



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 #7
 7:00 PM, Wednesday, May 10, 2017
 Key Elementary School Library
 2300 Key Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

Meeting Minutes-Final

Attendees

JFAC:

Ginger Brown
 Theodore Black
 Susan Cunningham
 Todd McCracken
 Susan Robinson
 William Ross
 Katie Rouse
 Janine Velasco

County Staff:

Jennifer Fioretti-DPR
 Kris Krider-CPHD
 June Locker-DES
 Lisa Maher-DES
 Tim O’Hora-DES
 Joseph Reshetar--ACFD

APS Staff:

Sarah Johnson

Others:

Nia Bagley
 Kelly Bingel
 Collier Cook
 Dawn Cooper
 Rick Epstein
 Steven Leutner
 Maurya Meiers
 David Tornquist
 Cara Trap
 Sharon Valencia
 Matt Weinstein

Welcome

Ginger Brown (GB) introduced the main purpose of the meeting—to review five scenarios consisting of pairs of schemes for the Buck and Carlin Springs sites that have complementary sets of primary, near term, uses. These scenarios were culled from the results of the previous week’s meetings of the two subcommittees. Ted Black (TB) requested that the subcommittee put together a list of things they would like to know about the projects/scenarios, as well as alternate ways of meeting the County’s urgent needs.

Approval of May 3 Subcommittee Minutes

The subcommittee approved the May 10 meeting minutes with one edit, change "Sue Robin" to "Sue Robinson" and one abstention Katie Rouse (KR).

What Fits Activity Part 2—Tier 2/3 Use Consideration Analysis

Jennifer Fioretti (JF) explained the terminology used in the scenarios. Kris Krider (KK) described how the Buck subcommittee scenarios were culled, refined, and combined with the Carlin Springs scenarios to result in five pairs of drawings. These combined scenarios focused on achieving the County’s and APS’s

urgent near term needs. On the Buck site, the scenarios kept both options with and without the Arcland self-storage facility, which preserves the County's option to undertake the proposed Arcland land swap or not. KK showed and summarized the five scenario pairs, which includes one with a school, one with affordable housing, and one with athletic fields, in addition to scenarios that maximize flexibility for introducing other uses in the long term. Susan Cunningham (SC) posed a question about consideration of higher vs. lower investments in the scenarios with new buildings, which could increase long term flexibility with use of temporary structures. June Locker (JL) responded with some information about the costs and utility associated with temporary structures for the various County uses.

In response to a question by William Ross (WR) about whether any urgent near term uses were not represented in the scenarios, JF responded that the north side shift change building was excluded, since it's preferable to combine with the salt storage, which is planned to remain on 26th Street, and is lower priority than the uses included in the scenarios. JL confirmed, in response to a question by Katie Rouse (KR), that police vehicles could be located anywhere in the County, although the central location of the Buck site makes that site preferable.

Lisa Maher (LM) summarized staff's draft evaluations of the tier 2 and 3 use considerations for the five combined scenarios, which were contained in one of the meeting handouts. Some use changes on each site since the first round of evaluations resulted in minor revisions to the scores for that site scenario. For many of the considerations, an average of the scores for the two sites would yield the overall score for the pair of sites in each scenario. For a few considerations, the score for the combined sites would not be the same as combining/averaging the scores for each site, and this issue will be discussed later in the meeting. WR reported that he undertook his own evaluation, adding numerical scores.

What Fits Activity Part 3—Buck and Carlin Springs Scenarios

The subcommittee next reviewed each of the five combined site scenarios, with advice from staff that since only five scenarios were under consideration at this point, with two representing the Arcland land swap and three not including the swap, they would probably want to keep five in order to present a wider variety of options in the Community Forum on May 24.

Scenario A:

GB asked why construction material staging was added back. KK responded that there was room left to add it back, which staff wanted to show because of the urgency of the need. Committee members and staff discussed keeping these staging areas as far from homes as possible, but at least some members believe that construction material staging is not appropriate at either site, and it would be difficult to get community support for County light industrial uses on either site if they include this use. In addition, for the Buck site, SC recommended moving ART bus parking as far away from the neighborhood as possible and maximizing green space in the south of the site. If remediation of contamination would be an impediment to adding green space, perhaps planters on top of the existing pavement could be used to achieve the same purpose.

