

DRAFT Minutes – June 5, 2012 ACCF Membership Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm by President James Schroll at Hazel Auditorium. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Pete Olivere from Glencarlyn. The agenda was approved as submitted. Minutes for the previous membership meeting and the Treasurer's report were approved.

Membership Committee Report

Black Oak Cluster Community Association was admitted to membership. Madison Manor Citizens Association was readmitted after an absence.

Election of Civic Federation officers and Executive Committee Members

The following officers for 2012-2013 were approved unanimously: President James Schroll Ballston-Virginia Square Vice President Kim Klingler Leeway Overlee Secretary Amy Levin Aurora Highlands Treasurer Peter Olivere Glencarlyn Executive Committee Burt Bostwick Old Glebe Executive Committee James Lantelme Lyon Village Executive Committee Mike McMenamin Maywood Executive Committee Terri Prell North Rosslyn Executive Committee Vacant The vacant Executive Committee position will be filled in the fall.

CIP Program

The Federation heard presentations by Schools and County Staff on the pending Capital Improvement Plan programs for each, followed by questions from the committees and from delegates.

Planning and Zoning Sign Ordinance program

The Committee's presentation outlined previous CivFed positions on the revision of the sign ordinance and took "straw polls" on a number of proposed changes. Delegates voted for as many options as they supported. The results of the nine straw poll items are attached.

Unfinished Business

The Federation deferred action until fall on a Resolution Regarding Proposed Changes to the County Ordinances Affecting Agriculture. A County task force is working on the issue, and the Civic Federation now has a representative on that group (Darnell Carpenter). See May minutes for the resolution.

New Business

The Federation debated and passed a Resolution Regarding the Placement on the November 2012 Ballot of the Bonding Authority for Phase II of Long Bridge Park, requesting the County to put it on the ballot as a separate item not combined with other park bonds. (Attached) The vote was 25 - 6 - 0

The Federation deferred action on a resolution asking the Arlington County School Board not to take action on selecting sites for new or expanded facilities without adequate neighborhood participation. (attached)

The meeting adjourned at 10:48 pm until the next membership meeting on September 4, 2012.

Submitted by: Randy Swart Interim Note Taker

Resolution Regarding the Placement on the November 2012 Ballot of the Bonding Authority for Phase II of Long Bridge Park

Adopted June 5, 2012.

WHEREAS, on May 19, 2012, the County Manager introduced her proposed Capital Improvement Plan for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 (the "CIP"); and

WHEREAS, the CIP includes \$72.262M of construction funding for Phase II of Long Bridge Park, which includes an aquatics and fitness center, including four separate indoor pools; and

WHEREAS, the CIP proposes funding Phase II of Long Bridge ("Phase II") was a combination of \$9.762M of remaining bonding authority from the 2004 bond referendum, \$20M of so-called "developer contributions," and \$42.5M from a new bond referenda for November 2012; and

WHEREAS, the likely source of the \$20M of developer contributions is the sale of density by the County to developer(s) under the transfer of density ordinance; and

WHEREAS, since the developer contributions are speculative in nature, the Manager is proposing interim borrowing of the \$20M, so that Phase II can proceed; and

WHEREAS, the combined "all-in" annual cost of Phase II, including bond debt service, interest on the interim borrowing and net operating cost subsidy, is projected to be in the range of \$7M per year in its initial years; and

WHEREAS, the impact of Phase II on both the County's bonding capacity and its future General Fund budgets is considerable; and

WHEREAS, the County Board is scheduled to approve the CIP and the structure of the County's bond referenda at its meetings on July 21/24 2012, prior to the next meeting of the Federation; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Arlington County Civic Federation urges the County Board to place the \$42.5M (or any other amount, if the Board modifies the County Manager's proposal) for Phase II as a separate and distinct issue on the November 2012 ballot, and not be combined with any other projects proposed for bonding.

Resolution Requesting the School Board to Defer Final Decision on School Locations Until Major Community Issues Are Addressed

Action deferred until September, 2012.

WHEREAS the Arlington County School Board has submitted a CIP for FY 2013-2022 which includes the construction of two new elementary schools, one on the grounds of Williamsburg Middle School and one on the grounds of and Kenmore Middle and Carlin Springs Elementary Schools; and

WHEREAS the School Board had committed to include the impact on Neighborhood Resources as a criterion in the site selection process yet did not consult with the neighborhoods and thereby essentially ignored a broader set of impacts that will affect communities; and

WHEREAS significant requirements to meet critical community needs may not be included in the planning of funding if they are not discussed until after funding for the project is approved resulting in substantial increases in the estimates or critical items being left out of the of the specifications:

- for example substantial roadway changes to provide alternate entrances to the site and to mitigate the impact of a substantial increase in the number of vehicles flooding the area and

- the incorporation of some type of non-surface parking to preserve some of the recreation space used by numerous groups from across the county.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The School Board should not make final decisions on any site until there is agreement that one or more satisfactory solutions exist to mitigate the issues of critical concern to the community; the Arlington Public School (APS) staff should identify and include any costs in the estimates needed to address likely community concerns, e.g. road improvements or parking structures; and all information presented to the public in the final APS CIP for 2013-2022 and in material supporting the FY 2012 bond issue should acknowledge these conditions.

