City of Alexandria, Virginia

PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
Thursday, July 21, 2016, 7 p.m.
Alexandria Police Department Community Room
3600 Wheeler Ave. - Alexandria, VA 22314

Summary Minutes

Commission Members: Jennifer Atkins, Chair; Judith Coleman, Vice Chair; Gina Baum, Steven Beggs, Rich Brune, Secretary; Jesse O’Connell, Michael Peter, Brian McPherson, Catherine Poulin. Absent: Danielle Baker, Angela Lalwani, High School Youth Members.

RPCA Staff: James Spengler, Director; Robin DeShields, Executive Assistant; Laura Durham, Open Space Coordinator/Acting Director, Chinquapin Recreation Center and Aquatics Facility; Jack Browand, Division Chief, Park Planning, Design & Capital Development; William Chesley, Deputy Director, Recreation Services; Dinesh Tiwari, Deputy Director, Park Operations; and Shantel Lynch, Youth Volunteer.

Other City Staff: Jesse Maines, Division Chief, and Brian Rahal, Civil Engineer, Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES), Stormwater Management.

Guests: Caroline Grigilone, Jeff Newhouse, Alexandria Soccer Association & Youth Sports Advisory Board, Jeannie Gardner, Paul Gilbert, Executive Director, Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NOVA Parks), Terrance Ross, Teddy Ross, Boy Scouts, and William Goff.

I. Call to Order: Chair Jennifer Atkins called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

II. Public Hearing:

a. Lease Agreement between the City of Alexandria and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority for Cameron Run Regional Park: Jack Browand, Division Chief, Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities (RPCA). Atkins noted that this item was previously heard on June 23, 2016, and public comments received are included in the minutes. Since the P&RC did not have a quorum this item is being reheard. Browand gave a brief overview from the June presentation. He said the purpose of tonight’s meeting is to: 1. Hold the Public Hearing on how to proceed with the public process for Cameron Run Regional Park, and 2. P&RC discussion and staff advisement on the public process.

• The Presentation from June 23, 2016 is posted at: https://www.alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/recreation/info/CameronRunParkPlan23June2016.pdf
Information on the Proposed Public Planning Process is posted at:

Background: On June 18, 2016, City Council held a public hearing to receive input on the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority’s (NOVA Parks) request to renew its lease of the Cameron Run Regional Park property. The current lease expires in June 2021, and NOVA Parks wants to renew the lease through 2036. City Council deferred action on this item, and directed staff to develop a planning process for the Cameron Run Regional Park site, in conjunction with staff and all relevant stakeholder groups. Staff will provide recommendations to City Council in Fall 2016. Browand said in 2014, the P&RC approved RPCA’s Coordinated Open Space Plan for the Cameron Run area, which included Joseph Hensley Park (‘Hensley’) and the surrounding area (See Presentation). RPCA will begin design work for Hensley Fields this summer, with construction expected to begin in 2018. Atkins noted Public Comments from the June 23rd Public Hearing have been reviewed by the P&RC and are reflected in the minutes and were received from John Timmons, David Pritzer, Bill Dickinson, Elizabeth Wright, Judy Noritake, Ed Goes, Paul Gilbert, Executive Director, NOVA Parks, and Stacy Chittlick – See minutes posted at:
https://www.alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/recreation/info/PRCMinutesJune232016APROVEDMINUTES.pdf

Email comments and correspondence are posted at:
https://www.alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/recreation/info/PublicCommentsTableNOVAParksLease.pdf

Public comments July 21, 2016 hearing:
Paul Gilbert, Executive Director, NOVA Parks submitted a copy of a letter to City Manager Mark Jinks, dated July 18, 2016 (See Attachment). Gilbert states “The central question the P&RC has focused on is, if the reuse of Cameron Run would result in more local athletic facilities, and if so, in what time period?” He said the new planning process for Cameron Run should focus on alternative uses for the site. A determination should also be made regarding the number of individuals to be served, cost of developing new uses, and the costs to create alternatives. Gilbert requests that any studies be completed expeditiously so the lease renewal is not held up. He said NOVA Parks submitted some suggestions about a year ago for uses of the property with cost estimates (See Memorandum). He said the current lease expires 2021, and that midsummer 2020 would be the final season under the existing lease.