SC raised the issue of short vs. long-term uses, and that if the County chooses to put a use on either site that will be there long term, a real investment should be made to maximize the efficiency of land use by building below ground and adding height to the building in order to combine uses as much as possible. Regarding temporary structures, if the County is not making long term choices, Chief Joseph Reshetar of the Arlington County Fire Dept. (JR) discussed which police and fire uses can be accommodated in a temporary structure and which have climate control and greater security needs. In addition, except for

items that are essentially being stored, which can be below ground, most of the police and fire needs must be met above ground, and the fire-related uses need to be near each other, as do the police uses. In response to a question about noise, JR noted that generators and compressors do not create much noise. In addition, they only run during weekday business hours, and some are located within buildings.

Subcommittee members discussed the fact that buildings on the Carlin Springs site in the various scenarios tend to be new buildings because the existing buildings can't be reused, and they also talked about where on the site new buildings should be located. Theodore Black (TB) suggested having clearer differentiation in the scenarios between reused and new buildings.

Scenario B:

KK noted that this scenario shows a lot of green space on the Buck site, significantly more than in Scenario A, although preserving that long term reduces the potential for site expansion within the site. In response to a question about the addition of construction material staging after the subcommittees had removed it from an earlier version, JL explained that material laydown at the Buck site would be for planned projects and would therefore be accessed during regular construction hours. Therefore, the major impact would be during weekday daytimes. In contrast, staging areas at the County's Trades Center include materials that need to be accessed during emergencies, which could be at any time or day of the week. Susan Robinson (SR) stated that the range of materials and times of use would need to be explicitly stated.

SR commented on the Buck site scenarios that include the Arcland self-storage facility. Allowing a private company to own part of the site would reduce the County's control over what uses and community impacts would occur over time. LM noted that the market for redevelopment of the Buck site with its current zoning has not been strong enough for redevelopment to occur. KK added that Arcland's interest in the site for self-storage use is likely an interim plan with the expectation that at some point in the future, the County would allow a more valuable use, such as residential. In that case, the County would be able to have significant control over future uses.

SR noted that Scenario B requires more investment in the Carlin Springs site. SR and SC discussed cost considerations related to constructing new buildings shown in this scenario, as well as layout of uses on the Carlin Springs site. SC commented that since land is limited, new buildings should go deeper into the ground and be taller than most buildings constructed on County land in the past. A taller building than shown in this scenario should be placed south of where it is shown—away from the neighborhood. There was some discussion of the needs and best location for community gardens, the fact that there are different preferences for park uses between passive and active, and which type of active uses, so at this point in planning the site it is probably better to show any park areas as general open space rather than specific uses. WR agreed with that suggestion.

Scenario C:

KK described this scenario as maximizing the adaptive reuse of buildings on the Buck site, and of longer term uses at Carlin Springs, including ART bus parking, which potentially could be moved underground in the long term. GB suggested that a building in the northern portion of the Carlin Springs site could be used for County or APS swing space until a longer term use for that location is developed. SC suggested that the uses of this building be labeled more generally, such as not specifying the type of school, or listing uses such as County or APS swing space or other future needs. There was some discussion of putting a nature center at the Carlin Springs site, whether in addition to others in the County, or as a replacement for an existing nature center, whose land could then be used for another purpose. WR and

SR asked whether any of the existing uses could remain, either temporarily, or to support swing space on the site.

Members discussed the police impound lot shown on the Buck site and received information from JL on the needs and impacts of this use, which would need to accommodate 20-40 cars, is fenced but could have a more decorative fence, and generates relatively little traffic. Janine Velasco (JV) observed that this scenario provides the most flexibility for the Carlin Springs site in the long run.

Scenario D:

KK described this scenario, which assumes the Arcland land swap having taken place. He emphasized the significant buffer from the residential neighborhood (Quincy Park North) to the south. It could also be possible to use some of the area that Arcland would lease back to the County for additional park uses. Subcommittee members discussed the impacts of the self-storage building, including height, massing, and the location of both the building and its parking. Tim O’Hora discussed some building options that Arcland might accept, including a lower building that would take up more of its site. While the self-storage use, density, height, and other elements would conform to the site’s zoning, the County could negotiate limitations or requirements for elements of the development such as those listed above (height, massing, site layout, parking location, etc.) and even negotiate limitations on longer term future by right development as conditions of the land swap. However, such a real estate deal would not be a public process.

JV commented that this scenario locks the County into less flexibility for long term uses of the site than other scenarios. SR pointed out that this scenario for the Buck site leaves the Carlin Springs site with more of the urgent County uses. In response to a question by SC as to what happened with earlier iterations of the scenarios that included more long term uses with taller and denser buildings, GB said that the scenarios being presented at this meeting were focusing more on the short term needs and did not intend to preclude those longer-term use ideas. SR felt that the uses shown for the Carlin Springs site looked more like medium term buildings that were shorter and took up more land, which was an inefficient use of the site, and not what the County should be building. KK suggested that County staff could revise the Carlin Springs portion of the scenario to better display the intent of the subcommittee.

