



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
 VHC Agreement (Carlin Springs) Subcommittee**

Meeting #3
 7:00 PM, Thursday, March 30, 2017
 4th Floor, 406 Conference Room
 2100 Clarendon Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

JFAC:

Greg Greeley
 Cicely Whitfield
 Gabriel Rubalcava
 Jerry Gidner
 Rachel Silberman
 Steve Young
 Susan Cunningham
 Rodney Turner

County Staff:

Jill Griffin-AED
 Jennifer Fioretti-DPR
 June Locker-DES
 Allison Blanchard -DES
 Bryna Helfer-CMO
 Kris Krider-CPHD
 Brett Wallace-CPHD
 Kristina Frazier-CPHD

Others:

Rick Epstein

Meeting Summary

Welcome

Greg Greeley (GG) provided an overview of the agenda with his proposed changes: approval of minutes shifted to the end; SWOC exercise flipped with the use considerations and framework. Jennifer Fioretti (JF) provided a more detailed explanation of the various agenda items and how the results fit into the broader subcommittee work.

SWOC

Bryna Helfer (BH) and Kris Krider (KK) described the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Constraints (SWOC) exercise in detail: BH the overview and KK the details.

The group broke into three groups. One group started with the Carlin Springs site, one with the Lee Highway site and the third with 16th Street N properties plus the cash option. Each group went through the SWOC for each site and then switched sites. Group members added to the SWOC comments built by the original group. The groups returned to their original starting point and then reviewed the comments. One member of each group reported out on the top three comments from each SWOC category. The groups were then given three different color dots to identify each individual’s top three comments for each SWOC category. BH summarized the activity. JF explained that the SWOC comments would be used to create “illustrative” base maps for the “What Fits” activity and would also be used to confirm the use considerations and tiering framework.

Results from this activity are captured in a separate document.

Use Considerations & Framework

GG reviewed the purpose statement and posed the first of four questions.

Q1: Do you generally agree with the proposed Phase 2 Use Determination Process purpose statement?
Susan Cunningham (SC) requested language be added to address the VHC transaction.

Rodney Turner (RT) suggested the statement be restructured.

Steve Young (SY) stated that there was confusion around APS needs. There was general consensus around this point. GG stated that this issue came up in the Joint Commissions/Stakeholders meeting. SC pointed out that three major decisions are required by June: Carlin Springs, Buck and the high school. There was additional conversation around long term school needs and the implications.

GG asked about the near term/long term element of the purpose statement. SC and RT joined the discussion about defining the terms.

Gabriel Rubalcava (GR) asked if the purpose was becoming too specific and too long.

Cicely Whitfield (CW) suggested that the cash scenario seemed to be an afterthought. She further stated that the construct with Arlington County and APS seemed to convey that every scenario required both and suggested that we use the term and/or.

General conversation to discuss flexibility and future opportunities for the long term.

RT read a revised purpose statement based on the subcommittee's conversation (separate document).

General conversation to add the charter, a timeline, definitions, context etc. as potential footnotes.

SY questioned if there was any bias as to acquisition due to existing uses. Urgent care, day care, etc. Could the County acquire and lease back? QUESTION: Can the County be a landlord?

Q2: Do you support the proposed use consideration framework? The subcommittee affirmed.

SC suggested that examples within the framework also include APS examples. It was suggested that APS needs are in the same format as the County needs – short term and long term.

SC also asked if it was possible to illustrate the three processes running simultaneously and how they will come together.

Q3: Do you support reducing/collapsing the overall number of use considerations? The subcommittee affirmed.

JF discussed the changes made to the framework based on the conversation with the Buck subcommittee. The Carlin Springs subcommittee agreed with the changes.

Jerry Gidner (JG) stated that JFAC is one point of information to the County Board for decisions – there are other stakeholders and the communities.

GG discussed the community forum in May and a presentation to the Civic Federation in April.

General conversation around APS activities and updates. Information will be distributed to JFAC.

Q4: Given that this is the first time the JFAC has developed use considerations and an evaluation framework, do you support an iterative process to modify the use considerations during phase 2?

SY asked about EIA/EIS for the sites. JF responded it was part of due diligence and would share what could be shared.

CW asked that the term “Alternative” be changed to “Scenario.”

Announcements and Public Comment

Rick Epstein spoke during public comment. He raised concern about the potential need for 4 – 6 new school sites. As there are no easy sites, he suggested that, although not popular, Carlin Springs may have to be a site. APS planning needs to incorporate creativity and flexibility. JFAC should push for the planning process.

Approval of Minutes

GG presented the minutes to the subcommittee for its review and approval. GR moved and JG seconded. The subcommittee approved the minutes unanimously.

SY asked about the framework and suggested that the check sign be replaced with a different graphic. It was agreed that an asterisk be used.

Meeting adjourned.