Email comment JoAnn Milliken: Ms. DeShields noted that an additional comment was received from Milliken on July 20, 2016 who supports keeping the Cameron Run Regional water park and batting cage open. She said that there “are not many options for outdoor water activities in the area” and that Cameron Run Regional Park is used by many families in the community (See Attachment).

MOTION: O’Connell moved to close the public hearing, Brune seconded. The motion carried unanimously. The public hearing closed at 7:16 p.m.

Action: Atkins deferred Commission discussion on the Proposed Planning Process for Cameron Run Regional Park to later in the meeting, in order for the P&RC to receive the updates on the Lake Cook Stormwater Retrofit Project.
b. **Recommended Concept Plan for the Braddock Neighborhood Park, 600 N. Henry St.:** Jack Browand, Division Chief, Park Planning gave a brief update on project. This item was heard on June 23, 2016, and was deferred due to a lack of quorum. **Background:** The project will replace the .50-acre interim open space at 600 N. Henry St. with a permanent 1.0-acre park. The final Concept Plan for the permanent park was presented to the P&RC on March 10, 2016. Browand said staff is seeking endorsement from the P&RC on the Schematic Design for the 1.0-acre park.

**Public Comments June 23, 2016:** Atkins noted that two public comments were received one by email from Allen Irvin, who supports the Concept Plan; and one from Judy Noritake, President, Braddock Metro Citizens Coalition (BMCC); and President Braddock Implementation Advisory Group (BIAG), who testified in favor of the Concept Plan.  
MOTION: O’Connell moved to close the public hearing, Brune seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Brune moved that the P&RC write a letter supporting the Concept Plan (or Schematic Design) for the Braddock Neighborhood Park Plan. O’Connell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

III. **Presentations:**

a. **Water Quality Steering Committee:** Jessie Maines, Division Chief and Brian Rahal, P.E., CFM, Civil Engineer IV, T&ES Stormwater Management Division

i. **Lake Cook & Ben Brenman Pond Stormwater Retrofits:** See Presentation posted at:  

- **Background:** The City is required as part of the Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Cleanup Mandate to improve its stormwater management systems and treat stormwater runoff. Acres Requiring Treatment for Chesapeake Bay Cleanup, and Permit Cycle is included in the presentation (See Presentation). Goal is removal of pollutants to achieve within the next 15 years; this will be achieved in part by the work done at Lake Cook and Ben Brenman Pond. The existing stormwater detention ponds treat some storm water, but need to be upgraded to improve efficiencies.

- **Ben Brenman Pond** is at 10% Concept Plan: See Presentation and schedule. Rahal said the project will be at 30% design submittal in August 2016, and a public hearing is anticipated September. The final design is anticipated in Spring 2018, and construction is anticipated to begin Spring 2019. **Lake Cook** is at 100% design stage, and documents will be received by T&ES by tomorrow. See Presentation - Lake Cook Schedule and Next Steps: July 22, 2016 - 100% Design Submittal, August 2016 – Bid Document Submittal, November 2016 - Construction Scheduled to begin, with expected completion Spring 2017.

- **T&ES staff responded to questions from Commissioners.** Peter noted that the pond at Ben Brenman needed maintenance as there is a lot of trash there. Rahal said that a Memorandum of Understanding will be developed between T&ES & RPCA that will include established maintenance responsibilities. Spengler noted that stormwater detention ponds are designed to collect debris. In response to a
question from Baum, Maines said that T&ES discourages people from going into the streams or swimming in the detention ponds after rain events. Atkins said the public has expressed some concern about invasive plants and wants to ensure that any new plantings be native. Rahal said staff is working with Natural Resource Specialist Rod Simmons concerning the types of plants to be used. He said removal of invasives is not a targeted focus. However, most of the vegetation at Lake Cook will be removed when dredging occurs.

b. Citywide Parks Wayfinding Plan: See Staff Report. RPCA has hired Applied Wayfinding to design a comprehensive Wayfinding plan and phased implementation for the City’s largest parks. Parks for this phase include Ben Brennan/Booth Park, Holmes Run Park and Greenway, Chinquapin Park, Four Mile Run Park, Eugene Simpson Stadium Park, and Joseph Hensley Park, per a recommendation in the Citywide Parks Improvement Plan, and Windmill Hill Park.