KR noted, that in general, the scenarios with Arcland required significant new building on either or both sites in order to adequately accommodate the urgent County uses. GB, SR and SC all recommended a better arrangement of the uses on the site. Changes to Carlin Springs should include removing the affordable housing, moving the APS parking back from Carlin Springs Road, and, if possible, stacking uses into taller buildings.

Scenario E:

This is the most expensive to implement in the short term. It includes the largest number of new buildings. For the Buck site, this scenario saves and reuses only one building—the one in the worst condition. However, it does allow the expansion of Hayes Park into the Buck site by placing a field adjacent to the park. Subcommittee members discussed the possibility of moving the police uses to the existing building in the southwest corner of the site, and then only one new building would be required, to accommodate the fire logistics and fire reserve vehicles. Since a large play field would need extensive grading, a smaller practice field would require less investment in the near term, since the grading requirements would be significantly reduced. Members also thought that showing specific recreational uses would distract from the main concept that the eastern portion of the Buck site should be recreational in this scenario, and the decisions on which recreational uses to include could be made later.

The members felt that this revised version of the scenario is a compromise between maximizing the County's urgent operational needs and the earlier "all park" version.

Announcements and Public Comment

A representative of Dynamic Gymnastics advocated for keeping that use on the Buck site, which serves 1,000 children, particularly since there is no future scenario to date that includes a sports complex.

Rick Epstein (RE) raised the question of varying traffic impacts of different recreational uses, which wouldn't be addressed if the use is kept as generic recreational.

A resident of Quincy Park North (QPN) commented on the handout describing the benefits of the Arcland land swap proposal, noting that it would be better to list both the advantages and the disadvantages. Regarding the effort to maximize accommodation of the urgent needs on the two sites, it is artificial to assume that these are the only two sites where these uses could, or would best be, located. Finally, the County should consider taking the Arcland site by eminent domain, rather than giving up part of the Buck site in exchange.

The resident wanted to encourage JFAC not to characterize the zoning on the Buck site as unable to be changed. In addition, evaluation of public safety and traffic impacts of potential uses should be a higher priority.

Nia Bagley (NB) expressed that JFAC has made amazing progress. She emphasized that it is very important to spell out the concepts and terminology we've been using that the public may not understand, so they can fully participate. In addition, she hopes the public will be given sufficient information about the costs of the various options and scenarios. She noted the pros and cons of the Arcland land swap.

Dawn Cooper (DC) agrees with what previous speakers and JFAC members have said. Placing construction laydown feet from houses is inappropriate, and other urgent County needs also have negative impacts on the adjacent residential properties, such as lights from the police impound lot. She emphasized the importance of really understanding what's required of these uses and how they would affect their surroundings. The Trades Center video looks like propaganda. There should also be videos of the Buck and Carlin Springs sites. GB responded that the intent of the Trades Center video was to illustrate the uses at that site. Dawn also wanted to know when the materials to be presented at the May 24 Community Forum would be posted online so people who cannot attend the Forum can review them and provide comments. JF said that all the materials would be available on the JFAC website for 1 ½ to 2 weeks, after the forum, for public review and input. JV wants to make sure the public knows about all the information, timing, and options for input.

Maurya Meiers (MM) thanked JFAC for all its work, and for members' comments about the appropriateness of certain uses adjacent to the QPN neighborhood. She pointed out that nobody from the adjacent neighborhood is a JFAC member, and there should be an opportunity for neighbors of the sites under consideration to be members. GB noted that the JFAC charge allows for additional representatives to be appointed as members of the JFAC subcommittees. MM asked if representation from QPN could be considered. She stated that longer term planning should be a focus of these use determination efforts. She reiterated that in the QPN survey, bus parking ranked lowest, and also warned that short term uses tend to remain and become long term uses. She urged people to spend more time

walking all around the Buck site and nearby streets, since the bus tour only included a stop at the entrance to the Buck property.

Sharon Valencia (SV) lives in the QPN neighborhood. She recognizes how challenging this effort is. It's important to look at the entire inventory of County property and uses to look more globally at which sites could best accommodate which uses. SV is disappointed in the document listing the pros of the Arcland land swap, which should include the cons as well. There should be a clear accounting of the present and future value of the Buck site, with and without the land swap. The comparison of the two sites' appraised value makes the swap look like a good deal, but the land price should be discounted by the costs of remediation and building demolition. Also, because some of the Buck site can't be built on, the cost per "usable" acre should be included. With the land swap, only 49% of the Buck site could actually be used.

Adjourn

GB closed the meeting.