



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 #2
 7:00 PM, Wednesday, March 8, 2017
 Conference Room 311
 2100 Clarendon Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

Meeting Minutes-Final

Attendees

JFAC:

Ginger Brown
 Laura Simpson
 Susan Cunningham
 Todd McCracken
 William Ross

County Staff:

Lisa Maher-DES
 Jennifer Fioretti-DPR
 Michelle Congdon-DES
 Tim O’Hora-DES

APS Staff

Others:

Dawn Cooper
 Steve Leutner
 Maurya Meiers
 Tom Wolfe

Welcome

Attendees introduced themselves. Ginger Brown (GB) distributed the draft minutes from the February 22 subcommittee meeting for participants to review. GB noted that the full JFAC would discuss the draft use considerations and evaluation framework, as it comes out of this subcommittee meeting, on March 15, so the next scheduled Buck Subcommittee meeting on March 14 would be cancelled.

Jennifer Fioretti (JF) summarized the Carlin Springs Subcommittee’s discussion on the first draft of the use considerations and evaluation framework. While there was robust discussion on almost all the considerations, particularly important points emphasized regarding the use considerations included the following:

- Considerations that must be met are the first “tier” that should be evaluated.
- Cost considerations should be moved to the end of the list to convey that these are not the most important factors.
- The availability of alternative sites for each use is very important and represents an opportunity cost. It’s critical to know if there is no alternative site.
- Urgency of use provides a prioritization among the uses.
- Proximity to service demand can be used to eliminate certain uses.
- A separate category should be devoted to future uses.
- Neighborhood characteristics should be separated from regulatory items.
- Community input collected during the use determination process should be added.
- More environmental impacts should be added, including natural resources, climate, and heat island effects.

Todd McCracken (TM) and Susan Robinson (SR) were tasked with testing evaluations using the considerations list to see if it works without weighting. If unsuccessful, then they should establish and apply weights.

Use Considerations and Framework

Ginger Brown (GB) reviewed the considerations list with revisions per the Carlin Springs Subcommittee discussion. The following list summarizes those that were discussed further:

- “Availability of alternative sites” should be revised to “only site that meets needs”, since the complete unavailability of any alternatives is most important.
- “Solves an identified need” can be evaluated by considering various possibilities, such as various forms (size/configuration/efficiency due to colocation) of a facility or the potential of additional property acquisition if that flexibility is available.
- “Proximity to service demand” can be either a go/no go consideration in some cases, or an “important”, “nice to have”, or “unimportant” consideration in other cases.
- “Building reusability” could be either of existing buildings on the site or of longer term changes in use of new buildings constructed for more urgent uses.
- “Land use compatibility” should include additional impact factors, such as hours of use and seasonality.
- “Local traffic and parking congestion” triggered significant discussion of current and future traffic, impacts of traffic on the facility uses being considered, and also impacts of facility traffic on the surrounding neighborhood. In addition, the point was made that traffic could or should be expanded to include walkability and other transportation-related impacts.
- Equity considerations should have their own category.
- “Other documented community input” should be conveyed as broader than written.
- Security considerations should be two-way—on and from the considered facility uses.
- Displacement of existing uses should be added.
- GLUP and zoning items should include both whether they are compatible, and if not, the likelihood of changing them to be compatible.
- Some of the site suitability and environmental considerations overlap and should be clarified/reorganized. As written, there is some confusion about whether these items describe negative characteristics that need to be eliminated for use of the site, features that could have value, or something else.
- Some existing natural resources should be added as features to consider, such as streams.
- It was agreed that an item about “biophilic cities” should not be added, because Arlington has not identified as one.
- The concept of sustainability is important but not captured in the considerations. There was significant discussion about whether to add it, what it would include, and how that would be evaluated. Perhaps it should convey energy conservation-related measures for the uses, which may or may not be associated more with facility design than with use consideration.
- Historic/archeological issues should not be included with the environmental consideration.
- Cost considerations should be evaluated based on order of magnitude rather than detailed cost estimates.

The subcommittee discussed the evaluation framework options and agreed with the Carlin Springs subcommittee that the preference is for colors. William Ross (WR) noted that if the colors don’t work out well, they can be revised to another scale.

Work Plan

GB briefly reviewed the updated version of the work plan.

Announcements and Public Comment

First, the subcommittee considered the February 22 meeting minutes, with one correction to the name of a public speaker. William Ross (WR) moved to approve the minutes as corrected, and TM seconded the motion. The subcommittee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

GB announced the cancellation of the scheduled March 14 subcommittee meeting, noting that the entire JFAC would discuss the use considerations at its March 15 meeting. The next subcommittee meeting will be March 29, to discuss the schedule, budget, and process timeline. A status report will be forwarded to the County Board by April 5 or 12. Potential uses for the sites will be identified later in April.

Maurya Meiers (MM) urged the subcommittee to consider characteristics of the Quincy Park North neighborhood and take into account expected future development in the vicinity that will affect the neighborhood. Demographic changes over time should also be considered. MM noted that Quincy Park North is missing certain amenities such as a neighborhood elementary school and a community center. She suggested a consideration of the opportunity for connections among amenities within the neighborhood and also the effect of various potential uses on property values. MM also emphasized the importance of defining the considerations so their intent is clear, being careful about how the scale is applied, and the value of having each member rate the considerations independently before discussing them together to reduce the likelihood that members with stronger opinions would skew the outcome from what each of the members individually think. She recommended that the subcommittee consult someone with expertise in survey instruments.

GB and WR discussed with MM how and when the neighborhood and/or civic association would make a presentation to the subcommittee about their proposals of what uses and configuration of uses should go on the Buck site.

Steve Leutner (SL) stated that the community's recommendations would be similar to those from the 1984 Neighborhood Conservation Plan. He also suggested that when the subcommittee develops overall ratings for the considerations that they note whether the ratings show general agreement among the members or are a product/averaging of individual ratings that disagree significantly.

Adjourn