IV. Items for Information:

a. Public Comments – non-agenda items: None.

b. Updates: See Staff Report for Park Planning, Design & CIP.

i. Patrick Henry School and Recreation Center: See Staff Report. Alexandria City School Board has approved the selection of Keller Construction Management, LLC to lead the building of the new Patrick Henry School and recreation center. 

Discussion: Browand said the Concept II Plan was submitted in June and staff have submitted comments to the Design Team. The Final Site Plan is scheduled to go before the School Board in August 2016, and if approved will be sent to the Planning Commission for approval of the Development Special Use Permit (DSUP), and to City Council in December 2016. Construction is expected to begin late spring 2017, and the new school is expected to open in fall 2018.

Atkins asked if the Final Site Plan will come before the P&RC in fall 2016. Browand said RPCA staff is working with ACPS and the Design Team to finalize the outdoor amenities, which will be built using additional funding approved by City Council for FY2018. He said in order to maximize open space, the recreation center parking lot will be removed, and there will be one consolidated parking lot for the whole property. However, staff has requested that a minimal number of spaces be set-aside for daytime recreational use. In response to Baum’s question, Browand said ACPS did not propose any athletic lighting for the project, however there is no condition that says there can never be lights. He said any request for lights would need to be done in conjunction with ACPS, since this is school property and would need to go through a separate process. Browand said there is currently no funding available for lights. For more information: http://www.acps.k12.va.us/facilities/ph/

ii. Windmill Hill Park Shoreline Rehabilitation Project: See Staff Report. Final construction documents are complete and RPCA received final BAR approval on July 6, 2016. City Procurement is finalizing the BID document for release this month. Construction, beginning with demolition will begin in late summer.

Discussion: Browand said that the Request for Proposals (RFP) went out last week, and final BAR approval has been received. Bids are expected in by mid-
August or after Labor Day. Staff will provide more information in September.

iii. **Open Space Plan Implementation Strategy:** See Staff Report. RPCA has hired Lardner/Klein Landscape Architects to compile a status report on the success to date of implementation of the 2003 Open Space Master Plan (OSMP) and will produce an Implementation Strategy for the plan over the next ten years. 

**Discussion:** Browand said RPCA staff will be drafting a position paper on how well the OSMP worked, and the future direction of the plan. Staff wants to ensure all public access space is properly recorded, and the information will be brought back to the P&RC in September 2016 and will then go to City Council for implementation. He said as part of the Implementation Plan, there may need to be some changes to the existing OSMP. Durham said any specific policy recommendations will follow what goes to the P&RC and City Council. She said staff won’t be recommending any immediate policy changes. Coleman said she thought the original goal was to develop a coherent open space policy so that the City is not doing ad hoc negotiations with each developer. Durham said yes, there will be a series of recommendations, and specific recommendations will be brought forward that require policy approval. She said the OSP was approved in 2003, and in 2004 the Implementation Strategy was completed. Staff is now updating the Implementation Strategy, and there will be a number of recommendations that City Council will need to vote on. She said the P&RC has received periodic updates from staff, and this is taking the final last steps mapping recommendations from the P&RC and review at a staff level.

iv. **Limerick Field/AlexRenew:** Browand said a plan is being implemented to fix the leakage issue, and staff is hopeful that the field will be available for use by Labor Day. Staff is working with T&ES to identify additional parking. He said any programming needs to be done to ensure the site is not overloaded, and staff is looking at limiting parking during certain times of the day around high programming areas.

