

North Potomac Yard Advisory Group Meeting #1

April 18, 2016 | 7:00PM – 9:00PM | Charles Houston Recreation Center

Meeting Notes

Advisory Group Members Attendance

- Stephen Koenig, Chair
- Bill Hendrickson
- Reuben Juster
- Jeremy Fretts
- Michael Caison
- Michael Peter
- Colleen Stover
- Jon Frederick
- Nancy Appleby
- Garrett Erdle
- Ryan Jones
- Patricia Harris

City Staff

- Jeff Farner
- Carrie Beach
- Richard Lawrence
- Steve Sindiong
- Dana Wedeles
- Tamara Jovovic

The PowerPoint presentation and all other meeting materials can be found on the project website at www.alexandriava.gov/potomacyardplan

7:05PM *Introductions*

Stephen Koenig, Chair of the Advisory Group, provided opening remarks and members of the Advisory Group introduced themselves with background information about their connection or history with Potomac Yard and surrounding neighborhoods.

7:20PM *AG Ground Rules, Responsibilities, and Development Framework*

Richard Lawrence, Project Manager, and Urban Planner III with the City's Department of Planning provided an overview of the civic engagement process and ground rules, the Advisory Group's purview and responsibilities, and basic information about how the City's planning and development framework operates.

7:30PM *Potomac Yard Development History*

Richard Lawrence provided information on Potomac Yard in the context of the region and City, information about the different sections of and development blocks of Potomac Yard, and a chronological overview of development approvals and construction in Potomac Yard over time.

7:35PM *North Potomac Yard Plan Principles*

Jeff Farner, Deputy Director the City's Department of Planning provided a summary of the North Potomac Plan approved in 2010, describing the principles governing each topic area such as the plan framework, building heights, land uses, affordable housing, transportation, etc.

7:50PM

Questions and Discussion

- Question: Topic: *BRT/Phasing* – Reuben Juster
What is the future alignment and design of BRT; when will that be integrated as part of the redevelopment? Will Route get an exclusive median for the BRT similar to south of Glebe.

As approved, the future Transitway (future phase of the existing Route 1 Metroway) would have dedicated lanes north of Glebe and throughout the development. The 2010 approved alignment would traverse along dedicated lanes, north on Route 1, east on the future Silver Meteor Avenue and north on Potomac Avenue to connect to the Transitway constructed in Arlington. The Transitway is required to be constructed when the North Potomac Area reaches 2 million square feet.

- Question: Topic: *BRT/Phasing* – Ryan Jones
Will the theater site redevelopment trigger the infrastructure requirements of the CDD (the BRT)? Will the proposed amendment trigger the 2 million sq. ft. BRT requirement?

The first phase would most likely develop under the 2 million sq. ft. BRT requirement and most likely come after the redevelopment of the theater site.

- Question: Topic: *BRT/Phasing* – Stephen Koenig
Does the CIP include funding for the two BRT stations as proposed in the NPY SAP? How is it related to the intermodal transportation center at the top of the Transportation Commission's Long Range plan and the north entrance of the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station?

The CIP included funding for the Route 1 Metroway that is already constructed; however, the future phase of the Route 1 Metroway (dedicated transit lanes extending north of Glebe Rd to Arlington) would be directly tied to the developer contributions as required by redevelopment. The City has already constructed its extent of the Route 1 Metroway and Arlington County has completed their portion just north of the site. The stations that will serve the North Potomac Yard site are still conceptual at this point and as part of North Potomac redevelopment the final locations of stations would be determined, and constructed by the developer. The intermodal transportation center may not necessarily be a major facility, but rather “super-stops” i.e. locations that buses will have access, shelters and provide commuter information. The intermodal transportation/superstop is anticipated to be within close proximity to the future Potomac Yard Metrorail station to facilitate good access between the two transit modes.

- Question: Topic: *BRT/Connectivity* – Nancy Appleby
What is the difference between the users of the BRT vs. Metro? Local vs. Regional transit? Will the BRT/and bike lanes primarily be in NPY; connectivity to adjacent grid and Four Mile Run/Arlington? Can the BRT be discussed more at a future meeting?

