

JOINT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM, Wednesday, April 25, 2018
Navy League Building
2300 Wilson Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

MEETING SUMMARY

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair: Ginger Briggs Brown	Todd McCracken
Vice-Chair: Gregory Greeley	Devanshi Patel
Theodore Black	Susan G. Robinson
Susan Cunningham	William Ross
Mathew de Ferranti	Christina Diaz-Torres
Jerry Gidner	Rodney Turner
Eric Goldstein	Janine Velasco
Joseph Leitmann-Santa Cruz	

MEMBERS ABSENT: Angelika Goodman, Katie Rouse, Rachel Silberman, Cicely Whitfield, Steve Young

BOARD MEMBERS: Reid Goldstein, Arlington Public Schools Board
Libby Garvey, Arlington County Board; Erik Gutshall, Arlington County Board

STAFF PRESENT: George May, Jennifer Smith, Arlington County
John Chadwick, Sarah Johnson, Robert Ruiz, Lisa Stengle, Arlington Public Schools

1. Welcome
 - The meeting was called to order by Chair Ginger Brown at 7:01 PM, quorum present.
 - Chair Brown provided an overview of the agenda.

2. Chair’s Report
 - Approval of the February 28, 2018 Meeting Minutes: Chair Brown motioned and Susan Cunningham seconded with no change.
 - Chair Brown announced that the next JFAC meeting will be May 30th at Key Elementary School. The specific meeting room was not known. *Update: the meeting will take place in the multi-purpose room.*

3. Discussion of Process to Define the JFAC 2018 Work Program: Chair Brown
 - Chair Brown facilitated a discussion of a document, “JFAC: Framework for the 2018-19 Work Plan”, which was drafted at a “two-by-two” meeting.
 - Chair Brown noted that to develop a scope for a long-range plan for County and APS facilities through 2035, per the JFAC Framework document, there is a need to form sub-committees on various topics, including:

- Research best practices
- Work with staff and possible consultant on an inventory of all County and APS facilities. With an assessment of condition, location, accessibility, and opportunities for bridging those gaps in accessibility.
- Produce a needs analysis. It was asserted that the County does not have a handle on long-range need beyond the CIP timeframe.
- Assess expected demographic growth over time and identify where growth is likely to occur.
- The Chair will send an e-mail asking who wants to join a committee.
- The JFAC Framework document also asks that JFAC envision what types of public facilities are likely to be needed in the future. Chair Brown offered several examples of questions that the envisioning sub-committee could address: How might libraries fit within other facilities, such as schools, etc.? What is the future of schools and how are these facilities changing? What is happening around the world that we should know about to inform long-range planning efforts?
- Vice-Chair Greeley noted that at the prior JFAC meeting there was feedback on this topic and he and the Chair are trying to be responsive to the feedback. A priority is to define what a long-range plan looks like. He noted that JFAC was charged with visioning; see what facilities could look like. For example, at Arlington Mill there is a pop-up library.
- Eric Goldstein asked, what is meant by developing a “scope.”
 - Chair Brown answered that it defines what are JFAC’s principals, what are we trying to achieve, what type of plan do we want.
 - County Board Member Gutshall asserted that JFAC must tackle long-range planning while accommodating pressing immediate needs. The JFAC Framework document is a plan to get to a plan. The scoping asks: what does that plan look like, what are the components? Then JFAC can address true long-range planning. The point is to get out of the “spin cycle” on short-term and make sure we work on long-term.
- Todd McCracken asked if there was consideration given to thinking about specific needs, for example needed amount of land for schools. Chair Brown answered that FAC would be brought into such a discussion.
- Susan Robinson asked if the product from this work would become a component of the comprehensive plan? Chair Brown answered that it is open to consideration and if that was the case JFAC would need a good reason.
- William Ross noted that thinking about the discussion on facility needs, makes him think about land acquisition. Chair Brown answered that the intention is for a sub-committee to look at inventory and see if we have the land that we need. Vice-Chair Greeley noted that he fully expects land acquisition to be a tool that we need to use.
- Chair Brown noted that another topic of JFAC Framework document is how does it review the Capital Improvement Plans (CIP). The Chair noted that for the current CIP process, a key question is how does JFAC review the CIP considering other committees are reviewing it, such as FAC. In addition, should JFAC get involved when there are joint projects, such as the Career Center. Should there be a place holder for the Career Center in the current CIP or should it be included in the next CIP.
 - Vice-Chair Greeley reiterated these questions by asking “what does our role look like, how do we weigh in” on the CIP.
 - Jerry Gidner wondered if JFAC should be looking at the CIP right now, especially since it deals with short-term projects. Is it worth our time right now?
 - County Board Member Gutshall noted that this is his first round of working on a CIP. His general sense is that there are no well-defined processes for identifying opportunities for creative ideas on the CIP and making sure that the APS and County CIPs are aligned. He asked that JFAC look at the CIP critically and offer its input.

