

26th Street & Old Dominion Drive Master Planning Task Force Meeting #8 Summary

March 7, 2019, 6:30-10:15 pm

Marymount University, Rowley 107

Task Force members in attendance:

Noah Simon, Michael Cantwell, Mike Hogan, Susan Cunningham, Elizabeth Gearin, David Howell, Sarah Merservey, Rob Topp, Kit Norland, Alisa Cowen, David Palmer, Kathleen McSweeney, Margarita Brose and Al Diaz (15)

Staff attendees:

Lisa Wilson, Michelle Congdon, Bethany Heim, Mike Moon, Shani Kruljac, Janelle Okorie, Jeremy Hassan, Matt Mattauszek, Diana Handy, Kris Krider, Zach Larnard (APS), and Robert Ruis (APS) (12)

I. Opening Remarks - Noah Simon

Updates:

- County Board has not changed the charge. The Task Force should continue to include all items listed in the charge
- All Items posted on the website
 - Donaldson Run Civic Association – Letter summarizing survey and preferences
 - Mary Glass comments and proposed site layout
 - Marymount updated proposal
- Schedule of upcoming meetings
 - 3/7 - Introduce initial concepts
 - 3/21 - Identification of Preferred Scenarios
 - 3/28 – Review Draft Report
 - 4/11 – Vote on Final Report
 - Board/County Attorney verified that proxy voting is not approved during the community process

II. County & Consultants Presentation on Initial Concepts

A. Initial Concepts for Site Layout:

- Review of the “What Fits” exercise - Operations- 4 schemes / Parks-10 Schemes
- Long-term operational needs overview
- Site planning criteria and considerations
- Evaluation Process
- Initial Concept Review

III. Task Force Working Session

Concept A: Single Access NCAA Field

- Can this also be a 100% park/open space option (with no NCAA field)? Leaf Storage underground is a potential complication due to safety concerns
- Latest MU Proposal Option was shown with two smaller fields vs one large one in the “What Fits” Exercise
- Marymount proposal offers 2/3 acre to use across the 26th Street N for recreational use (playground/garden/open space) to allow for Leaf Storage facility to be above ground/open air and move the parkland to Marymount property
- Large retaining wall at field edge is a significant concern for neighborhood along with the lighting and compatibility of the neighborhood
- Provides the most green space m/ open space
- 25th Road can serve as a second means of egress for the site (emergency or fire access road if the County finished it), would like the 25th Road access to be included in the future layouts
- Site Lighting of Field is of concern
- Requirement for parking on site and where is this in the scenario and no discussion is being accounted for (County is speaking to private entities for parking agreements)
- Concerned that we have not found any other municipalities that can store leaves underground and potentially put the leaves on Marymount property (this is not consistent with the charge), should this option come off the table due to the leaf issue
- Can the curb cuts be shown for across the streets (MU campus on 26th St.)?
- Field location shown on drawing respects the RPA but note differs, consultants clarified the RPA provisions
- Shift change and chain shop are identified together on the drawings, clarification of the location of the brine tanks
- Do you have a breakout of how much is the field vs open space?
- Where would the location of the lights be on the sports field, 4 on the sidelines (2 each side), downlighting with 75’ poles, LED lighting is much more controllable with new lighting
- Marymount is open to discussion about lights (Al Diaz)
- Clarify ODC letter and a smaller U-10 sized soccer field is desired
- Connectivity of the open space and what can the space be used for, can there be a trail to connect the site together and with the trailhead, boardwalk over the RPA could be made
- Concerns about the RPA (Resource Protection Area) and how construction will affect it since it is already touching the field...
- What is the height of the wall next to the trail? Approximately 35’ above the street level (3 story building)
- Does the synthetic field affect the calculation for the 95% open space?
- Mulch pile is left off this scenario, where would the location be?

- What is the ventilation and fire system for the trucks that are all underground? If we electrify our trucks, would this make a difference? No, just change the amount of air exchange needed
- Could the option be modified to have the leaf and mulch above ground? No current scenario but will be studied further
- Quality of the green space is most important vs quantity
- Can the percent be given open space and green space? What is the difference for staff to consider. Any geological issues with the site, are there underground springs?
- Is it possible for the road going in and why configured long across the park, truck turning radius is needed?
- At the trailhead there is a sign that says park, is the .5 acre park not really a park? Is just being maintained as parkland but not purchased for actual parkland
- Comments on the POPS plan and reinforce the planning process and Task Force aligns with the other County/Public initiatives
- What is the percentage of disturbed earth vs not (or by SF)
- Change Administration label and just call it shift change facility

Concept B1&2: Single Access Loop

- Disturbed earth vs not
- Where is the leaf storage located today?
- Can we fit a trail along the back of the site to connect to the open space? Yes
- Does operations staff have a best site access point? 26th and OD are preferred
- Is there an idea of which options protect the most trees that are healthy? Skinnier drive through scheme is better for trees
- Put more access from the state road (Old Dominion) and off of 26th
- Does this work with fire issues from the ramp? Yes
- Consider scheme that puts the leaf storage pile on top of the deck structure and use it in off season for other uses (courts, etc.)
- Can you make a larger, shorter salt storage box?
- What will this look like from the Marymount dorms? It will be lower for people walking by
- Feels like this is more engineering scenarios and should be more creative on how we use the space and double up on how operations is using the space
- Storm water management and runoff needs to be evaluated

