



**4MRV Working Group Meeting**  
**March 7, 2017**  
**7 – 10:00 PM**

Notes prepared by Bethany Heim, Association Planner, Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)

**Working Group Charge**

The Working Group (WG) members discussed the changes between the original charge, adopted by the County Board on April, 19 2016, and the revised charged, adopted July 19, 2016. Some WG members expressed concern that language pertaining to the Park Master Plan was not included in the revised charge, and the map delineating the Park Master Plan boundary is gone. The WG also discussed how the arts district fit into the current WG charge.

**Park Bonds**

Questions were asked if Park Bonds funds can be allocated for arts related uses. The group agreed that this is a topic to review with the County Board.

The 3700 property was purchased in 1998 with Park Bond funds, and the arts related uses were a temporary arrangement. However, over time, the building has been renovated to accommodate those uses. When 3700 was purchased, the Cultural Affairs Division was housed within the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and now it is housed within Arlington Economic Development (AED).

Lisa Grandle, DPR Parks Planning Division Chief, spoke about the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The Park Bond funds carry over, if they are not immediately used, and are banked and accumulate. The CIP is a planning tool that has a 10-year outlook. The County Board adopts the first year, and the following 9 years anticipate a collection of potential projects that anticipate funding. The CIP includes projects from every County Department and Arlington Public Schools (APS). The next CIP process kicks off this Fall and the 4MRV park improvements will be considered by the County Manager and the County Board.

**Park Master Plan Alternatives**

Kate Thomas, Principal Planner for DPR, review the dog park matrix and options. County staff continues to study physical and environmental impacts of the dog park. Moving the dog park is not shown in the current alternatives, however, it is still under consideration.

The park alternatives were introduced by Jim Klein, the principal consultant for the Parks Master Plan. The WG members provided feedback on what they did and did not like about each alternative. Eventually, there will be fewer alternatives to review and ultimately one plan that will be presented to the County Board.

County staff passed out questions pertaining to the park alternatives. They would appreciate notes via email or handing them in at the next WG meeting.