Metro generally provides transit for regional commuters, traveling longer distances. The Route 1 Metroway (BRT) is a transit service somewhere between a “local” transit service and “regional” transit service. It provides connectivity to the regional system, while also providing connectivity to major activity centers along a corridor. The Route 1 Metroway provides access and connectivity for riders all the way from Old Town to Arlington/Crystal City. It has greater frequency levels (5 to 10 minute headways during the peak) than a local transit service, and stops are at a greater distance. It includes other elements that improve travel time and efficiency such as pre-board payment, level boarding, and real time information at stations.

The North-South bicycle path is proposed along a dedicated multi-use trail along the eastern portion of the site adjacent to Potomac Yard Park. Additional bike facilities proposed can be a combination of dedicated or protected bike lanes as well as a mixture of shared traffic lanes (such as sharrows) that will provide connectivity north-south along and through the site as well as provide east-west connectivity to Route 1 and areas west. The plan is to provide optimal opportunities for bikes and pedestrians and make the use of other modes of transportation as easy as possible.

- Question: Topic: *Transportation/Connectivity* – *Jeremy Fretts*
When will connectivity to the West (Route 1, Del Ray/Lynhaven) be discussed?

Connectivity will be explored in greater detail as part of the Transportation Analysis that will be required as part of the Amendment. It is anticipated the analysis will begin in late summer/ early fall. As part of the 2010 transportation analysis, recommendations included improvements to the intersections of Route 1 at E. Reed and at Glebe Road. Additionally, a Traffic Calming Plan was also included as part of the previous study. The Traffic Calming Plan will be updated as part of this process. Additional transportation and pedestrian improvements were recommended as part of the Route 1 / Oakville Triangle Corridor planning process.

- Comment: Topic: *Schools* – *Stephen Koenig*
School site – Block 4: The school site is a very significant and tremendously exciting aspect of the Plan and this process should use this opportunity to clarify, add details, and further the discussion of an urban model as was proposed in the 2010 Plan. This model can be a school like no other in the City and a model as we move forward and think about school planning and better utilization of land resources in the City. ACPS should be engaged in this discussion and more clarity should be determined and shared by all regarding the school site. The result should be a school site that is viable and operational. The Plan update should move beyond the assumptions made in the 2010 plan, include some of the thought that went into the ACPS Long Range Facilities Plan, and provide “rich refinement” to the urban school concept for this site.

- Comment: Topic: *Schools* – Nancy Appleby
It is critical that we (the City and community) think outside of the box and take a non-traditional approach to this site; we need to think vertical and mixed-use. This urban concept is critical. The typical suburban school model no longer works in an urban environment like this.
- Advisory Group members emphasized the importance of the engagement of ACPS in this process.
- Comment: Topic: *Schools* - Reuben Juster
Other jurisdictions such as Fairfax County, have converted unused office buildings into schools and other innovative ideas should be considered as part of the school site discussion.
- Comment: Topic: *Sustainability* – Stephen Koenig
There needs to be serious thought about integrating infrastructure and stormwater management giving the limited space for multiple uses (open space, infrastructure, stormwater, etc.). Emphasize integrated design of open space and infrastructure/stormwater management.
- Question: Topic: *Retail* - Bill Hendrickson
2010 Plan vs. 1999 Plan; there has been a negative change between the retail focus of Landbay G to North Potomac Yard. How will the Town Center on E. Reed relate to the Town Center as proposed for Landbay G to the South and Oakville Triangle? Can that be explored as part of this process? How can the 2010 Plan be strengthened to address the issues? What are the nodes of retail and how are they being planned?

As we think about retail, what the character of the three different retail areas (North Potomac Yard, Landbay G, and Oakville) and what the retail experiences provided by each will need to be defined and refined as to not compete with each other. Upcoming meetings will discuss what the nodes of retail are and how to they work together and provide a critical mass that creates a sense of place.

- Question: Michael Caison
How does this process relate to the 2010 process, what will the review of the upcoming amendments look like in relation to what was approved and; when will the Advisory Group have a chance to view/discuss the JBG Concept?

