



4MRV Working Group Meeting
September 18, 2017
7 – 9:30 PM

Follow Up on Arts District Committee Report – The Arts District Committee was handed a list of questions by Caroline Haynes. Arts District Committee Chair read those question aloud. The Committee Chair and members of the Committee responded to all questions.

- There are approximately 20-30 private arts groups supported by Arlington County using the 3700 building. The financial arrangement for private arts groups using County-owned space includes renting space or applying for a Space and Service Grant. WG member asked for a list of these groups to be posted on the 4MRV website. Here is a general list of County supported arts groups:
<https://commissions.arlingtonva.us/commission-arts/supported-arts-organizations/>
- The County offers two types of grants to private arts groups: Space and Services Grant and Cash Award Grant. An applicant may apply to one or both grants. Groups are designated as “County Supported” if they are awarded a grant. WG member asked about the advertisement and award processes associated with these grants. Specifically, how do arts groups learn about these grants and who reviews and approves the applications? WG member stated that the Arts Commission is in charge of recommending to the County Board which arts groups are awarded the grants. There is a total of \$250,000 per year spread out among the various groups. Applications are accepted at the beginning of the calendar year. Here is a link to a County Board report authorizing the allocation of funds:
http://arlington.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=3401&meta_id=165864
- WG member noted that arts groups are having to look outside Arlington County to find space.
- WG member noted that the use of the County-owned buildings solely for arts space precludes other community uses, such as a community center that could provide GED courses. Another WG member stated that Drew School and Community Center is a shared space. When it was originally built, it was intended to provide adult education but is simply two rooms and not adequate facility of community use. There was also once a community center at Fort Barnard but the County tore it down.

- A WG member thinks the Arts District Committee Report overstates the County Board’s Work Session comments on the arts and County-owned buildings. The WG Chair stated that the report will not change; this is their report.

Dog Park Committee Report – Caroline Haynes provided an overview of the report via PowerPoint presentation and took questions after. The presentation included a summary of the charge.

- The presentation stated that the site will have to, at some point, address regulatory requirements related to the Resource Protection Area (RPA) and stormwater. Leaving the dog park ‘as is’ is not a sustainable option over the long term. Also, the overall and long-term objective for the County’s management of this area over the next 30+ years must include being exemplary stewards of the stream corridor and working to establish best practices.
- The Committee offered short, medium, and long-term recommendations for improving the dog park.
- The WG Chair expressed disappointment that the Committee report went outside the charge by addressing the County-owned storage building. The Chair stated that it is within the Arts District, however, the Dog Park Committee Chair disagreed and thought the site could have complimentary benefits to integrate arts, park space, and stormwater mitigation.
- WG member suggested retaining a similar sized dog park but moving it outside of the RPA.
- WG member suggested that dog parks and the arts are both County subsidized, and feels this is appropriate. Another WG member stated that sports related amenities used by organized teams are charged fees and the County implements a cost recovery model.
- WG member suggested the County lead by example and address the stormwater issues on County-owned properties. Also, make stormwater related infrastructure easier to approve and rewarded, particularly if done voluntarily. Grants should be offered.
- WG member suggested the parking situation would improve if the County installed parking meters in the park’s parking lot. Members also suggested that the funds collected at the parking meters could be used to support the park.

Working Group Discussion of Guiding Principles

- The WG Chair stated that the principles must be adopted as a whole and there will be no votes on individual principles. The Guiding Principles will not be addressed again; either the group adopts them at this time or never.

- WG member suggested an additional principle: channel the public’s will that was expressed at the public outreach events. (*Not acted upon.*)
- Suggestion for #9, acknowledge County-owned facilities as a whole.
- Suggestion for #4 . . . we don’t have control of “elsewhere” and may want to rethink that term . . . #9 replace the word “maximize” with “increase”
- Comment: We need general principles that you can hang an approach on . . . no place mentions “improving the stream” maybe add to #11 or #8 . . . probably a way between #2 and #7 that we are not just looking at existing uses but encourage next generation of industrial and arts because this is the only place where we have space.
- This could be used as a way to rate the options/alternatives as a check list.
- Motion: WG Vice Chair, Robin Stombler, moved that the Guiding Principles be adopted, as a whole. Majority 16 accept . . . one opposes . . . one abstains.

Public Comment

- The group may be doing something unpopular or even wrong. The County Board took options off the table for the park and has created an artificial constraint, except for the arts. What I’m hearing ignores public input, the public wants more open space. Bond measures were for parkland and not for arts district within the park. The more principled approach is to get a separate bond for the arts and not draw from parks funding.
- Nauck citizen wants to keep dog park in its current location. Principal #2 maintains existing zoning . . . support this but look at the self-storage facility and parking as part of the dog park . . . not against self-storage facilities but don’t see it as compatible and maintaining the stormwater consideration and the way it looks – eyesore.
- Barcroft resident and a proponent of the dog park. The dog park is a gem and must include stormwater mitigation and want more green space than warehouses. This is a very diverse and friendly community and a lot of happy people and dogs. Community should be proud of the dog park and not view it as a problem.

For more details on these presentations and the meeting in general, please visit the 4MRV.com webpage.