

MEETING SUMMARY

Eisenhower West/Landmark Van Dorn Implementation Advisory Group Meeting #4

Monday, Oct.23rd, 2017 | 7:00 – 9:00 pm | Cameron Station Great Room, 200 Cameron Station Blvd.

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
- Ken Wire, Business Representative
- William Harris, Alexandria Housing Affordability Advisory Committee
- Judy Coleman, Park and Recreation Commission
- Arthur Impastato, Resident Representative
- Dak Hardwick, Business Representative
- Jessica Lassetter, Environmental Policy Commission

2 City Staff Present

- Jeff Farner, Department of Planning and Zoning
- Carrie Beach, 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
- Helen McIlvaine, Office of Housing

3 Consultants Present

- Zach Teague, Kimley-Horn
- Ted DeLio, Kimley-Horn

4 Welcome and Overview

- Ms. Labadie welcomed members and reviewed the evening's agenda.
- Ms. Lyle, Chair of the Advisory Group, presented the recently completed community mural project on Edsall Road by artists, Lynn Garren and Cindy Wallace, and sponsored by the Pickett Place Foundation. She said there will be a dedication or wall signing ceremony within the next three to four weeks.
- Ms. Lyle mentioned that the efforts towards the mural's creation was a true community effort and public comments were considered.
- Ms. Lyle said they are currently figuring out the best way to light the mural.
- Ms. Lyle said the mural will be sealed and will be up until the parcel is redeveloped.

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.

5 Roles & Communications

- Ms. Beach mentioned that staff spoke with Ms. Lyle a couple of weeks prior to the meeting about the meeting agenda and collectively agreed that staff should speak about roles and communications since the group is still new and recognized there have been some “bumps in the road” when it comes to communication and that this part of the presentation would discuss ways in which staff could improve communication moving forward.
- Ms. Beach affirmed the mutual goal of wanting to see progress toward implementation of the plans and moving the studies forward.
- Ms. Beach mentioned staff’s goal is to keep the AG informed and maintain momentum of the studies, and the AG’s goal is to make sure staff is maintaining progress and to give staff guidance on development.
- Ms. Beach said staff has looked at ways to improve communications on other topics including SUPs (special use permits) and administrative SUPs, including adding the AG to the email notifications that typically go out to civic and homeowner’s associations from the SUP planners.
- Ms. Beach said the above-mentioned action would be in addition to the eNews notifications that she encouraged everyone to sign up for if they weren’t already as well as visiting the website, which is updated regularly.
- Ms. Beach also mentioned the eNews sign up information is located at the bottom of the agenda.
- Ms. Beach provided an update of Landmark Mall. She began by stating that the AG received an email notification in late August before the Planning Commission meeting in September of the text amendment to change the CR zone (Landmark Mall is the only area in the City with this zoning classification) to allow a temporary homeless shelter to serve as the Carpenter’s Shelter temporary location while its existing location near Braddock Metro is being redeveloped.
- Ms. Beach said this temporary use would not impede or stall the redevelopment plans for Landmark Mall because Howard Hughes is still in negotiations with Sears. Ms. Beach mentioned Howard Hughes has already acquired the Macy’s site.
- Ms. Beach said there have not been any changes since the release of the aforementioned email and information regarding the mall can be found on the City’s website, which is updated as there is new information to share.
- Ms. Beach said the shelter is supposed to be out of the Macy’s site by 2020 and that this timing dovetails with the redevelopment schedule for the mall. Howard Hughes, as Ms. Beach explains, will need to apply for a revision to their development review application which would start in 2018.
- Ms. McIlvaine added that she attended a Cameron Station Homeowner’s Association meeting in early September and that the community members present were very supportive.
- In response to a question from a community member in the audience about what would happen if redevelopment of the mall came before the completion of the new Carpenter’s Shelter, Ms. Beach reaffirmed that the mall will need go through the revised entitlement process for their development application.

6 Infrastructure Plan Update

- Ms. Labadie gave an overview of the Phase 2 Infrastructure plan including the purpose of the studies and how they will feed into the developer contributions analysis.
- Ms. Bevis-Carver presented an update of the sanitary sewer study starting with the map of the sewer system in the plan area.

