



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 #6
 7:00 PM, Wednesday, May 3, 2017
 Key Elementary School Library
 2300 Key Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

JFAC:

Ginger Brown
 Theodore Black
 Matthew De Ferranti
 Eric Goldstein
 Greg Greeley
 Susan Robinson
 William Ross
 Janine Velasco

Bernadette Grullon-DPR
 Bryna Helfer-CMO
 Kris Krider-CPHD
 June Locker-DES
 Lisa Maher-DES
 Tim O’Hora-DES

APS Staff:

Lisa Stengle

Rohini Chopra
 Collier Cook
 Dawn Cooper
 Rick Epstein
 Caryn Ginsberg
 Peter Harnik
 Nancy Iacomini
 Lois Koontz
 Steven Leutner
 Pamela Merritt
 Maurya Meiers
 Cara Trap
 Sharon Valencia

County Staff:

Justin Falango-CPHD
 Kristina Frazier--CPHD
 Jennifer Fioretti-DPR

Others:

Rick Airhart
 Nia Bagley
 Michael Beer

Welcome

Ginger Brown (GB) provided an overview of the agenda.

Approval of April 26 Subcommittee Minutes

GB presented the April 26 Buck Subcommittee meeting minutes. The meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Public Comment

GB offered public comment for those interested in speaking at the beginning of the meeting. There will be an additional opportunity to speak at the end of the meeting as well.

Lois Koontz (LK) expressed concern about admissions to Key School and Science Focus if APS does away with neighborhood preference. She noted that Arlington needs more elementary seats. She asked the group to consider, as it relates to Buck, putting some of the students from Science Focus in the office building adjacent to Hayes Park. This would offer interim capacity as transfers occur between schools. The County or APS could use the building for something else as well. APS doesn’t need the entire

building. Bill Ross (BR) asked the subcommittee to confirm where this request would fit into the evaluation process. GB said that they could consider this as a complementary use since APS had not made an official request for the JFAC to include it in their urgent needs list. LK asked what the definition of short-term was. GB noted that it is defined more so by level of investment than time.

Steve Leutner (SL) shared a proposal to expand science focus on the Buck site. He provided handouts to the public and the subcommittee to review. He noted that the school is the third most crowded and second smallest school property in Arlington. There is nowhere else to put students in the school. Changes to enrollment and transfer policy could have a significant impact on the school PTA is concerned about how it will impact school and as a result are looking for solutions. SL noted the Buck site could be used to support a school between 2019-2025 and then return the site for other uses. He has already briefed three of the five APS Board members, who stated that this idea was worthy of exploration. He understands that APS will need to make a formal request for JFAC to evaluate this idea. Leadership Team [at school] endorses the plan as viable. Nia Bagley (NB) noted that SL statements do not represent the Ballston Virginia Square Civic Association.

Michael Beer noted that he is a big fan of placing tennis courts on the roofs of buildings.

Karen Kinsburg said she appreciated the opportunity to speak and the open process. She noted that she participated in the Y meeting this past Monday and felt sad that the neighborhood is changing. The proposal will bring major commercial and multifamily units to the SE corner of the site. She realizes that no decisions have been made, but with the conversation about storing buses at Buck things are changing. There's a fundamental change coming to the neighborhood. She asked that the JFAC look at the character of the neighborhood, traffic, parking and collisions.

Rick Epstein reminded the group that the County Manager said that we need 15 acres of County land for public services. He is not surprised APS is saying we need to use the land. He is concerned that their request will impact County services. He believes APS should consider changing model and realize that they don't have enough land. APS continuing to expand was not what he thought was the underlying intent of this exercise.

Eric Goldstein noted that if we park buses on a site it could be long-term since they may not have another place to go. GB noted that in the long-term we need to get more answers on decking and the process to get there which will help address the many demands, including buses, for the site.

What Fits Activity Part 1—Tier 2 Use Consideration Analysis

Kris Krider (KK) went over the instructions. He walked the group through the six evaluation schemes for Buck as well as the seven schemes identified by Carlin Springs Subcommittee.

GB introduces draft use consideration analysis done by staff. The group can agree or disagree and make changes. She asked the group to consider any of the schemes that they wish to discard. GG noted that the all fields option doesn't offer high school sized fields. Janine Valasco noted that a marching band could fit someplace smaller. GB noted that the cost of the Buck site is \$30M, once you move the major utilities add another \$15M, potential mitigation of contaminated soil is another \$1M/acre. Cost could exceed \$7M/acre to build the fields. Jennifer Fioretti (KF) noted that fields cannot be placed on top of utilities because of the manholes.

EG asked where the community input was on the use consideration list. JF noted that the marker is still on the framework, however it would be difficult to translate hundreds on comments on the sheet. She asked the group to refer back to the Themes Analysis and Written Comments Spreadsheet as well as Raw Comments sheet from Community Roundtables. GB encouraged the subcommittee to re-read the comments.

