Concept design and evaluation, consistent with Task Force feedback documented in the "decision justification" matrix.
19	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	Additional considerations: + If white fleet or emergency/fire/police parking needed on non-snow days, how much would fit?	This has not been explored as part of the Initial or Refined Concept design and evaluation, consistent with Task Force feedback documented in the "decision justification" matrix.
20	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	Additional considerations: + What usefulness of the proposed Marymount shared areas for park use? Could another practice field or trail connection work there?	Additional open space suggested by Marymount in early March has been incorporated into Refined Concept A. It was initially proposed as casual use space or community garden.

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
21	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	Additional considerations: + Does material storage work in all or some?	Material storage can be accommodated in all of the concepts.
22	Susan Cunningham (Email, Received March 7)	Additional considerations: + Is there a lay-by or on street parking on Old Dom or 26th in any of the scenarios Considered?	A limited quantity of temporary truck parking and staging can be accommodated as a layby on existing adjacent roads, for those options where all the vehicles cannot fit on the site.
23	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	We want the County to retain the primarily residential character of the area by undergrounding of county facilities (i.e., salt storage, change facility, chain shop)	Options have been developed that place the salt operations and leaf operations below the existing site grade. Some of these options also show that a roof can be placed over some of the vehicular operational areas, with the development of a park or other landscaped open space on the roof structure.
24	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	A dedicated park to include a play area (for toddlers – 10 years) with open space – similar to Woodstock Park at 2049 N. Woodstock St. Park to be <u>at least one acre</u> in size	All options will have a park with a minimum one-acre size.
25	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	Park should be connected/linked to the neighborhood – so it should be sited along Old Dominion Drive closer to 25 th St.	The concept options show various locations for park and open space at various locations on the property, for consideration by the Task Force
26	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	County should conduct a robust community-centered planning process for the park	Once funding is identified, a public park planning process will be conducted prior to development of any specific designs.
27	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	Runoff mitigation and protection of Donaldson Run from salt must be adequately addressed	Any option that is developed will have to comply with environmental control standards.

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
28	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	Limit noise, sight pollution (lights, industrial stuff)	All options will show various means of screening the operational facilities, including walls, graded berms, and extensive landscape screening.
29	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	Some sort of welcoming structure to the neighborhood, such as a gazebo, should be strategically placed on the site	A park structure can be placed at an appropriate entrance to the site.
30	ODCA Response to Task Force (Letter, Dated March 6)	We can live with: 1. A salt facility, but only if it is totally or partially underground 2. Leaf mulch site in its current location (perhaps on top of the salt storage facility/change facility/chain shop?) 3. A dedicated park of at least one acre on the site 4. A small sports field without lights	No question posed.
31	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	Marymount recently offered to convert a parcel of land (approx. 2/3) into a park for recreational use by the community. How can this be considered in this process?	The parcel offered by Marymount for use as a community park will be shown as part of the Marymount field proposal option.
32	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	There was concern expressed about the height of the retaining wall (25 ft). Additionally, the lighting proposed for the field does not align with community values.	No question posed.
33	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	Can 25 th Rd serve as an emergency egress road for security, firefighting?	25 th Road is a county right of way and can be used for emergency egress.

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
34	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	It would be sad to see so much black top installed, when it will only be used for a portion of the year	No question posed.
35	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	Can you confirm the impacts of this option on the RPA?	The RPA is an area that cannot be developed for any of the proposed project concepts.
36	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	I would like to see a concept with leaf storage above ground and all other operational uses for the site below ground	Options are developed showing various locations and elevations for the operational facilities.
37	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	Do you have hydrogeologic information that can be provided for the site?	No hydrologic information is available to the Task Force.
38	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	At the trail head, there's always been a sign that says park. It seems that with this option we are "unmaking" a park. How is that possible?	The field option essentially proposes to relocate the park area from the northern end of the site (near the trail) to the southern end of the site (along Old Dominion Drive)
39	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	The proposed field appears out of step with the County's Master Planning efforts for parks and open space. Do we not want to be in line with that?	The field has been illustrated in response to feedback from the Task Force following earlier discussions, the "decision justification" matrix and the "what fits" exercises.
40	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	Can we see the percentage of disturbed earth associated with this option? This option seems to disturb 90% of the site.	Approximate areas of disturbance will be provided for each of the Refined Concepts.