- Susan Robinson stated that the “joy of CIP” is it is dynamic and it is revised every two years. She offered that it is important to offer comment on the next iteration of the CIP.
 - School Board Member Reid observed that there are different pressures that inform the County and APS’ CIP.
 - Todd McCracken stated that what is unique about JFAC is that it is thinking long-term. He opined that JFAC should focus on long-term thinking and have that thinking inform priorities with County and APS proposed projects.
 - Susan Cunningham had a concern about the involvement of staff regarding envisioning. She wants to make sure that roles for sub-committees and staff be defined. In addition, she wants there to be cutting edge staff available to assist JFAC and that there is staff and community ownership.
 - The Chair responded that there will be consultant services available and that inter-disciplinary staff will assist on these projects.
 - County Board Member Gutshall said there is a commitment to get resources to this committee. He further stated that this work will be a shared vision of community and inter-disciplinary staff.
 - There was another question regarding defining a scope.
 - The Vice-Chair responded that for him a “scope” is similar to an outline of a paper.
 - The Chair noted that JFAC will need to work on items on the “two-by-two” list.
 - There was a question about the timeline for targeted deliverables and if there will be another lull in the summer. Chair Brown answered that JFAC will have to figure out at a June subcommittee meeting about the timeline for work.
 - Mathew de Ferranti stated that for him a long-term period is four-to-five years. He further stated that there is a need for JFAC’s insight on the CIP. He opined that if we don’t manage priorities well for next four or five years, then the social contract might be weakened by then. He advocates for a JFAC sub-committee look at the current CIP.
 - The Chair agreed to set up a subcommittee for CIP.
 - There was a question about when will the Schools CIP be approved. Staff answered June 21st.
 - There was a question about Schools CIP projects that include TBD for location. Chair Brown mentioned that JFAC might be able to contribute input on location. The inventory process will help for this purpose.
 - The Vice-Chair stated his desire for JFAC to hold public forums on the CIP. A round table is an option, perhaps in two-years.
 - William Ross opined that there was a lot of public engagement for the budget, but he does not see the same type of engagement with the CIP. Thinking ahead to the future, he asked how do we engage in the CIP? County Board Member Gutshall said that the County Manager will release his proposed CIP in early May.
4. Presentation, “Career Center Working Group: CIP considerations that impact the FY 2019-28 CIP and beyond”: Sarah Johnson, APS
- After the presentation by Sarah Johnson, Vice-Chair Greeley explained that the Career Center Working Group (CCWG) has reached general consensus on massing for the school and that this is a massing that can accommodate the projected students. He also noted that there is just enough parking for current uses, but that the CCWG needs to consider parking in the future since everything that is surface parking today will need to be changed to fields. There are possibilities in the interim to use off-site parking while the surface lots are converted into fields.
 - After a question regarding the location of library, the Vice-Chair noted that those representing the library want it to be on Columbia Pike. The library located at the Career Center is currently the second most utilized in the County. The library provides multiple services beyond a traditional library.

- The Vice-Chair also noted that the CCWG needs to consider the capital plan for the project. Because of the rising interest rate environment and the need to consider the County's bond rating, the project will need to be done in phases.
- Mathew de Ferranti asked what would happen to the Patrick Henry Elementary School. The Vice-Chair answered that in the short-term, Patrick Henry stays. But in the longer-term, if Patrick Henry is relocated elsewhere, there will be an option to get two fields where the elementary school is currently located. This scenario is an aspiration for the group in the long-term.
- The Vice-Chair observed that neighbors who are advocating for a neighborhood high school think that it should have the same amenities as other schools, including pools. The question is if we can afford it.
- There was a question about how tall the school might be. The Vice-Chair answered that in the massing studies the tallest portion would be facing the current AT&T building. The areas that face residential streets would be tapered from 2-3 stories.
- Mathew de Ferranti said that the last CIP assessed that we need more high school seats. The current CIP also calls for a need in elementary school seats. Mr. de Ferranti asked, can 800 students fit in the current career center building? The Vice-Chair answered that JFAC should consider what is beyond the 10-year time horizon and should address what a second phase looks like. Lastly, 800 students cannot fit in the current career center building.
- Theodore Black asked if there has been conversation about making the high school more adaptable for community use. Such that it could function as a community center, for example.
 - William Ross followed by stating that this building should be part of the community.
 - Susan Robinson answered that there is not a school that does not have a community use.
 - Theodore Black responded that the schools are not optimized for community use.
- Susan Cunningham asserted that we should think about flexibility across ages in school facilities. The Vice-Chair answered that the interior of that existing building is flexible.