2. The County Board should specify along with their approval of bond funding for the APS for 2012 that the locations identified within the descriptions are contingent on APS reaching satisfactory solutions to mitigate issues of critical concern to the community; and the County Board should charge the Public Facilities Review Committee to consider these critical community concerns in their deliberations and reject a proposed location if the concerns are not met, whether or not an alternative location for a school has been identified.

Planning and Zoning Committee: Straw Poll Results

The results of the nine straw poll items follow. At various points there were 37 or 38 delegates voting. The left column indicates the percent of those delegates who supported the options listed. The item with the greatest support is bolded.

1. Commercial Signs in the Public ROW

The description provided by the speaker suggested that ¼ mile would not be adequate.

0%	I want no commercial signs in the Public Right of Way.
27%	I support the current draft and the ¹ / ₄ mile option.
92%	I support the current draft and the ½ mile option.
73%	I would like to revise the current draft to expand the times allowed based on the event timing.
8%	I support current draft with a 1-mile option.

2. Political Signs in the Public ROW

The description provided by the speaker reminded delegates of the prior difficulty associated with caucus and endorsement signage and also indicated the Planning Commission's suggested wording for expanding the definition of political event.

0%	I support revising the current draft to allow political signs in utility strips in R zoning districts as well as in medians.
73% 0%	
14%	I want no political signs in the Public Right of Way.

3. 7-Day Signs in the Public ROW

The speaker reminded delegates that prior Civic Federation input asked for a way to announce community events and then characterized the 7-day signs as a creative solution. There was a question whether fund-raising activities were commercial events and thus not eligible. A clarification was needed that the organizations in question would qualify as non-commercial if they operated as not-for-profit entities.

3%	I do not support 7-day signs in the Public Right of Way.
97%	I support the current draft.

4. Neighborhood Conservation Signs

The speaker showed a drawing of the current NCAC standard for neighborhood signs and where temporary signs might be added. The speaker also explained that there were older signs that did not conform to the current NC standard as well as signs that had temporary attachments that did not conform to the rules in the current draft.

0%	I do not support adding any temporary signs to neighborhood conservation signs.
81%	I support the current draft.
86%	I would like to revise the current draft to allow existing neighborhood conservation signs to continue in their current form — and to grandfather their current practice of temporary sign attachment.
54%	I support revising the current draft to allow two temporary signs each with up to 2.5 square feet.

5. Signs for Permitted Park Events

The speaker explained that the current draft wording seemed to disallow signage in smaller parks, such as Lyon Village Park because the signage would be legible from the street.

0% 11%	I want no signage in public parks, even for park events with a special permit.
11%	I support the current draft.
100%	I would like special events held at parks with permits to be allowed to place event signage in/near the park even if it is legible from a public right-of- way outside the park.

6. Institutional Use of Sidewalk Signs

The speaker indicated that delegates had requested this option. There was a question whether civic associations qualified as institutions.

0%	I support repealing the recently-approved use of sidewalk signs.
43%	I do not support increasing the use of sidewalk signs beyond what has already been approved.
76%	I support allowing institutions to use the sidewalk (A-frame) signs as their 7-day signs.

7. Signs on Utility Poles

The speaker explained that lost pet signs are posted on utility poles, that it was undesirable to make this a criminal misdemeanor, and that removing the ban from the ordinance language would also enable the current practice whereby DES posts use permit and variance notices.

0%	I do not support allowing any signs on utility poles except those installed by the utility.
100%	I support the current practice of allowing Arlington officials to place notices on utility poles.
51%	I support removing the current language that prohibits signage on utility poles.
100%	I support allowing 8.5x11" non-commercial signs on utility poles.

8. Roof Line Signs Above 40 Feet

The speaker mentioned several cities that do not allow roofline signs, as did delegates.

57%	I want no roof line signs above 40 feet.
5%	I want the County Board to decide all roofline sign requests.
19%	I support the language of the current draft with Option A.
32%	I support the language of the current draft with Option B.

9. Roof Line Signs Above 40 Feet Facing Public Lands Additional restrictions for signs facing public lands

Delegates were given copies of the letter from the National Park Service (NPS). The speaker identified and distinguished the monument core in the current draft, the expanded list in the NPS letter, and the further expanded list in the Planning Commission's resolution.

76%	I support adhering to the request made in the letter from the National Park Service AND other national monuments such as the 9/11 Pentagon Memorial and USAF Memorial (which the Planning Commission unanimously recommended).
68%	I support adhering to the request made in the letter from the National Park Service.
5%	I want the County Board to decide all roofline sign requests. 2
59%	I support Option F, no signs above 40 feet facing public lands as defined in the Draft.
30%	I support Option E, no illumination.
11%	I support Option D, reduced hours of illumination — not between 10pm and 8am.
16%	I support Option C, no additional restrictions.