During the May Advisory Group Meetings, JBG will present their concept presentation and provide an opportunity for the Advisory Group and community to review potential changes and challenges that will need to be addressed to the developer's proposal. At this stage, no submissions have been made to the City.

8:20PM *Transportation, Open Space, Affordable Housing*

Steve Sindiong, Principal Planner with the City's Department of Transportation and Environmental Services (TES) provided an overview of transportation principles established

in the North Potomac Yard Plan as well as things related to transportation that have happened since the Plan was approved, such as the opening of the Transitway, approval of the Ped/Bike Master Plan, etc.

Dana Wedeles, Park Planner with the City's Department of Recreation, Parks, and Cultural Activities provided an overview of the open space components of the 2010 Plan including the successes of Potomac Yard Park and requirements anticipated with redevelopment within the site area.

Tamara Jovovic, Housing Analyst with the City's Office of Housing, provided an overview of the 2013 Housing Master Plan highlighting the high level goals and objectives recommended in the Housing Master Plan. Tamara discussed successful examples of projects that included on-site affordable housing units in Potomac Yard and projects nearby reinforcing that affordable housing serves a variety of users at different income levels, in all employment sectors, and at various age ranges and life stages.

8:30PM ***Oakville Triangle & Potomac Yard Metrorail Station***

Jeff Farner provided a brief overview of the Oakville Triangle & Route 1 West Corridor Plan which was approved by Council in November 2015. The Oakville Plan area encompasses the commercial and industrially zoned properties across Route 1 from East Howell Avenue to East Reed Avenue and is approved for up to 2.6 million sq. ft. of development. The Plan includes design guidelines and recommendations for streetscape improvements, transportation, bike/ped, and open space improvements. Jeff briefly discussed the status of the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station, a concurrent process for the Metrorail station located adjacent to the North Potomac Yard site. Discussed were the design-build approach and the current station design review by staff and other Boards and Commissions.

- Question: Topic: *Metro Station* – Stephen Koenig
Will the north entrance be a part of the refinements of this process? The station entrance will be an important element of this effort.

As part of the Metro Station process and future site plan that will go before Planning Commission and City Council, planned for June 2016, the plans will dedicate a placeholder for the north entrance landing in a portion of this site. The placeholder allows for the northern entrance to land anywhere in that zone. Due this amendment process, until the locations of buildings are generally understood, the placeholder allows for flexibility and will be refined as this process progresses. The expectation is to integrate the buildings and metro station that celebrates the metro station. By fall 2016, the location of the landing will need to be determined.

- Comment: Topic: *Metro Station* – Jeremy Fretts
Kudos to the City for the planning and foresight for making the integration of the Metro to the urban fabric of high importance.
- Comment: Topic: *Affordable Housing* – Jon Frederick

Related to affordable housing, there is a difference between money and opportunity and we should look at increasing the opportunity for providing more affordable units. The developer should be creative/leverage other affordable housing resources.

- Question: Topic: *Affordable Housing* – Nancy Appleby
Who is the affordable housing intended to serve; retail workers, other groups?

Affordable housing serves a variety of users including service workers but also entry level teachers and public service employees. The Housing Master Plan provides a comprehensive analysis about the different populations that are served by affordable housing not just by varying income levels and employment sectors but also through different life stages. The HMP emphasizes that there is a need across all income levels at different life stages.

- Comment: Topic: *Affordable Housing* - Stephen Koenig
The affordable housing approach should reinforce that there is a need across all income levels and use this amendment of the Plan to build in a more ambitious housing solution.
- Question: Topic: *Stormwater Management* – Bill Hendrickson
What are the plans for the water retention ponds? Will the north ponds be affected by the Metro? As currently designed, they are very awkward and not well integrated into the site or open spaces.

One of the discussions that will need to occur as part of this process is what happens to the northern pond. Nothing has been decided at this stage. There are pros and cons to each alternative that will need to be evaluated however; the northern metro landing has not precluded that pond from remaining.

