



Jennifer Fioretti
 jfioretti@arlingtonva.us
 703-228-4967
 2100 Clarendon Boulevard
 Arlington, VA 22201

Zachary Larnard
 zachary.larnard@apsva.us
 703-228-8652
 1426 N Quincy Street
 Arlington, VA 22207



**JOINT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMISSION
 Buck Site Subcommittee**

Meeting #4
 7:00 PM, Wednesday, April 5, 2017
 Conference Room 715
 2100 Clarendon Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

Meeting Minutes-Final

Attendees

JFAC:

Ginger Brown
 Theodore Black
 Susan Cunningham
 Eric Goldstein
 Susan Robinson
 William Ross
 Katie Rouse
 Laura Simpson

County Staff:

Lisa Maher-DES
 Jennifer Fioretti-DPR
 Michelle Congdon-DES

APS Staff

Others:

Nia Bagley
 Dawn Cooper
 Cynthia Hilton
 Steve Leutner
 Maurya Meiers
 Jim Todd

Welcome & Chair’s Report

Ginger Brown (GB) opened the meeting. Attendees introduced themselves. GB stated that she will draft a status report for the completion of Phase 1. The report will outline the use determination steps as recommended in the Community Facilities Study (CFS) report, with the exception of a change made to move the identification of complementary uses to Phase 2, because it makes more sense there. The “siting” considerations, modified for use determination studies, have been identified as part of Phase 1. She noted that the facility needs list has been updated to include new school needs. Also, the civic engagement plan is being followed. JFAC will transmit the status report to the County Board and School Board and then start Phase 2, after which JFAC will hold a work session with the two Boards. The Boards will help determine the remainder of the timeline.

Approval of March 29 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Subcommittee members who attended the March 29 meeting reviewed the minutes. William Ross (WR) moved to approve the minutes as amended. Katie Rouse (KR) seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously with one abstention by Theodore Black (TB).

Community Roundtable Comments

GB stated that notes from the roundtables would be posted on the JFAC website on Thursday April 6. Jennifer Fioretti (JF) clarified that written notes would be posted on Thursday, but staff was still working to transcribe the raw notes, which will be posted as soon as they are available. JF introduced a draft “Key

Themes” document developed by County staff, representing ideas that received the most discussion and comments, that came out of the roundtables as a whole.

GB urged all participants to review all the notes, including those that are not specific to the Buck site. Some major overall ideas included encouraging the County to preferentially acquire available land for current or future needs, emphasizing the need for more school bus parking, and the need for more open space but deferring to the update of the Open Spaces Master Plan. Ideas specific to the Buck site include purchasing the land, minimizing the impacts of a Cube Smart if one is located on the Buck site, and purchasing the Arland site outright instead of doing a land swap. While there wasn't a lot of outright negative comments, there were concerns about whether Cube Smart is the best use for a portion of the Buck site. The County should explore sites outside the County. The Buck site could include a gymnastics center/sports complex, in recognition of some of the uses currently on the site. The site could potentially be used for some school activities. The adjacent neighborhood should be considered in decisions of which uses should be sited there. There was a lot of interest in decking over I66 to expand the site, its ability to accommodate uses, and create connections between various nearby parks. Concerns were also expressed regarding traffic, ingress and egress. It would be important to coordinate uses on the Buck site with the decision currently underway on where to locate a 1,300 seat high school.

WR asked if the Buck site could be rezoned if there is an interest in locating a school or fields on it. Easements on the site need to be respected, and it's important to consider costs.

KR asked whether the subcommittee would be evaluating uses on the Shirlington Road site. GB responded that the recommendations of the upcoming Four Mile Run Valley Study, which will be available in Fall 2017, would inform any evaluation of that site.

Jim Todd (JT), the president of the Cherrydale Citizens Association, heard a lot of questions about why the County couldn't just rezone any site in the County, so that issue needs to be clarified. A rush into having a Cube Smart on the site would restrict possibilities to make connections between a number of County-owned parcels. Susan Robinson (SR) also heard a lot of these kinds of comments, which she didn't see listed in the Key Themes document. JF clarified that the themes were intended to be broader ideas and not specific comments, so perhaps a theme related to flexibility for future uses might be appropriate. KR noted concerns she heard about costs, including the high cost of the Buck site and the cost to build schools. TB heard questions about the number of kids who currently use the Buck site. He heard a figure of 1,000 but doesn't know what time period that represents. It would be helpful to understand the level of use. Janine Velasco (JV) heard questions about zoning but not about flexibility. Perhaps there should be a theme around GLUP and Zoning. GB reiterated the importance of reviewing all the raw comments. WR agreed, noting a similar experience with projects such as the Williamsburg Middle School field lighting process.