Baum said she recalled parking being in the original plan. Browand said some parking was dependent on future development that hasn’t occurred, and the Hoffman properties are now being sold. He said there is some on-street parking. Baum asked if parking will this be like a Simpson Field situation. Browand said there should be enough parking unless a lot of new programs are added. He said available parking spaces will need to be carefully managed.

v. **Warwick Pool:** See Staff Report. The City has hired Lukmire Partnership, Inc. (Engineer & Design Firm) to design and manage replacement of Warwick Pool, and initial discussions have started. 

**Discussion:** Browand said there is a limited budget, and the time schedule is accelerated, so that the new pool can open next year. City Council’s direction was to replace the pool and the bathhouse will be reduced to a one-story seasonal structure. The new pool will be a neighborhood based pool of similar size and function.

V. **Items for Action:**

a. **Approval of Minutes:** April 21, 2016 & May 19, 2016, June 23, 2016. 

**MOTION:** Baum moved to approve the minutes of April, May and June 2016, Brune seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
b. **Approval of Recommended Concept Plan for the Braddock Neighborhood Park, 600 N. Henry St.:** Approved - See Item II- b.

c. **NOVA Parks Cameron Run Regional Park Planning Framework:** Continued – See Item II-a.

The Proposed Planning Process for Cameron Regional Park is posted at:

The Department of RPCA will provide a public process framework to identify potential alternative future uses of the Cameron Run Regional Park site to the P&RC and City Council in fall 2016. RPCA will seek consultant services to develop, recommend, and implement a Public Process and provide alternative Conceptual Plan(s). The timeline outlines the process and plan development and is broken down into three Tasks. Browand reviewed Task 1 & Task 2 Items.

**Task 1:** Public Process Framework: Fall 2016

**Task 2:** Public Process Implementation: November 2016-February 2017, and

**Task 3:** Conceptual Plan Development, February 2017-March 2017

Browand said the P&RC needs to decide if they want to recommend that Joseph “Hensley” Park be included as part of the planning process for Cameron Run Regional Park. He said staff intends to hire one contractor to handle all three tasks, and the funding will come from the Capital Budget for open space.

**Discussion:** The P&RC discussed whether to include “Hensley Park”, as part of the planning process for Cameron Run Regional Park. A consensus was reached to include “Hensley Park” in order to provide flexibility and take a holistic planning approach, since both parks are located in the Eisenhower West area, even though the land use constraints may be different. The P&RC noted that the City has already completed or established other plans in this area.

Coleman said one concern with including “Hensley” is this may increase the amount of time or money needed to complete the process, and may affect the public engagement process.

O’Connell asked when the new Needs Assessment will be completed. Browand said the studies are done biannually, and the next one is scheduled for 2017. He said all data from the 2015 Needs Assessment will be provided to the Consultant.

Durham said the challenge is because the Citywide Parks Plan was done and the CIP included funding for Hensley field in 2018, that timing may be an issue.

Poulin said in regards to Gilbert’s letter to City Manager, she would like to know the number of Alexandria City users served by the facilities at the Cameron Run Regional Park.

Beggs said the Consultant can do the engineering, land use analysis in a good time frame that can be easily presented to the public.

Atkins said she hopes the timeline can be maintained, because time is of the essence. She agrees with including Hensley so that the planning area will be looked at as a whole. She also agrees with having the Consultant handle all three Tasks. She is pleased that Paul
Gilbert, Executive Director, NOVA Parks has agreed to participate with the planning process, and she appreciates staff’s work on the planning process schedule. Coleman said it is important that input is received on what the City’s priorities are over the next few years, in addition to input from the community, and City Departments. She said ACPS should be included, as there have been ongoing discussions regarding building a major recreation center in the City’s West End. She said RPCA staff should be mindful of the timeline and the upcoming end of year holidays, as this may impact Task 2 meetings, scheduled to occur from November 2016 to February 2017. Browand said staff will include City stakeholders in the planning process, in terms of land use development. Regarding the timeline, he said staff are aware of the end of year holidays, and there are a variety of tools that can be used, including using Charrette models, to obtain a lot of information in short period of time.