Concept C: Double Access Loop

- Is the traffic and safety scenario better to go mid-block or where it is today? Transportation would prefer to have the curb cuts further from curbs
- Can't we load the salt structure from above and move the salt storage closer to the road?
- Can we go underground and lower Old Dominion or go under the road?
- Most offensive from Marymount and neighborhood
- Destructive layout to the neighborhood

- Would traffic be better coming off 26th vs Old Dominion?
- Put “ugly” uses on the “ugly” corner, unsightly scheme
- Are the v-box spreaders stacked in this option? Yes
- Should not take away any natural park space as we move forward
- We should be thinking outside the box and outside the charge
- Should be retaining open space
- This scheme has Truck lay-by space designated on 26th

Concept D: Double Access Drive Through

- Is the leaf area sunken? Yes
- Like the two means of access to the site
- Is the leaf pile underground? Only small portion
- Creating all the blacktop even below ground for only small event frequency over time
- Shift Change Facility (w/Chain Shop at Lower Level) goes above the green roof to be used for restrooms and community space
- The location is not necessary accessible for the safety and finding it for the community
- Life, limb and safety is critically important for the Community and can't be measured
- Could the Park Space on roof deck be used for field activities?
- What is the elevation of the green roof? Students would look at the park from the dormitories. No park programs are defined in these scenarios.
- What do you mean for “Green Roof”, clarification to call it a park on the roof with 3’ of soil with tress, turf...
- Connection to Old Dominion is not great, can this work with 25th?

Concept E: Double Access at Grade

- Repeat of everyone’s comments
- Why didn’t this maintain the temporary salt structure that we already built, long term view of the site and salt structure
- Confirm the life span of the tent and the foundation
- Land Value: The cost of the land needs to be factored into the thinking and that we are not recouping land other places
- General public make accommodations to fund parks with decks and people just may want open space, recapture what we are losing
- Do all trucks need to do the shift change at one time? More complications in shift change and issues with trucks, maintenance and staffing
- Can we stack things to get more park?
- If we/County own the right of way on 25th, can we use it for access in an emergency and not have the circle around the site for a future arrangement?
- Neighborhood dislikes this one the most and unsightly from the road and gateway to their neighborhood
- Most likely the cheapest option for the County
- Any consideration for putting the salt structure closer to the road for more urban design

IV. Vote to Remove Concepts

A - Consensus to remove the Scheme as shown. Need to create modified layout with Leaf Storage open with no roof

B1 (All open) - Consensus to remove the Scheme

B2 (Park on Roof) - Consensus to keep the Scheme

C - Consensus to remove the Scheme

D1 (All open) - Consensus to remove the Scheme

D2 (Park on Roof) - Consensus to keep the Scheme

E - Consensus to remove the Scheme

V. Public Comment

Q/C: Consider a structural grid when designing the underground spaces, storm water management, double using every sf of pavement and use smaller trucks, can you stack things? Do you really need as tall of a structure? Summary tab should include all open space vs useable and define buffer space...Why can't trucks park where leaves are stored and consuming ground?

Comment: on efficiency and green space, reiteration of the charge for the future going forward. Do we need all the same facilities we have been using for the last 20 years? What are the costs for the site (environmental, storm water, air quality....) Endangering health of our community by not retaining green spaces. Use existing spaces to get the job done better and smaller footprint.

Comment: Marymount government student council, read letter submitted to the Task Force on 3/7. Fields would benefit the students at Marymount and build more school spirit and for public recreation and other County sports. Site developed like Concept A allows for safer environment for campus

Comment: Concerned about the character of the site and ugliness of the site and consider. Selection and location of the parks matter and that it will be a walkable park and no parking would be provided. Visual from Marymount and the neighborhood is important. Think about dual use and technology that is available today and may be expensive but encourage other types of creativity and weigh the costs and benefits of each. Are we storing too much salt?

Comment: Everyone is doing a good job within the Charge but are not considering other things and Board may not be aware of the other things that are being added to the necessity on the site.

Comment: Neighborhood to the south is not shown on any plans show the lower properties and sections cut from the view of the 25th road neighborhood.

Comment: Considering the cost and budget situation with the County and what is feasible regardless of what the task force recommends. How do you expand the surfaces and what are creative space uses we can use over time?

Comment: The charge is not correctly written, and things are not a necessity and are all desires of the County. Cost has not been discussed. Langston and other facilities should be used for these functions. What is the definition of green space that is denoted on the plans, no loss of green space and do not touch the RPA. What is the efficiency saved vs the cost to build?

Comment: Interested in the County being efficient. Climate change is coming and in favor of getting rid of salt, leaves as fast as possible. Property values are also affected with keeping up with services offered.