Todd McCracken liked the idea of putting comments in buckets and suggested that additional information to clarify the themes would help both the Commission's and the public's understanding. Everyone should think about whether there are more themes that should be considered.

SWOC Debrief/Use Considerations and Framework

JF summarized the outcomes of the SWOC exercise. She noted that the priorities developed by the votes cast in the SWOC exercise should be compared with the division of use considerations into the two levels of importance (Tiers 2 and 3) to see if any should be re-prioritized based on the SWOC exercise. SR

wanted to clarify whether existence of certain underground utilities should be a threshold question or subject to Tier 2 or 3 evaluation. Utilities were placed in Tier 2. Susan Cunningham (SC) recommended that particularly important considerations or staff opinions should be flushed out early, so complications can be thought through.

JT noted that there are potentially additional street connections to the Buck site, either into the adjacent neighborhood and/or to I66. Additional comments regarding the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and constraints identified in the SWOC exercise were made about the importance of land use compatibility since the Buck site is so close to the neighborhood, the fact that North Arlington locations are relevant to the equity and service delivery considerations, the flat topography is also captured in the use considerations, and proximity to schools raises issues that are both positive and negative. KR noted that environmental considerations are listed in both environmental and legal categories.

EG asked whether the transportation considerations should move up to Tier 2. Lisa Maher (LM) commented that this item may not be very important for uses with few employees and few other users or visitors.

GB stated that the subcommittee may shift considerations between tiers during the process.

JT asked whether the subcommittee will look at building heights or just horizontal needs for each use. JF noted that the exercises to fit uses will be foam core, but probably will not emphasize the true proportional building heights. Height information will be in the fact sheets for each use.

JT asked whether decking over I66 can be considered if it's not cost prohibitive. GB said yes, but that would be only for long term uses. SR noted that as long as nearer term uses don't preclude using the land more flexibly later, either due to investment or location, then more options are preserved for the long term.

GB presented the new purpose statement for the Use Consideration process. Eric Goldstein (EG) commented that the statement looks like it's emphasizing the near term at the expense of the long term. After some discussion, it was decided to revise the Buck statement to match the language revisions made in the Carlin Springs statement by that subcommittee. The changes were mostly to add clarity.

Members discussed how to consider the impact of whether and how the Arcland site is used on evaluation of the Buck site. GB noted that the subcommittee would not look at the Arcland site through at least Phase 2 of the use determination process, because the Four Mile Run Valley planning process will be making recommendations that could inform the range of uses on the Arcland site. That information can be incorporated into Phase 3 of the Buck site process.

Announcements and Public Comment

GB mentioned the historic designation request for the Education Center site across the street from the Buck site. JT mentioned the Stratford School historic designation arrangement where the County Board makes certain decisions instead of the Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB), and how that might be a better way for the County to handle the Ed Center request.

JT asked about the status of the Arcland land swap and expressed concern that it appears to be a done deal that was decided outside public view. GB stated that JFAC wasn't tasked with weighing in on the

land swap but will evaluate the Buck site both with and without the Cube Smart (with and without the land swap). Cynthia Hilton (CH) wants to understand the Cube Smart option better. Dawn Cooper (DC) suggested that Arcland might be willing to sell its land to the County instead of doing a swap if Arlington declines the deal. She noted comments at the Washington & Lee High School roundtable about this.

Steve Leutner raised the issue of decking over I66 to create new area for facilities and said County staff should prepare a rough order of magnitude cost for decking both adjacent to the Buck site and adjacent to Arlington Traditional School. This would make a big difference in the value of the Buck site for the County.

JT cautioned that he hopes the County Board will allow the JFAC subcommittee process to inform the actual uses chosen for the Buck site, noting that the ultimate location of Fire Station #3 was different from what that siting process recommended as its preferred site.

SL recommended keeping the existing uses on the Buck site if possible. GB noted that the County Attorney and County's Real Estate staff will weigh in on constraints of having the County take over existing commercial leases.

DC commented that she heard from Katie Cristol that the County Board planned to decide whether to go ahead with the Buck site purchase in June. JT heard the decision would be made sometime in the summer.

Adjourn