



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 #7
 7:00 PM, Thursday, May 11, 2017
 Key Elementary School Library
 2300 Key Blvd., Arlington VA 22201

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

JFAC:

Greg Greeley
 Ginger Brown
 Cicely Whitfield
 Devanshi Patel
 Gabriel Rubalcava
 Jerry Gidner
 Rachel Silberman
 Steve Young

County Staff:

Jill Griffin-AED
 Jennifer Fioretti-DPR
 Kris Krider-CPHD
 Bernadette Grullon-DPR
 June Locker-DES
 Tim O’Hora-DES

APS Staff:

Zach Larnard

Other:

Meeting Summary

Welcome

Greg Greeley (GG) provided an overview of the agenda.

Minutes

GG presented the meeting minutes from May 4, 2017 to the subcommittee. The minutes were approved with one addition: Susan Cunningham as an attendee.

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

GG provided a brief overview of the analysis. Jennifer Fioretti (JF) explained how the schemes were reduced from seven to five. She provided an overview of all the schemes for both Buck and Carlin Springs.

Scenario A

GG stated that he liked the descriptive names and asked for a bit more differentiation. The subcommittee spoke about the merits of the buffer and connections. Steve Young (SY) asked about the wild strip of land along 66 and whether it was outside of the property. [It is located outside of the property boundary.] He stated that all scenarios need to be careful of natural resources.

Scenario B

There was general discussion around the Buck scheme and questions pertaining to the level of remediation and the potential for conflict with the utilities. Staff responded that there was limited conflict with the utilities and remediation for open space is fairly high. However there are options that may have less cost.

The subcommittee spoke about the storage facility, the size, the lease back area and the amount (or not) of flexibility with the facility. The subject of the gymnastics facility was brought up and the challenges associated with finding appropriate space. SY asked about a 3D massing study. Kris Krider (KK) stated that it is possible but such models are time extensive and staff must be judicious with its time. GG suggested that perhaps Arcland could do some of the studies.

JG stated that not all busses could fit within the space long-term. Rachel Silberman (RS) asked the time horizon and learned it was 10 years. She stated that such parking should be seen as a place holder.

Scenario C

The subcommittee spoke about the impound lot and the general concerns raised by the neighborhoods about the appearance of the facility.

Scenario D

Cicely Whitfield (CW) asked about the affordable housing units. KK explained that a subdivision would be required and the location would need to be shifted. Ginger Brown (GB) stated that there is a limited amount of AHIF money and that the need for affordable housing should not be all southern Arlington. SY asked about senior housing and JF stated it was captured as a long-term need.

Scenario E

CW asked how people would get to the ball courts. RS stated that she had significant concern that all Carlin Springs scenarios have bus parking. She recommended that a few scenarios not show the parking. KK suggested Scenario D. GB suggested that maybe not ALL uses can (or should) be accommodated.

GG stated that there has been a discussion about the efficiencies at trades. SY stated that a limited buffer is at Shirlington. The Carlin Springs site could allow for swing space while there is an incremental do-over. SY reminded everyone about the traffic concerns on Carlin Springs.

What Fits Activity Part 3 – Buck and Carlin Springs Scenarios

GB suggested that the subcommittee look at permanent versus temporary. If the County builds a new building, it is long term and permanent. For such buildings, the County needs to build up and down.

Scenario A

GB asked what is appropriate or not appropriate adjacent to single family dwellings. The staging of construction materials was not appropriate.

GB questioned how best to communicate permanence. SY wondered is there could be an animation of change over time to help visualize. GB stated that there would be much more to consider in the Phase III analysis.

GB stated that finding a home for Dynamic Gymnastics remained an outstanding issue. Tim O’Hora (TO) stated that staff has been working with them and trying to meet their needs.

The subcommittee reviewed the evaluation tool. There was general concern about the displacement of activities at VHC.

Jerry Gidner (JG) asked how long is permanent. The answer: 50 years.

The subcommittee recommended that the police impound lot be moved to Buck for co-location of services. Materials staging could be moved further south on the site. The open space should reference both Passive and Recreational.

Rachel Silberman (RS) stated that the impound and materials were generally low impact. June Locker (JL) responded that the materials may have greater traffic depending on the particular project.

SY stated that in emergencies, the materials staging could be operating at all hours with noise. He stated that managing traffic was important and pointed to the staging at Douglas Park.

GG asked about the criteria pertaining to geographic equity. SY wondered if there could be a geographic centroid map of the county – population and also drive-time.

Gabe Rubalcava (GR) stated that the JFAC may receive comments about equity on the May 24th forum. He suggested that it's something you know it when you see it.

Scenario B

GB pointed out the permanence of the new buildings.

Devanshi Patel (DP) asked about the safety for OEM. Should there be geodiversity? Is there concern about access? Might OEM prefer the Buck site because of traffic concerns along Carlin Springs Road.

The subcommittee recommended that the fire structures should be combined (similar to other schemes); the materials staging be switched with APS bus; and the courts be removed and the open space reference both Passive and Recreational.

Scenario C

GG stated that there was some discussion about using the public ROW along N Quincy Street (Buck site) for parking. It may require a GLUP amendment, rezoning, abandonment.

GR suggested changing the name of impound to "Police Forensics Lab and Secure Vehicular Storage" to get away from the stigma of the use. It was also suggested that there was a good example in the City of Alexandria on Eisenhower Avenue.

The subcommittee recommended that the buffer be extended around the entirety of the Carlin sites; the label for the open space be consistent; the APS building to have screening. The name of the scenario should be changed to APS/ACG swing space.

The subcommittee also recommended updates to the evaluation tool: change "Future Use" to dark green; compatibility with zoning to red; and costs to light green.

There was significant conversation among the subcommittee about relocatables.

Scenario D

GB stated that the storage required significant trade-offs and many in the community are opposed.

There was discussion as to how to explain. SY stated that the JFAC presents the various scenarios to the County Board and the County Board ultimately makes the decision. GB stated that there are numerous other things going on like POPS, APS work, 4MRV, etc.

The subcommittee recommended to remove the affordable housing, remove the APS bus parking, shift and cluster the buildings toward the street and provide a greater amount of open/recreational space.

The evaluation tool requires updates: future use to light green and fewest and least extensive tenancies to dark green.

Scenario E

GB stated that this is a very expensive scenario.

The subcommittee recommended the following changes: move the police impound lot to Buck, place the bus parking together (below grade), change the courts to open space/recreational facilities.

The evaluation tool requires a change to costs from orange to red.

SY stated that the medical office building allowed for off-hours parking to the community. It is seen as a community asset.

SY also discussed the opportunity for a wildlife corridor and connectivity.

General Discussion

SY raised the concerns again about the loss of hospital uses: pediatrics, child care and urgent care. GG agreed that this is a public loss – particularly the pediatric access for low income families.

There was some discussion about the Child Care Initiative and how the VHC swap could result in an overall loss of services.

Announcements and Public Comment

The subcommittee discussed the upcoming May 24 Community Forum.

JF explained the analysis and “temperature” diagram being created for each scenario. GG stated that it would be used to quickly communicate costs and flexibility.

SY asked about the outcomes for the 24th. GB stated that she was hoping to receive a general reaction to the scenarios. JF highlighted four outcomes: education, listened to & input on the scenarios, culling the scenarios and long term uses.

There was no public comment.

Meeting adjourned.