5. Presentation, "Buck Property": John Chadwick, APS

- During the presentation by John Chadwick regarding APS' potential use of the Buck site for the white fleet vehicles, there was a question related to start time of drivers. Mr. Chadwick responded that drivers will pick up vehicles in the morning and leave their own vehicle at the buck site. HVAC technicians start at 4AM. It gives schools an opportunity to have HVAC systems repaired before school starts. There are other shifts throughout the day 3:30 to 5:30 to start their day.
- Eric Goldstein asked why is JFAC being shown this information, what are we going to decide?
 - The Chair said JFAC can talk about mitigating factors, if any.
 - County Board Member Gutshall said JFAC should evaluate this in light of the phase 2 analysis, is this consistent or inconsistent with Phase 2 analysis? Could it fit here? Not another in-depth analysis asking for advice to the Board on whether this could go in the Buck site.
- A member asked if there would be a community based input process. The county needs to get involved in setting up process to tend to site, mitigation strategies.
 - John Chadwick responded that there was no County request to have a working group, rather they requested that APS talk to the community.
- Mathew de Ferranti asked about how many spaces would be used by the white fleet. Mr. Chadwick responded no more than 40 vehicles at any one time.
- William Ross asked where maintenance is done. Mr. Chadwick responded at the Trade Center.
- Todd McCracken asked if most of the traffic would happen for limited hours in the morning and afternoon. Mr. Chadwick responded that this is correct and drivers would miss most of rush-hour.

6. Public Comment

- Cynthia Hilton, Cherrydale Citizens Association, commented:
 - There is a concern about the lack of public engagement that we were promised through JFAC before committing to uses of the Buck site.
 - At the last JFAC meeting, CCA was told about the police impound lot. We have not heard the outcome of the concerns we raised about the impound lot, and now, APS is adding its white fleet.
- Dawn Cooper commented:
 - It is very evident there was a breakdown in the JFAC process at the last meeting
 - Ms. Cooper thought JFAC was going to consider what should fit, not just what can fit. Issues from last meeting not resolved, what is status of phase 3?
 - Why expediting impound lot?
 - John May responded that his office hopes to have something to offer on phase 3 in early fall. Doing early study to see how the impound lot can fit.
- Steven Leutner commented:
 - This is a great opportunity for JFAC to create its own CIP.
 - Challenge the assumptions. Don't be boxed in by what is put on the table.
 - Think about leveraging commercial opportunities
 - Noted that the Buck property is zoned M-1, but asserted that according to the General Land Use Plan (GLUP) the site should be a low density residentially zoned property. The proposed use of the site is also inconsistent with the neighborhood plan.
 - He asked what has changed to put the white fleet on this site. Why the urgency, what changed?
- A member of the public stated the following:
 - No members from her community in JFAC.
 - Need input from members of the community.
 - Her community feels absent and neglected.
 - Expect that the uses at the Buck Property will bring noise.
 - What type of neighbor does the county want to be to our neighborhood?
- Nia Bagley said she is puzzled why this has been brought to JFAC
 - County Board Member Gutshall responded:
 - When the white fleet use comes before the Board, he will think about it as a temporary use.
 - The County needs to get through the next couple of years in accommodating growth with equitably and efficiently.
 - There is an opportunity to discuss mitigation options.
 - The reason this use was brought back to JFAC was to get the commission to validate if there was something not consistent with phase 2.
 - He will work so this does not become a precedent.
 - County Board Member Garvey responded:
 - There is a need to marry APS and County long-range planning
 - The County side needs to get up to speed with where APS is in long-range planning
 - The goal is to think long-term, but we also need to consider some short-term issues
 - The need for white fleet is that we have a whole lot of school buses because of student growth. As the Cube site lease runs out, the white fleet needs to move to allow buses parked at Cube site to park back at the Trade Center.
- Susan Cunningham said that what is inconsistent is the process to allow the temporary use of the white fleet, not the use based on what can fit.
- A member of the public commented that home owners who bought in the neighborhood did not have an expectation of the Buck site having uses such as the white fleet or impound lot.