

Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee
October 11, 2018

Meeting Minutes – APPROVED

Meeting location: Navy League Building
2300 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22201

1. Roll Call and Brief Neighborhood Report
 - a. Phil Klingelhofer announced that the residents of the Boulevard Manor CA are happy with the newly completed NC sidewalk/trail project.
 - b. Sarah McKinley announced that next Monday the Columbia Heights CA will hold a debate of the County Board candidates and Tannia Talento (School Board member) will discuss the Elementary School redistricting process.
 - c. Bill Braswell informed the Committee about the BLPC for the proposed Reed Elementary School, noting there has been good consensus among the BLPC members and the project and their work is moving along well.
 - d. Alex Luchenitser – noted the Final Design Presentation for Waverly Hills’ 20th Rd. N sidewalk project will be occurring soon.
 - e. Mike McDonald, president of the Woodmont CA, introduced himself to the group and is a new attendee to NCAC.
2. Approval of Minutes from September 13, 2018 NCAC Meeting:
 - a. It was requested that the final copy of the minutes spell out all acronyms.
 - b. The Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.
3. Officers and Staff Report
(none)
4. Discussion / Action Items:
 - a. Review and Vote on “Interim Project Scoping Modifications” List, dated October 4, 2018.
(Copy attached.)
Questions/Comments:
 - i. Stephanie Derrig asked how the \$500k limit takes project overruns into consideration.

Rob replied that NC Staff will perform analysis of projects first to give a ballpark on cost estimates, then if funded, the NCAC will have an opportunity to review and approve the project at the estimated construction cost.

Tim McIntosh added that staff recognizes some estimates may end up higher than \$500k. The NCAC members will need to decide how they want to deal with the overrun, with either flexibility or rejection of a project.

- ii. Kathy Reeder proposed an exception to #1 to allow projects already qualified during prior funding rounds not be limited to \$500,000.

Rob suggested the exception be voted on as an amendment after #1 is fully discussed by the group.

- iii. Claudia Fedder asked the following:

Do NC Representatives work with staff to determine the projects that fall within the \$500k limit?

Rob – Yes, staff can also look at possibly breaking a project into smaller components, for example, 2 separate blocks.

Tim - consider not looking at full blown sidewalk projects for this interim phase.

What is the deadline for submitting projects for swapping out?

Tim – as of right now, the plan is to stick with the current NC deadlines for project submissions.

- iv. Deborah Wood asked what the method for assessing projects that will be likely to fall under \$500k.

Tim replied that NC Staff will work with engineering staff in DES to create rough cost estimates, and these would occur earlier in the process than typically done on NC Projects.

- v. Bill noted that several project cost drivers are ancillary services from DES, such as underground utilities, and asked if they are still included under this interim list?

Tim responded yes, but along with estimating, staff will request more money and time spent early in the process to determine if things such as storm water improvements are needed.

Bill asked if the current practice of including 35% contingency cost overage will continue to be included in the estimates.

Tim explained that the contingency is typically 20% to 30%, and he will discuss that with DES staff, but as of right now, no change should be assumed.

- vi. Alex suggested the \$500,000 limit in the draft be amended to include that if the project cost goes over the limit by a reasonable amount, this will not make a project lose its place in the queue.

Rob suggested that this be reflected in the minutes, and be the accepted understanding of the NCAC and NC Staff, rather than a formal amendment to #1.

- vii. Brent Buriss asked what the cost estimates are for the 2 currently qualified projects. He noted that if large, they will swallow all the available funds for any smaller ones.

Tim informed the group that the Long Branch Creek street light project is estimated at around \$1 million, and the Glencarlyn sidewalk project is around \$2 million. If both

are funded now, it is likely that they would be the only two projects over this next bond cycle.

Brent asked if the Long Branch Creek project would be prevented from being built now because the Street Light Master Plan is still incomplete.

Tim recommended staying away from street light projects until the County Board adopts the master plan, and noted that this is covered in #3 of the Interim draft.

- viii. Claudia asked if a private community could contribute funds for a project.

Tim replied that he would have to check the bond fund rules, but most likely not.

- ix. Eileen Janas suggested allowing the two already qualified projects wait until the next bond cycle in 2020, as first priority, to be built ahead of all other projects.

Rob replied that he would be hesitant to do that, as the NCAC may make different project and spending decisions in the future that cannot be predicted at this time.

- x. Kathy stated that she is not in favor of deferring the Glencarlyn project, and prefers splitting the project into two.