- Ms. Bevis-Carver said the map shows yellow lines, which are the smaller city-owned collector sewers. Ms. Bevis-Carver said capacity issues for these lines are resolved at the site plan phase where the applicant is required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewer capacity and make improvements if needed.
- Ms. Bevis-Carver mentioned the focus of the current study is on the interceptor sewers, which were shown in blue and green on the map. Ms. Bevis-Carver mentioned that most of these sewers are owned by Alexandria Renew Enterprises. Ms. Bevis-Carver said this plan area is unique in that some interceptor sewers are owned by Fairfax County.
- Ms. Bevis-Carver said the study began with a kick-off meeting in July with staff, the consultant, Alex Renew and Fairfax County representatives. The scope included updating the sanitary sewer model.
- Ms. Bevis-Carver said that since that kick-off meeting, they have added Fairfax County-owned sewers, Fairfax County development projections, and flow data to the model. With this data gathered, they can begin running the model to identify any sewer constraints in the system. From there, they will come up with alternatives for addressing any identified constraints.
- Ms. Bevis-Carver reviewed the study schedule and noted that they are on track.
- Ms. Bevis-Carver said she will present the model results and preliminary alternatives, if needed, to the AG in February.
- A community member from the audience asked if Fairfax County is still paying for its portion of the lines located in this study area, to which Ms. Bevis-Carver replied by saying that they do; they also pay their share of operations at Alex Renew as well as any maintenance to the lines they own. Sewer upgrades, however, are a shared responsibility.
- Ms. Artemel asked how potential upgrades would be funded, to which Ms. Bevis-Carver replied by saying that the city has an enterprise fund, existing user's sewer bill and tap fees collected through redevelopment. The model will reveal if there is an existing capacity issue or if there is an expected capacity issue, which will then inform the source of funding.
- Ms. Artemel asked how timing of improvements occur with redevelopment, to which Ms. Bevis-Carver replied by saying that any improvements made will consider the findings of the modeling and may need to be added as future CIPs but that she did not have the exact answers at this time.
- Mr. Hardwick asked Ms. Bevis-Carver to expand on her relationship with Fairfax County, to which Ms. Bevis-Carver replied by saying that the city has an active, on-going relationship with the county in dealing with sewer issues as new development comes along. The county has to agree to take on the flow from new development should the developments flow into county-owned lines. Mr. Hardwick also asked if new development flows will enter into Fairfax County interceptor lines or city lines or both, to which Ms. Bevis-Carver replied by saying it's a combination and also includes flows in outside areas, as well.
- Mr. Sindiong began by reiterating the purpose of the roadway infrastructure study, including looking at the 10% design for key framework streets while considering the grid of streets envisioned in the small area plan.
- Mr. Sindiong said the study started over the summer with hiring of Kimley-Horn and began the project in August and that the goal is to have the study complete by late next year.
- Mr. Sindiong discussed the framework streets, including the multimodal bridge, the Farrington Connector, Metro Road, Eisenhower Ave., and key grid streets. He mentioned that the study is looking at roadway dimensions, alignments, transit, and bike facilities.

- Mr. Sindiong described what the consultant will be providing and when and that this study will coincide with the developer contributions analysis.
- Mr. Impastato asked if there will be an interim report that can be shared with the AG and the public, to which Mr. Sindiong replied by saying that there will be a report to share by the February meeting.
- Mr. Sindiong explained that the consultants are coordinating with the sanitary sewer analysis, has gone out for in-the-field reconnaissance, and has also been coordinating with Norfolk Southern. He mentioned the consultant has completed an existing conditions mapping exercise and are now taking the road configurations outlined in the small area plans to identify any associated issues and explore possible alternatives.
- Mr. Sindiong went through the framework streets shown on a map and described them in context of the goals and recommendations of the small area plans.
- A community member in the audience voiced concern about the multi-modal bridge connecting to South Pickett Street as it relates to increased traffic and noise, to which Mr. Sindiong replied by explaining the scope of the study and the goals of the small area plan as they relate to increasing connectivity and therefore options for the amount of trips identified in the 2015 traffic analysis. He also mentioned that noise analysis occurs in the future but is not a part of this study.
- Mr. Sindiong said the 2015 traffic study could be accessed on the city's website.
- Ms. Lyle voiced concern about the enforcement of SUP conditions for Cameron Station.
- A community member in the audience voiced concern about operations at Virginia Paving as it relates to the proposed multi-modal bridge.
- Mr. Sindiong noted that the multi-modal bridge is currently located to the west of Virginia Paving plant operations.
- Mr. Farner reiterated the goals of the small area plans as it relates to increasing connectivity and therefore options and increasing the walkability of streets. He also mentioned the feasibility, phasing and funding of the multi-modal bridge and how it relates to the Virginia Paving site.
- Ms. Artemel asked if this study is just an engineering study and not focused on economic development, to which Mr. Sindiong replied by saying it is only looking at design and will take into consideration stormwater.
- Mr. Teague went over the process taken so far to determine initial findings of each framework street and what the general details of those initial findings.
- Mr. Teague went over two options for the Farrington Connector, including the alignment shown in the small area plan and an alternative that uses existing right-of-way at Burnside. He mentioned pros and cons of each option.
- Mr. Teague explained two options for the multi-modal bridge, including the Norfolk Southern preferred alignment and an option that considers the straightening of Eisenhower Ave. as per the small area plan. He mentioned pros and cons of each option.
- Various community members in the audience asked questions related to timing and cost for the options. Mr. Teague replied that this portion of the study will come later. Mr. Sindiong added that phasing will be considered during this study.
- A community member in the audience asked why the bridge is needed instead of widening Van Dorn, to which Ms. Coleman replied by saying that these sorts of questions were discussed and determined during the small area planning process.
- Mr. Durham requested Mr. Teague and staff to look at walking distance for each multi-modal bridge option.
- A community member in the audience asked about the height and slope of the multi-modal bridge and how that will impact pedestrians and cyclists, to which Mr. Teague

described the initial findings on grading. Mr. Sindiong added goal is to keep the grade at 6% maximum.