8:45PM *Next Steps/CDD/MPA Process*

Richard provided an overview of the CDD concept plan and the current process to review amendments to the approved CDD Concept Plan and Master Plan. Richard highlighted key conditions of the approved plan particularly conditions related to requirement developer contributions and community benefits.

Jeff walked through the anticipated Work Program and schedule to review the potential MPA and CDD Concept Plan amendments. The discussion ended with options for the upcoming Advisory Group precedent bus tour and upcoming AG Meetings for May and June.

- Precedent Bus Tour – The AG largely agreed that Saturday, April 30th is the preferred date to attend a bus tour and it would be the most efficient use of time.
- Comment: Topic: *Next Steps* - Stephen Koenig
Can staff/developer team provide as much information in advance of the May workshop so members can actively participate in the presentation/discussion?
- Comment: Topic: *Upcoming May AG Workshops* - Colleen Stover

If the expectation is to function as liaisons between the community groups and boards holding two consecutive evening meetings would limit the AG members from hearing from their groups. Staff should find an alternative date that would provide time to get some community comment and inform the 2nd day workshop activities.

9:00PM

Meeting Adjourned

Meeting Evaluation Summary

Positive:

- Staff provided an excellent presentation;
- Good first meeting

Opportunities:

- Better introduction of speakers. Perhaps written names;
- Speakers should stand near the front of the room;
- Reduce the repetition of information.



MEETING EVALUATION

Date: April 18, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #1

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Property Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Interested Community Member | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board or Commission Member | | |

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> eNews | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Media |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City Website | <input type="checkbox"/> Friends | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: |

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

6. Do you feel your comments were heard?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

7. What are your concerns about this event/project?

8. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

9. Other thoughts?



MEETING EVALUATION

Date: April 18, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #1

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- Resident
- Business Owner
- Board or Commission Member
- Property Owner
- Interested Community Member
- Other, please specify:

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- Newspaper
- City Website
- eNews
- Friends
- Social Media
- Other, please specify:

Notice from staff

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

6. Do you feel your comments were heard?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

7. What are your concerns about this event/project?

8. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

Good first meeting

9. Other thoughts?



MEETING EVALUATION

Date: April 18, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #1

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Property Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Interested Community Member | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board or Commission Member | | |

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> eNews | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Media |
| <input type="checkbox"/> City Website | <input type="checkbox"/> Friends | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: |

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

6. Do you feel your comments were heard?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

7. What are your concerns about this event/project?

8. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

9. Other thoughts?



MEETING EVALUATION

Date: April 18, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #1

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Property Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Interested Community Member | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Board or Commission Member | | |

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> eNews | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Media |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City Website | <input type="checkbox"/> Friends | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: |

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

6. Do you feel your comments were heard?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

7. What are your concerns about this event/project?

8. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

9. Other thoughts?



MEETING EVALUATION

Date: April 18, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #1

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- Resident
- Business Owner
- Board or Commission Member
- Property Owner
- Interested Community Member
- Other, please specify:

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- Newspaper
- City Website
- eNews
- Friends
- Social Media
- Other, please specify:

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

Direct Email from

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

6. Do you feel your comments were heard?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

7. What are your concerns about this event/project?

N/A

8. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

Some info repetitive

9. Other thoughts?



MEETING EVALUATION

Date: April 18, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #1

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- Resident
- Business Owner
- Board or Commission Member
- Property Owner
- Interested Community Member
- Other, please specify:

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- Newspaper
- City Website
- eNews
- Friends
- Social Media
- Other, please specify:

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

6. Do you feel your comments were heard?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

7. What are your concerns about this event/project?

8. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

excellent staff present - strong

9. Other thoughts?



MEETING EVALUATION

Date: April 18, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #1

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- Resident
- Business Owner
- Board or Commission Member
- Property Owner
- Interested Community Member
- Other, please specify:

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- Newspaper
- City Website
- eNews
- Friends
- Social Media
- Other, please specify:

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

*- better introductions of speakers/names
- can speakers stand near front written*

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

6. Do you feel your comments were heard?

- Yes
- No
- Additional Comments:

7. What are your concerns about this event/project?

8. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

See above

9. Other thoughts?