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
41	Task Force Member Comment on Option A: Field Option (March 7)	Can you clarify why there's an "administrative office" referenced in an earlier slide? The Task Force previously decided that there would not be any administrative offices at this site.	In the referenced slide, the term "administrative" refers to any staff supporting snow and leaf collection operations, who do not work in the field. Such administrative tasks include snow truck routing and tracking, key distribution, timekeeping, driver management, etc.
42	Task Force Member Comment on Option B: Single Access Loop (March 7)	Can a trail be added to the back edge of the site for connectivity?	A trail can be added at the back edge of the site where sufficient room can be provided. One of the concepts illustrates this option.
43	Task Force Member Comment on Option B: Single Access Loop (March 7)	I would like to see how the concepts compare with regard to protection of indigenous trees.	Evaluation of impacts on existing trees will be prepared.
44	Task Force Member Comment on Option B: Single Access Loop (March 7)	What drives the depth of excavation?	Depth of excavation and placement of operational facilities below existing grade is determined by the maximum slope of the access road for vehicles into the site.
45	Task Force Member Comment on Option B: Single Access Loop (March 7)	I am having a hard time visualizing the view from Marymount University dormitories. What will the students see?	Depending on the option, the view from the Marymount dormitories across 26 th Street from the project site will be either park space, operational facilities, landscape screening, or a combination of all those elements.
46	Task Force Member Comment on Option B: Single Access Loop (March 7)	I encourage the engineers to be more creative with parking spaces and the use of vertical spaces. Not every truck needs a parking space.	Twenty-four is the minimum number of trucks that need to be accommodated at this site to meet the Task Force charge.

Comment-Response Matrix for Initial Concepts

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
47	Task Force Member Comment on Option C: Double Access Loop (March 7)	Of all the options, this one is the unsightliest.	No question posed.
48	Task Force Member Comment on Option C: Double Access Loop (March 7)	Is it possible to shift the Operations facilities to the corner of 26 th St N & Old Dominion?	The location of the Operations facilities has been shifted in the revised conceptual drawings (Refined Concept E1).
49	Task Force Member Comment on Option C: Double Access Loop (March 7)	Would having a double access road reduce truck congestion?	It would depend on other factors including the length of the drive aisles to reach the lower grade and whether or not there would be adequate space for truck queuing in those areas (or would they be limited to just traffic and the necessary turning movements).
50	Task Force Member Comment on Option C: Double Access Loop (March 7)	Is there a reason why there are 18 V-boxes depicted? Can we explore options for double-stacking this equipment?	We have explored options for double-stacking V-boxes during the off-season and reflected this change in the revised conceptual drawings. It should be noted that up to 24 snow removal trucks are shown in the various concepts, and the associated plows and v-box spreaders for each truck are stored at this location throughout the year.
51	Task Force Member Comment on Option D: Double Access Drive Thru (March 7)	I like that we've added greenspace	No question posed.
52	Task Force Member Comment on Option D: Double Access Drive Thru (March 7)	How does the community access meeting rooms or restrooms in the shift change building?	In options showing a two-story shift change building the rest rooms and meeting rooms would be on the second floor at the level of the adjacent park area, and could be accessed directly from the park by the public.

Comment-Response Matrix for Initial Concepts

Ref	Source	Question or Comment	Response
53	Task Force Member Comment on Option D: Double Access Drive Thru (March 7)	Can you clarify what you mean by “green roof”? When you use that term, people generally think about seedums.	Staff and consultants will refer to these as “rooftop green spaces” which is their main purpose. This distinction, however, does not rule out the possibility that the area in question could serve as a traditional “green roof” if designed properly with that in mind.
54	Task Force Member Comment on Option E: Double Access at Grade (March 7)	This option should be modified to show how we can use the temporary structure that has already been installed. The community has paid over \$1M for the structure and it is my understanding that the canopy has a 25-year lifespan.	An option has been prepared that keeps the existing salt structure remaining.
55	Task Force Member Comment on Option E: Double Access at Grade (March 7)	This concept shows that space is needed for 24 trucks. What is the minimum number of trucks that need to be accommodated on this site.	Twenty-four is the minimum number of trucks that need to be accommodated at this site to meet the Task Force charge.
56	Task Force Member Comment on Option E: Double Access at Grade (March 7)	Often with projects, there’s a working assumption that land is free. But, land has a value and park space also has a value.	No question posed.
57	Task Force Member Comment on Option E: Double Access at Grade (March 7)	I would like to see how the V-boxes might be stacked in this option.	V-boxes can be stacked and an option has been prepared showing this.
58	Task Force Member Comment on Option E: Double Access at Grade (March 7)	This is the most unattractive option, but it is also the cheapest. We are concerned that the County will like this option, because it is the cheapest.	No question posed.