Atkins agreed with the importance of identifying other stakeholders, in addition to athletic groups, NOVA Parks, and the general public, and with inclusion of ACPS and various City Departments as part of Task 1 such as: RPCA, T&ES, etc. Atkins asked if there any other comments or suggestions.

**MOTION**: Brune moved that the P&RC approve the Proposed Planning Process as presented for Cameron Run Regional Park. O’Connell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

d. **Election of FY 2017 Slate of Officers (deferred from June 23, 2016)**: Chair Jennifer Atkins said she and Vice Chair Judy Coleman will maintain their current positions, and that Michael Peter volunteered to serve as the new Secretary replacing Rich Brune. There was no opposition. **MOTION**: McPherson moved to approve the Slate of Officers as presented, Brune seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. **Director’s Report**: James Spengler, Director - **See Staff Report**: The Director had to leave early due to an emergency. William Chesley, Deputy Director, Recreation Services, Dinesh Tiwari, Deputy Director Park Operations, and Jack Browand, Division Chief Park Planning, Design and Capital Projects gave updates. Please See FY2017 Budget Report posted at https://www.alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/recreation/info/FY2017BudgetImpactsfinalPRC7_21_16.pdf

**Discussion**: Chesley said this past budget cycle staff was given guidance that they could not use revenue to offset reductions and this presented a challenge. He said staff’s guidance was to take a 5% reduction. However, some areas of cuts were restored, and there were some program expansions.

Chesley reviewed the Service Expectations for Recreation Services (See Report). He noted that the operating hours at Nannie J. Lee will be reduced (late evening hours for adults.) The community wanted the program to be maintained, and Monday and Wednesday late hours will remain on the schedule. He said even with the reduction of the hours the space can still be programmed and opened on demand as needed. Chesley said the only fees adjusted were those for the Out-of-School-Time Program (OSTP), and staff will review fees with area jurisdictions.

Atkins thanked Chesley for the Outdoor Pools Report – Summer 2016 vs. Summer 2015, (See Report). Poulin asked why the numbers for usage at Charles Houston’s Pool (4,076) decreased as compared to Old Town Pool (7,510). Laura Durham, Acting Director, Chinquapin Recreation and Aquatics Center said there have been no significant issues and she is unsure why this occurred. Atkins said perhaps the capacity at Houston pool is a key issue. She said the splash fountain at
Potomac Yard is also being used a lot.

Tiwari reviewed Service Expectations for Park Operations (See Report). He said mowing schedules will be reduced and this will have the largest impact. The new mowing schedules will be posted online.
Coleman asked if there is a map of the low-mow areas. Tiwari said signs will be posted in the park for no-mow zones and a final list of locations is being developed. He said maps will be done in the future.

Atkins asked about the reduction in the Jerome “Buddie” Ford environmental education program for school children. Tiwari said this will involve a reduction in the number of outreach hours that staff will do in the schools. Poulin suggested that that Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS), might be asked to continue these valuable programs, using their PTA’s. Tiwari said staff will follow-up to see if there are other ways to obtain resources.

Browand said that the City marina security patrol contracted services has been eliminated. He said as part of the MGM readiness, staff will increase weekend maintenance, and there is increased funding for cultural activities and also for Interim Fitzgerald Square (See Report.) Interim Fitzgerald Square/Waterfront Update: Browand said the Beachcomber property that was purchased in 2006, has recently been torn down and this has significantly opened up the views of the waterfront. He said the Old Dominion Boat Club (ODBC) plans to occupy their new facility by Labor Day 2017. The Interim Fitzgerald Square may be completed by spring of 2018. He said Robinson Terminal North (RTN) and Robinson Terminal South (RTS) are very close to receiving permits for demolition which may occur at the end of August. Browand said there is an Ad Hoc Waterfront Monitoring Group.

O’Connell asked about the breastfeeding signs behind the front desk at Charles Houston. Durham said the sign says breastfeeding is not prohibited, and that the wording of the sign may need clarifying. Chesley said the will check into this and correct if needed.

