MEETING SUMMARY
Eisenhower West/Landmark Van Dorn Implementation Advisory Group Meeting #3
Monday, May 22nd, 2017 | 7:00 – 8:30 pm | My Father’s House Christian Church, 4746 Eisenhower Avenue

1 Steering Committee Members Present
   • Mindy Lyle, Planning Commission, Advisory Group Chair
   • Jake Jakubek, Transportation Commission
   • Sheela Bykadi, Resident Representative
   • Jim Durham, Resident Representative
   • Grace Unangst, Resident Representative
   • Agnès Artemel, Business Representative
   • Jacob Bedingfield, Business Representative
   • Ken Wire, Business Representative

2 City Staff Present
   • Carrie Beach, Department of Planning and Zoning
   • Radhika Mohan, Department of Planning and Zoning
   • Ashley Labadie, Department of Planning and Zoning
   • Nathan Randall, Department of Planning and Zoning
   • Steve Sindiong, Transportation & Environmental Services
   • Erin Bevis-Carver, Transportation & Environmental Services
   • Khoa Dinh Tran, Transportation & Environmental Services
   • Eric Keeler, Office of Housing

3 Welcome and Overview
   • Ms. Lyle, Chair of the Advisory Group, and Ms. Mohan welcomed members and made introductory remarks.

Staff Presentation
Various staff gave updates on related projects and presentations on planning work in the Eisenhower West and Landmark/Van Dorn plan areas. Below is a summary of the discussions.

4 Air Quality Analysis
   • Mr. Tran gave an update on the Air Quality Analysis, starting with a description of the partnership between the City and Covanta.
   • Mr. Tran described the purpose of the study and the first task, which was to determine the lowest possible baseline emission rates and impacts for existing uses. He noted that the initial results indicate compliance with national and state standards.
   • Mr. Wire inquired whether the study included emissions from the existing asphalt plant and Mr. Tran confirmed that it did. Mr. Wire requested that emissions from both industrial uses be separated and distinguished from one another, as the asphalt plant site will eventually be redeveloped.
   • Mr. Tran noted that Covanta’s emissions are much lower than the limit and one option is to lower their emissions limit to be better aligned.
   • Mr. Jakubek and Mr. Durham inquired about mitigating the negative effects on air quality and Mr. Tran responded that mitigation strategies, including taller stacks, will be explored the next task of the study.
Mr. Jakubek requested that the report be circulated to the Advisory Group when completed.

Ms. Unangst asked whether the schedule allowed for enough time for review and development of mitigation strategies. Mr. Tran responded that many of the strategies are engineering standards and would not require a significant amount of time to research and include in the report.

Ms. Lyle requested a meeting at the end of September to review the final report.

Mr. Tran concluded with a case study of a similar Covanta power plant in Minneapolis, Minnesota, which is now part of a mixed use, transit oriented development.

5 Phase 2 Infrastructure Plan/CIP Projects

Mr. Sindiong gave an overview of the Phase 2 Infrastructure plan including the purpose of the study, timeline, and additional analysis.

Ms. Artemel stated that she thought the plan would include a broader description of infrastructure, such as parks and trails. Mr. Sindiong mentioned that some related projects are covered in the CIP but this plan would include an order of magnitude of costs.

Mr. Wire inquired about working with Fairfax County on the Farrington Connector and Mr. Sindiong confirmed so, particularly if the road is located partially within the county.

Mr. Durham inquired about utility investigations, Van Dorn Street widening, and High Street and Mr. Sindiong stated they were included in the study and CIP. Mr. Durham noted that the study would include 10% design and not 20% design as stated in older documents.

Ms. Artemel inquired about the developer contribution analysis and if projects come forward prior to the analysis being completed. Ms. Mohan stated that funding was approved for the analysis in the recent budget and language in the Eisenhower West plan acknowledged this by noting a case-by-case basis for early development projects that came forth prior to the completion of this analysis.

Ms. Bevis-Carver presented an overview of the sanitary sewer analysis and schedule, noting that it should be completed by fall 2018 with periodic updates to the Advisory Group.

Ms. Artemel inquired whether the analysis will identify specific locations where improvements are needed and Ms. Bevis-Carver responded that the site plan review process will accomplish that but this analysis will identify concerns of the larger area and might propose options for funding improvements, perhaps through the CIP process.

Mr. Sindiong presented on the multimodal bridge alignment, including a new alignment proposed by Norfolk Southern. Later in the meeting, a meeting attendee inquired if the intention was to only have one bridge. Mr. Sindiong responded that the 1993 study looked at multiple alignment options and the resulting recommendation from the Landmark/Van Dorn Corridor Plan was to identify the location of a multimodal bridge instead of the proposed Claremont bridge connector.

Ms. Artemel inquired whether this new alignment would change the traffic impacts outlined in the transportation study and Mr. Sindiong replied that it would not because the touch down points are the same as Option 1 that was previously studied.

Ms. Bykadi asked how dependent the Greenhill concept is on the multimodal bridge Option 3 and Mr. Sindiong said that option is not being ruled out and their proposal can still go forward with other alignment options.

Mr. Sindiong continued on to present CIP projects in the plan areas that relate to the Phase 2 Infrastructure Plan.
• Mr. Durham shared a survey about future bikeshare stations, particularly in the West End, and asked members to take the survey and share it with others.

6 Additional Updates
• Ms. Lyle gave an update on the mural project on the Greenhill site and showed an image of the proposed mural. She encouraged members to attend the meeting the following night on the Greenhill project for more information and noted that funding is needed for scaffolding and that West End artists have been selected for the project. She stated that it might take a couple of months to complete but could be exhibited for many years, until the site is redeveloped.
• Mr. Randall gave updates on the Greenhill project upcoming community meeting and the Virginia Paving SUP, scheduled to be docketed in the fall.
• Ms. Mohan gave an update on the Cameron Run Park planning process noting the current survey underway and encouraged members to get involved. Ms. Artemel explained more about the survey and process.

7 Questions and Next Steps
• Ms. Mohan presented general milestones for the Advisory Group.
• Staff will work with the Advisory Group to identify the next meeting date. Ms. Lyle noted her preference for a late September meeting date.