- Mr. Hardwick asked what staff's preferred alignment of the multi-modal bridge is and asked if the two options can be shown with the new configuration of Eisenhower Ave. Mr. Sindiong expressed staff's initial preference being for option 2.
- Mr. Sindiong went over next steps for the roadway infrastructure study, that staff and the consultant will continue to work together, and that they will continue working with Norfolk Southern on the multi-modal bridge alignment. He said planning level cost estimates, which feed into the developer contributions analysis, would be ready in the spring.
- Ms. Lyle asked about funding for the roadway infrastructure, to which Mr. Sindiong replied by saying they will be looking at several different funding options. She requested an update by the next meeting on funding options.
- Ms. Coleman asked if there would be a written report for the roadway infrastructure study, to which Mr. Sindiong replied that they will be providing a separate deliverable.

7 Small Area Plans/ Master Plan Amendments

- Mr. Farner explained the role of the master plan and when a master plan amendments are necessary.
- Mr. Farner introduced the typical topics of a master plan and that master plans build in a level of flexibility to accommodate changing technology and the pace of that change.
- Mr. Farner mentioned that master plans should be rigid on street networks, connectivity for multiple modes of transportation and block sizes while also considering the need to be flexible over time.
- Mr. Farner stated the vision of each plan is different for each plan area and the pieces in each plan are developed to implement that unique vision. He mentioned that one key ingredient to implementation is the market. The plan lays the groundwork for the market to respond.
- Mr. Farner spoke about the process for master plan amendment approval, which includes a public process and consideration as to whether the proposed amendment achieves the vision of the plan.
- Mr. Impastato voiced concern about master plan amendments being considered for increased density when the plan did not envision such an increase, to which Mr. Farner replied by explained the that some projects use the bonus density mechanism to provide affordable housing, that detailed studies commence at the site level when such projects come in to ensure mitigation of impacts, and that ultimately the review process includes community input.
- Mr. Farner revisited the street grid of walkable, bikeable streets envisioned in the small area plan to increase connectivity and therefore capacity.
- A community member from the audience asked about land use assumptions used in the small area planning process, to which Mr. Farner replied by saying office should be concentrated around metro stations to the extent possible and to also balance office and residential not from a square footage perspective but from an amount of people perspective, which affects economics and traffic. He also mentioned the results of the fiscal analysis on use.
- A community member from the audience asked if there is a site planned for a school, to which Mr. Farner replied by saying that there is a group working with staff and city facilities to located a school. He said they will be making recommendations to council. Ms. Lyle mentioned there is a school targeted for this area but that we will not know the location of the school for several years. Mr. Farner added that Patrick Henry school is under construction now.

8 Additional Updates

- Mr. Randall gave an update on recently completed development projects as well as some that are currently going through the development review process. He also updated the group on the status of the Greenhill CDD project, which is in a very preliminary state and that staff has not made any recommendations yet. He also updated the group on the status and parameters of the Virginia Paving SUP renewal process, including conditions related to compatibility with the community and the small area plan, as well as the Vulcan site's withdrawn residential development application.
- Ms. Lyle requested that staff host community meetings well in advance of planning commission on projects coming in to the area.
- A community member in the audience asked who is responsible for clean-up of some of the industrial sites once redeveloped, to which Mr. Randall replied by saying it is the responsibility of the owner/ developer.
- Ms. Labadie went over the scope of the developer contributions analysis and the status of the analysis. She mentioned staff has hired W-ZHA and also described the preliminary schedule and deliverables, which includes a draft by February and final technical memorandum by next spring.
- Ms. Coleman asked if the study was city-wide to which Ms. Labadie replied that this study applies only to Eisenhower West and Landmark Van Dorn plan areas.

9 Air Quality Analysis Update

- Mr. Tran reviewed the purpose of the air quality analysis and provided an update on the three parts of the study.
- Mr. Tran explained that after running the model, there were no impacts with the present land uses, and he mentioned the analysis included impacts from Covanta and Virginia Paving.
- Mr. Tran said over the summer, the modeling showed there are issues with nitrogen oxide emissions for buildings over 120'. He described some mitigation measures being considered.
- Mr. Tran noted that Covanta will need to come into compliance per State regulation, which will be included in the next round of modeling.
- Several community members from the audience expressed concern about existing air quality impacts, to which Councilwoman Pepper suggested residents gather samples and give to the city for testing. Mr. Tran agreed to work with the concerned citizen on testing a sample.

10 Questions and Next Steps

- Ms. Labadie went over the dates and locations of the next two scheduled AG meetings and reminded the group of an open house being held that week.
- A community member in the audience voiced concern about accommodating alignments of the multi-modal bridge based on the owner's preference, to which Ms. Lyle replied by explaining the lengthy process it took to get where we are today.