VII. Division Updates:

a. Recreation Services, Park Operations, and Park Planning, Design & Capital Development

See Staff Reports posted at: https://www.alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/recreation/info/PRCCOMBINEDREPORTSJULY212016.pdf

VIII. Commission Business:

a. Attendance Report (July 2015 to June 2016): Executive Assistant DeShieldts routed the draft attendance report for review. She will update the report per Chair’s corrections and also include Peter in report and email the corrected report to the Chair. Browand will coordinate completion of the P&RC Annual Report. The reports are due to City Clerk by August 31, 2016.

b. Reports from Commissioners by District:

District II – Michael Peter - North Potomac Yard (NPY) Small Area Advisory Group Update. Peter gave a brief update - See Written Report. There were no other updates.

IX. Next Meeting: September 15, 2016

X. Adjourned: The meeting was adjourned by Chair Atkins at 8:53 p.m.
July 18, 2016

Mark Jinks
Alexandria City Manager
301 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

RE: City process on reviewing options for Cameron Run

Dear Mark,

In the fall, City staff is tasked with coming back to Council with a process for evaluating alternative options for Cameron Run, as the Park and Recreation Commission had requested. I think it is important for this process to be scoped properly to allow it to come to a conclusion in a reasonable amount of time so that a decision about the future of this property can be made.

The central question the Park and Recreation Commission has focused on is, if the reuse of Cameron Run would result in more local athletic facilities and, if so, in what time period? I would suggest that this be the central question of this new process. Without a clear focus, this process could go on a long time and take many tangents.

As the process considers alternative athletic uses, it should be determined how many individuals such a use would serve, and what the cost of developing the new use at the Cameron site would be? The number of individuals served, and the cost to create these alternatives, will help City Council determine the path forward in the end.

Since our previous offer with Murray’s Livery and youth passes has expired, I would request that this process consider the alternative to the studied uses be the existing waterpark under NOVA Parks continued operations. This will simplify the process and keep it focused on the alternative uses the Park and Recreation Commission would like studied, and the cost benefit analysis of those options. We previously were proposing to make a $2 million investment in
new features and facilities. If the length of a future lease is substantial enough, we would like to be able to continue to invest in making the waterpark all it can be.

When this process is complete, the City Council will be armed with the research to consider all options and make a thoughtful determination about the future of this land.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Gilbert

[Signature]

Executive Director

copy:  City of Alexandria Park and Recreation Commission
The advisory group reconvened on June 27 and primarily discussed options for where the north landing of the new metro station could be built. At this meeting, city staff and representatives of the developer made it clear that this and the next several meetings would each be devoted to specific topics. This meeting focused on the metro zone. Future meetings will focus on street layout and building heights.

After discussion of the original goals of the metro zone in the original 2010 plan, the group was asked to break up into smaller working tables to discuss three different options for the metro zones. Those options are detailed below with comments I shared and also illustrated in the attachments.

Option 1 – Metro Plaza Split Between East End of Development and a Portion of the Park at the East End
- This option created a space where Metro was divorced from the development and seemed to be just dropped in the park. There was no integration with real public space or the park.

Option 2/South – Metro Plaza Located at South End (Southeast Corner) of Phase I
- This option brought more of the development up into the park and created a closed-off area for the Metro. There did not seem to be much of a benefit for the development or for the park.

Option 2/North – Metro Plaza Located Slightly North of the South End, and Split Between Street Plaza and Possible Park Plaza
- This option brings Metro closer into the development and allows for some interesting integration with the park.
- This creates the best pedestrian experience and will also allow for some experimentation with the plaza on park land.

The group was asked to rate each of these options based on the following criteria: pedestrian environment/experience; connection between BRT, Metro, and destinations; and unique building forms, curvilinear form of Potomac Avenue, and central urban park.

After much discussion, the general consensus of the group was to go with Option 2/North as the general concept. This provides a focal point for Metro, without making it in the only major attraction of the end of this retail street. It connects and integrates with the street and the park. By potentially locating the Metro landing in the park area, this could create some interesting options for integration with the surrounding passive and active space.

