



## Working Group Meeting Summary – Organizational Meeting – June 1, 2016

This was the first meeting of the Working Group. The meeting began with introductions of the Working Group Chair, the County Board Liaison, Working Group members, staff and community members in attendance. The following provides a summary of the Working Group discussion. Public comments are also included.

- Staff gave an overview of the process and purpose for the study
- The Chair gave an overview of the charge, and discussed some logistical and administrative matters for the Working Group, including:
  - Time commitment
  - Use of alternates
  - Public meeting notification and FOIA requirements (he recommended to Working Group members that staff are cc'd on all Working Group correspondence).
  - Videotaping of meetings has been requested by some Working Group members, however, logistically it is difficult due to the equipment required to properly record the proceedings. But there may be some budget to tape certain technical-heavy meetings, as appropriate.
  - The Working Group discussed regular meeting dates and decided on the following for the general scheduling of regular meetings – The 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday and the 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday of the month.
  - Meeting location: staff is looking into possible meeting locations in the study area, however, none are as large as 2700 S. Taylor Street. Staff indicated that the S. Taylor Street location is preferred due to the availability of audio visual equipment and the size of this location, but will keep other options open in the study area.
- The Chair indicated that all Working Group meetings are public and that the public is invited and encouraged to attend, and there will be opportunity for public comment at the end of every Working Group meeting.
- Staff provided an overview of the anticipated eighteen month timeline for the process.
- Staff presented an overview of the briefing book, which may be found on the project website.
- Staff gave an overview of planning in Arlington, covering both land use and park planning.
- Staff gave an overview of the key elements of the charge and the scope of the study.

The Working Group had a discussion and asked questions about upcoming Working Group meetings, and information, activities, materials and presentations members would like to see at future meetings:

- Regarding Key Element 3 in the Working Group Charge: how do Barcroft Park and the Trades Center outside of the study area get considered as part of this study?
- What about areas within the study area that are being used for other purposes? Such as pieces of Jennie Dean Park that are not being used right now for Jennie Dean Park. In the future can

there be materials that identify uses for County-owned properties within the study area? Staff indicated that such a map can be created and will post it online.

- Can the Working Group get copies of the plans for the Trades Center? There should be a coherent plan for how the Trades Center site is improved before it spills out into other areas. Would like Working Group to have an opportunity to hear specifically about this property.
- Would like to know what is going on in the Alexandria piece right outside the study area.
- Request for promotional materials about the project that Working Group and other community members can hand out, such as a simple one-pager and a bookmark.
- How up to date is the list of property owners in the book? Staff responded that it was updated within the last 30 days.
- Would like more information and presentation to Working group about the regulations for Resource Protection Areas.
- Choice of words is important. "Park" connotes Central Park, resting, picnic, free-for-all, but the terminology we use for Jennie Dean is "fields" and "courts". It is a park by name, but a facility by usage.
- When looking at study area, half is public space, half is private ownership. Unclear about on what area the Working Group will focus, and if it includes the entire area, how does the Working Group/Study address private property? Staff responded that the study area addresses all the properties, and planning processes do make recommendations for private property, which is why property owners are encouraged to attend and participate in the process.
- Is there a current land acquisition plan which will be part of the study? Staff responded no, however, anticipates that the planning process could result in recommendations that help guide a future land acquisition plan.
- When storm water comes through the section of Four Mile Run that is part of the study area, how do we address the fact that we don't know where the water is coming from, or is there a plan that helps guide this? Staff responded that the stream has been altered over the years and is not in its natural state, and one thing to think about as part of the study is how we might green up the banks and slow the water down as it passes through the area.
- Does the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) have any control of Four Mile Run anymore? Staff responded, that yes, the ACOE is the ultimate authority on this channel. In the late 70s Four Mile Run was channelized, which worked well for controlling floods, but was bad for the ecosystem. The adopted Four Mile Run Restoration Plan is a Master Plan for the stream; ACOE has conducted a feasibility study that created some baseline data for the stream.
- Will there be more information provided on each of the background studies? Presentation on industrial land use, Nauck Village Center, and Shirlington would be helpful to discuss at a future meeting.
- Zoning and zoning potential would be good to discuss at a future meeting.
- Would like to see some additional traffic counts on nearby intersections; bike and pedestrian counts from nearby counters; parking resources in the study area; crime statistics; crash statistics including bicycle, pedestrian;
- Would like to see results from recent POPS survey about what the needs are.
- This is not a project done in isolation - could we bring in ideas that were brought up in other planning processes, but not necessarily included and/or where previous study was not able to fulfil an identified need. For example, Long Bridge Park process discussed potential for another type of recreational facility.
- Would like more information about businesses serving this area, including nonprofit, and arts – Would like to see presentations; business forums with all business owners and landowners to

see what they envision for the future; and a forum for nonprofits, art and community service organizations.

- Is office building on the table for the parks planning (3700 Four Mile Run drive). Staff responded yes, this building would be considered as part of the park master plan, and as part of Phase 2 of buildout of the park; Phase I is first part of Park Master Plan to be designed and constructed. Is the old Signature Theatre part of Phase I? Staff responded that it is not.
- Would like presentation on what is funded/what is already ongoing/scheduling of leases/terms
- Trade names need to be updated on property inventory map in the briefing book.
- Heavily used fields will be taken out of commission during park construction, including a youth softball field. Need to consider timing of construction.
- Has there been any discussion about whether an environmental assessment will be required?
- Where in the process does visioning occur? Staff responded that public visioning workshops would occur in the Fall timeframe.
- Would be helpful to receive images, presentations, videos from other communities as examples
- Would be helpful to take a step back and look at a larger area beyond that shown in the briefing book to better understand how it all fits together. An initial conversation about what a vision could look like would be helpful early on.
- How do the businesses in the area in general contribute to the economic health of the community.
- None of the maps show the electric power element of the valley. Would like to hear from Dominion to understand any planning they have affects the area.

Staff briefly reviewed the plan for the Walking Tour scheduled for Saturday, June 4 from 9-1 pm.

### **Public Comment**

- Hope that the study looks at residential communities adjacent to the study area. Resident chose to live in a relatively dense area for its proximity to a large park system.
- Hope that the study looks at the intersection of Four Mile Run and Shirlington Road, with respect to safety, accidents and aesthetics.
- There is some confusion over what areas are part of the Northern Virginia Regional Parks Authority and which are County.
- Curious for more information about the “Phases” discussed earlier regarding park construction.
- Would be great to see an on-line communication center for brainstorming and additional opportunities for participation.
- Excited to get the buses off of the park
- Question about whether it is consultants or the County who is in charge of the process. [*The County is in charge.*]
- Cycling is an important part of the branding and identify of the area, given the heavy trail use and its location in area.