The group agreed to remove Scheme 7 – All Fields from consideration. The following are a summary of remarks associated with the conversation. BR noted in reading the comments how little there was from folks about wanting fields. Instead they were more interested in open space. Susan Robinson agreed. Fields are more of an exercise than a reality due to cost. JV suggested the group remove the scheme because it is too costly and does not meet many of the County and APS urgent needs. EG noted that moving utilities is costly up front but in the long run maybe not. The group asked staff to see if they could fit a field adjacent to Hayes Park in one of the schemes.

The group agreed to keep three Buck only schemes and 2 Arland only schemes. JF noted that the next activity will reconcile the Buck and Carlin Springs schemes and create “scenarios” that pair one Buck scheme with one Carlin Springs scheme.

What Fits Activity Part 2--Schemes

Bryna Helfer (BH) introduced activity. KK described instructions for adding complementary uses. SR asked that we make sure there is an opportunity to speak/brainstorm about long-term ideas. BH stated that the activity included an opportunity to do that as well this evening.

The group brainstormed possible complementary uses. The group then broke out into two groups, one to work on the three Buck only schemes and the other to work on the two Buck with Arland land swap schemes.

The group reconvened at the main table at the end of the exercise and discussed the revised schemes.

The group then discussed long-term uses for the schemes.

1. What is conducive to long-term?
 - a. Arland storage center is not.
 - b. Reuse of buildings because it is low investment and add do things with it. Leaves options. Some concern was expressed about the process moving quickly. GG stated that it is moving fast, but we aren't skipping any steps. Will slow down after the end of Phase 2. We need to do the needs assessment with the County to better understand the needs before we can fully appreciate the long-term needs.
 - c. Building new buildings is not short term. SR stated that if we build new buildings we need to know what long term use is going to be, but that won't be known in a couple of months.
 - d. Low investment is conducive to long term.
2. What would we like to know more about as we consider the long-term uses for the site?
 - a. School's needs (administrative and seats)
 - b. County Public Spaces Master Plan (currently being updated)
 - c. What does it take, how much does it cost to deck over I-66?
 - d. Arts Master Plan
 - e. Budget

3. Given that low investment is most flexible, what could be added in the long-term?
 - a. SR noted that Buck and Carlin Springs are highly desirable and we don't want to make long term decisions now. Short-term is good.
 - b. Opportunities for land acquisition R-5, could make certain things more possible.
 - c. Increase park land
 - d. I-66 decking – GB noted that we need to explore if this is viable what would be the constraints, costs. Tim O'Hora (TO) stated that VDOT owns the airspace. He said he spoke to the broker that worked on the DC decking deal who stated it took 16 years of process to get to this point. Cost is immense. Need to have commercial partnership to make it financially viable. Involved 6 different agencies which is why it took so long, a lot of litigation.
 - e. Consider reusing existing I-66 deck or deck over another highway. Need to consider ingress/egress. Consider adding buffer along I-66.

There was some discussion regarding the life of the buildings at Buck. June Locker (JL) noted that they are close to mid-life and would require some investment to extend life.

What Fits Activity Part 2--Strawman

The group directed staff to develop test fits for the schemes that represented the groups work.

Announcements and Public Comment

Maurya Meiers stated that her neighbors are unhappy about the process because they don't have representation from neighborhood on the committee. Thank you for referring to presentation. Tonight's conversation about long term was great. Would have preferred to talk about long term first. Think about process and how much you are being asked to do.

Dawn Cooper noted that cost was discussed tonight. One of the schemes was kicked off due to cost, however that is a tier 3 use consideration. She ready the County staff prepared project requirements fact sheet and had questions. JF directed her to JL for follow-up. What other locations are you looking at besides Carlin Springs for the urgent needs? Fear there is no other location at this point. Schemes narrowed down to five. I know you removed dense scenarios but to the neighbors the remaining schemes look dense. Asked why Buck is more desirable location for buses than Carlin Springs when Carlin Springs has four lane road and Buck only has two. She also expressed concern about the pace of the process. She asked if the subcommittee saw the materials in advance. JV said yes.

Sharon Valencia suggested that one of the criteria is to be creative. She said she thought tonight was great. Would like to see JFAC consider what is temporary, what is surge, and space requirements. Feel like neighborhood is being squeezed especially with Ed Center being considered for new school. She also asked what was happening with affordable housing.

SL appreciates school space being considered as temporary on Buck site. He mentioned example of Klyde Warren Park in Dallas, TX that decked over a highway. The structure cost \$48M, total to build \$90M with amenities.

RE said that for such a walkable neighborhood buses, impound or storage make sense.

Adjourn

GB closed the meeting at 10:07pm.