The attachments show the options as presented and also show the results of the group exercises, along with pertinent comments. A daytime workshop was held with staff, developer representatives, and members of the Advisory Group on June 30 to work on integrating the group consensus into the current version of plans.
OPTION 1 Framework Diagram
OPTION 1 Metro Plaza Concept
### Charrette Option One: Metro Landing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides the best pedestrian environment/experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between BRT, Metro, and destinations</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique building forms, curvilinear form of Potomac Ave and central urban park</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group score was not taken. Individual preferences were tallied. Assumes each option has a high rating based on preference.

#### Illustrative After Full Buildout

#### Group 1:
- Metro seems isolated across Potomac Ave (1)
- Potomac Ave is very wide (1)
- Difficult pedestrian experience getting across Potomac Ave (very wide, need to wait for light)
- Yes, closer to BRT, but concern would be with pedestrian crossing the right-of-way
- Like BRT dropping off more central to the development (Opt. 2)
- Like pond next to plaza (Opt. 2 South)
- Plaza could be done well in Option 1

#### Group 2:
- Metro is divorced from development
- Least pedestrian experience
- Less cohesive plaza design
- Plaza feels broken up/integrating the two plazas a challenge
- BRT connection is strong
- Connectivity to Metro strong, weak for connectivity to neighborhood

#### Group 3:
- Pedestrian access from BRT/Metro is jumbled
- BRT arrives closest to Metro of 3 options
- Crossing Potomac Ave-pedestrian nightmare/difficult, speed of vehicles
OPTION 2 Framework Diagram
OPTION 2/SOUTH

PHASE ONE

ILLUSTRATIVE AFTER FULL BUILDOUT
# Charrette Option Two: South Metro Landing

**Illustrative After Full Buildout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides the best pedestrian environment/experience</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between BRT, Metro, and destinations</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique building forms, curvilinear form of Potomac Ave and central urban park</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group score was not taken. Individual preferences were tallied. Assumes each option has a high rating based on preference.

**Group 1:**
- South Entrance-Less distance on bridge
- Feels like a bottleneck coming off the metro
- Awkward relationship to everything else
- Like pond next to plaza
- Ability to circulate vehicles

**Group 2:**
- Plaza all in one piece
- Activates the plaza
- Relationship to adjacent uses is strong
- Constraint - How attractive will the south pond be?
- Lower than 2N, 2N better connected

**Group 3:**
- No visual connection to Metro from BRT
- Very tightly constrained
- Seems urban/small-just a stop not necessarily a civic plaza
OPTION 2/NORTH

PHASE ONE

ILLUSTRATIVE AFTER FULL BUILDOUT
## Charrette Option Two: North Metro Landing

### Illustrative After Full Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides the best pedestrian environment/experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between BRT, Metro, and destinations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique building forms; curvilinear form of Potomac Ave and central urban park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group score was not taken. Individual preferences were tallied. Assumes each option has a high rating based on preference.

**Group 1:**
- Minimizes width of street crossings (frames pedestrian space)
- North Entrance-Least overlaps, Most office use
- Seems like a good pedestrian experience-terminates vista
- Sensory experience, like way buildings wrap
- Further north, more office workers
- Provides good access between Metro and BRT
- Option to connect to the park
- Nice urban room
- Good visibility coming in
- A little issue with whether there is something to see coming down the middle of the street.

**Group 2:**
- Buildings can great a canyon effect
- Kind of hidden
- Integrated into the park
- No road around office privatizes park, delineation of office building to park important
- Has strong connection between the plaza, not the road
- Activates and creates a memorable open space
- Potential challenge and opportunity to integrate Metro, park, and plaza
- More fun stuff immediately adjacent
- Breaks distance of two Metro stations

**Group 3:**
- Visual connection between BRT & Metro
- Comfortable crossing-plaza framed by buildings
- Best pedestrian experience, visual connection from blocks away, spills out into the park