



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 #2
 7:00 PM, Thursday, March 2, 2017
 9th Floor, 913 Conference Room
 2100 Clarendon Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

JFAC:

Greg Greeley
 Cicely Whitfield
 Eric Goldstein
 Gabriel Rubalcava
 Jerry Gidner
 Matthew De Ferranti
 Rachel Silberman
 Steve Young
 Susan Cunningham
 Susan Robinson
 Rodney Turner

County Staff:

Jill Griffin-AED
 Jennifer Fioretti-DPR
 June Locker-DES
 Tim O’Hora-DES

Others:

Lois Koontz

Meeting Summary

Approval of Minutes

Greg Greeley (GG) presented the minutes to the subcommittee for its review and approval. Steve Young (SY) moved and Rachel Silberman (RS) seconded. The subcommittee approved the minutes unanimously.

Work Plan

Rather than immediately discussing the use considerations and framework per the agenda, GG reviewed the agenda and draft work plan/schedule (distributed) to explain how this meeting fits into the general schedule. He explained that the work over these next couple of subcommittee meetings is similar to homework: not fun; something to get through; important to build values and understanding.

Use Considerations & Framework

GG reviewed the use considerations strawman (distributed). Jennifer Fioretti (JF) explained that the list was predominately pulled from the Community Facilities Study (p A-152). GG asked the subcommittee to think about the list, what needs to be added or changed to help frame and evaluate the sites.

General discussion: There were numerous questions by the subcommittee: how the use considerations would be used; would they be the same for Carlin Springs and Buck; what the Tier 1 notation meant; etc. Both GG and JF provided answers to these various questions. The use considerations would be used to analyze the prioritized uses as identified by the County and APS. At first, the use considerations for both sites would be the same but, as iterative analysis and testing was done with the considerations, a change may be necessary.

The Tier 1 notation was designed to impart a “yes/no” decision point of whether the site was suitable for a particular use. If no, the site was no longer considered at all. There was further discussion around the iterative nature of the use considerations – for the uses to determine if the properties should be acquired and then later to determine sites for uses. Jerry Gidner (JG) suggested that the exercise was going to be a “learn by doing” exercise – with agreement from the subcommittee. However, JG suggested that we not lose sight of the long term.

Gabriel Rubalcava (GR) asked the amount of time to work through the considerations and the framework – a horizontal and vertical evaluation. GG responded that the next several meetings would include this evaluation with a status report in mid-April.

Steve Young (SY) requested clarification about other needs outside of the list (i.e. affordable housing, parks). There was some general discussion around this and how these other needs and/or aspirational goals found within adopted plans and policies are addressed. JF reiterated the County Board charge to consider the immediate needs. These additional needs *may* be considered as complementary uses further in the evaluation.

Cost category discussion: The overall consensus was to place cost further down within the use considerations. Costs should not be the driving factor for consideration of the site – particularly with respect to long term uses. Susan Robinson (SR) introduced the concept of critical nature and suggested that the County not forego critical needs due to a cost.

This conversation led to discussion about prioritization of the immediate needs of the County and APS. Staff explained that there was not prioritization per se, but rather general timing for certain uses. Susan Cunningham (SC) reiterated the long term nature of analysis – the CIP is only a 10-year horizon. Certain uses are cyclical in nature (schools) and some reach a saturation point (fire coverage).

General category discussion: Eric Goldstein (EG) suggested the creation of a new category for future uses. Matthew De Ferranti (MD) suggested the use considerations needed to address the urgency of the use compared with the availability of alternatives. The subcommittee agreed with both suggestions.

SY suggested that documented community input should be a use consideration. JG stated that considerations needed to differentiate between documented (i.e. letters or reports from civic associations to the County Board) versus collected (input at meetings). The positions could be quite different.

Clarification around diversity and equity resulted in Eric Goldstein (EG) suggesting a new category for neighborhood characteristics. This category could address both geographic and demographic equity. The subcommittee agreed.

Zoning/Surrounding Land Use category discussion: No extensive conversation.

Site suitability discussion: Recommended to pull out building reuseability and site expansion to future use category. Change “conductive” to security requirements to “adaptability.”

Environmental category discussion: SY requested that additional categories be added to address numerous natural resources. MD didn’t disagree but thought the entirety of the Natural Resources Plan seemed too large. GG suggested this be a homework topic. JG stated that there needed to be an understanding of the existing site characteristics and how a proposed use may change those characteristics.

Legal Constraints category discussion: No extensive conversation.

Utilities Access category discussion: No extensive conversation.

Framework discussion: The subcommittee agreed they wanted something easy and rather than starting with weighted scores – test to see if necessary. JG stated that he liked the colors from a visual perspective. SR liked the numbers and suggested that numbers be placed in the colors.

Announcements and Public Comment

At the end of the discussion, GG asked for a couple of volunteers to start testing the various projects against the sites.

JF reminded the subcommittee that a large forum (250 people) would be held to help confirm/verify the work of the JFAC.

There were no speakers at public comment.