- xi. Jackie Wilson commented that the points process is intended to help make decisions, and perhaps adjusting the point process, such as increase points for ones that are under the \$500k limit, could help with this.

Rob explained that changes to the points allocation system is a slow process. It typically takes several months to review and come up with a recommendation for the NCAC to approve.

- xii. Bill made a motion to accept #1. The motion was seconded by Jerry Paull.

Kathy made a motion to amend #1, by adding "with the exception of already qualified street improvement projects."

The amendment was seconded by Ed Hilz.

Howard asked if this means that if one of those projects cost \$2 million, all of that amount would have to be funded.

The group replied "Yes."

Kathy clarified that the intent of the proposed amendment is to ensure a project not be excluded because of its size, and then be required to wait until the next bond cycle to get funded.

Bill stated that the intent of temporarily setting a limit of \$500,000 is to ensure more than only 2 or 3 projects can be funded over this next bond cycle.

Alex remarked that it would be imprudent to accept the amendment, as it prevents having many neighborhoods benefit from the NC Program and instead limits benefit to only one or two, decreasing the chances of the program surviving.

Claudia Fedder commented that she believes she and other members of the group struggle with how to acknowledge and recognize Glencarlyn, feeling it should be prioritized but within this limited scope.

A vote was taken on the amendment: Aye – 7 / Nay – 17 / Abstain – 2

A vote was taken on acceptance of #1, as written: Aye – 23 / Nay – 3 / Abstain - 1

xiii. Discussion began on #2.

Tim stated staff's recommendation for a large project that has been swapped out with a smaller/less expensive project by a civic association, the large project pulled would go to the bottom of the points list.

xiv. Darcey Cuffman noted the unfortunate nature of having to do this, but agreed that projects over \$500,000 should wait. She hopes useful guidance will be received by the working group that will review the program.

Bill informed the group that the County will appoint a working group over the next few months, and the NCAC needs to show super management of this program, as there has been criticism of the program.

xv. Bill made a motion to accept #2. The motion was seconded by Jerry Paull.

Alex made a friendly amendment that small projects inherit all points and large ones that were swapped out get to keep 1/2 of their points.

The amendment was seconded by John Kirkpatrick.

A vote was taken on Alex's friendly amendment: Aye – 10 / Nay – 17 / Abstain – 1

Phil proposed to amend #2 by adding that a larger project that has been swapped out goes to the bottom of the points list.

The amendment was seconded by Howard Solodky.

A vote was taken on Phil's amendment: Aye – 17 / Nay – 7 / Abstain – 4

A vote was taken on acceptance of #2 (with Phil's amendment): Aye – 20 / Nay – 3 / Abstain - 4

xvi. Bill made a motion to accept numbers 3 and 4 as written, and 5 with an amendment to change "skip over a typical street improvement project" to skip over all projects".

The motion with amendment to #5 was seconded by Eileen.

A vote was taken on acceptance of #3, #4, and #5 as amended: Aye – 27 / Nay – 0 / Abstain - 1

5. Other/New Business:

None.

6. Meeting adjourned.

NCAC Meeting October 2018 - ATTACHMENT

Interim Project Scoping Modifications to the NC Program – DRAFT

October 4, 2018

Due to the reduction in funding for the NC Program to \$5M for the upcoming 2-year bond cycle, the following modifications to the scoping and design of NC projects are proposed:

1. A total funding limit of \$500,000 in NC funds for projects will be imposed.
2. Neighborhoods with a typical street improvement project with curb, gutter and sidewalk in the proposed project queue over \$500,000 are strongly encouraged to re-evaluate it. Such projects which can be reasonably subdivided into two or more separate NC projects under \$500,000 should be so subdivided. Any neighborhood which has a project in the queue which cannot be reasonably subdivided can propose a smaller project instead, and the neighborhood would keep its place in the queue where the larger project currently sits. However, queue order is not a guaranty of the order in which projects will be proposed for funding by the NCAC.
3. There is a moratorium on street light projects until the streetlight management plan is approved by the County Board.
4. The types of project that can be funded include:
 - Beautification projects
 - Residential intersection improvements
 - Curb extensions
 - Missing sidewalk segments for three properties or less
 - Trail connector improvements
 - Modest DPR park and playground installations
 - Modest street improvement projects
5. The NCAC has the ability to skip over a typical street improvement project in the proposed project queue if a neighborhood chooses not to substitute in a project within the proposed \$500,000 funding limit.