

ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA
Interdepartmental Memorandum

October 6, 2008

TO: Christopher Zimmerman, Member, Arlington County Board

FROM: Office of the County Manager

SUBJECT: 339152/2370156

STAFF PREPARING RESPONSE:

- Lisa Grandle, Park Development Division Chief, PRCR, 703-228-3332
- Christine Nixon, Neighborhood Conservation, 703-228-3820

ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED:

Per Step Note dated September 9, 2008:

- Question #2. Master Park Planning for Virginia Highlands and Eads Street Parks (PRCR)
- Question #3. KIMCO site plan funds (CPHD)
- Question #4. Neighborhood Conservation Plan (CPHD) and sidewalk on west side of Fern Street (CPHD and DES)
- Question #5. Spray park in Virginia Highlands (PRCR)
- Question #7. Water Pollution Control Plant (DES)

CURRENT STATUS/FINDINGS:

- Answer to #2: The recently adopted FY2009 - FY2014 Capital Improvement Program focuses on the principles of meeting previous commitments and several large projects that are already in the pipeline. The *Public Spaces Master Plan* also acknowledges the need to complete projects and plans in the pipeline before beginning new planning efforts. For these reasons, PRCR does not anticipate beginning any new park master planning efforts for at least the next few years. The volleyball court installation is on hold pending a further planning study of the needs of those persons who frequently play volleyball in Arlington. Some of these users are part of organized leagues, but many, and particularly those who frequent the Crystal City courts seem to be drop-in users. The planning study will consider the specific needs of those volleyball players who currently use the Crystal City courts and will evaluate all possible sites in the Aurora Highlands and Arlington Ridge area. Due to current workloads, the Park Development Division will not have the resources to undertake the study until 2009.

- Answer to #3: One of the KIMCO site plan conditions included a contribution of \$500,000 to be used for multiple purposes: construction of a water park for Virginia Highlands, subsidies to reduce the rent on urgent care facility, contributions toward WMATA Pentagon City Metro Plaza improvements and/or the provision of new bus shelters. The process and timeline for consideration of these funds has not yet been determined. As discussions begin regarding the allocation and use of these funds, community outreach will be factored into the decision making process. County Planner Samia Byrd (703-228-3529) will be the source of ongoing information about this site and the process and timeline for allocating the KIMCO contribution.
- Answer to #4: NCAC recommendations for project funding are guided by a points system. At least twice a year the NCAC convenes a points Committee, open to all NC representatives, to evaluate the points system, discuss possible alterations to the points system and take those recommendations back to the entire NCAC for discussion and possible adoption. While the points system currently does not take Mr. Cameron's issues into consideration, his issues are certainly appropriate for the Points Committee's consideration. Under the most recent version of the points system (Attachment 1), Aurora Highland's 19th Street project is ranked #1, not only because of the plan update but because it is a sidewalk.
- Answer to #4a: Outside of the Neighborhood Conservation process, no funding is immediately available for a sidewalk on the west side of Fern St. between 18th and 22nd Streets. Future funding from developers will come as a result of site plan conditions from both the Potomac Yards and Pentagon Row developments. However, both site plan conditions emphasize using the funds for arterials and focusing on both the Aurora Highlands and Arlington Ridge neighborhoods. The site plans made specific mention of the intersection of 23rd St S and Arlington Ridge Rd. S. Glebe Rd. and S Joyce St. Any decision to use the funds from these developments for a sidewalk on Fern St. would have to have general concurrence from the civic association.
- Answer to #5: PRCR will schedule the planning and design of a spray playground when the funds from the KIMCO site plan become available.
- Answer to #7: County staff continues to work with neighbors on a range of issues, including contractor parking, contractor trucks using neighborhood streets, early morning noise, pile driving, dust suppression and rodent control. Most recently, staff sponsored a meeting at the Water Pollution Control Plant on July 15, 2008. Details on issues raised and addressed since then are contained on the attached Communication Summary and DES letter (Attachment 2) to civic associations summarizing the June 26, 2008 meeting

NEXT STEPS AND TIMEFRAME FOR COMPLETION:

None

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / BACKGROUND / RELEVANT HISTORY:

None

ATTACHMENTS:

- NCAC Project Ranking Procedures
- DES summary of their communication with neighbors
- DES Letter to Civic Associations Summarizing July 15 meeting

NCAC Project Ranking Procedures
--

Final: Adopted April 10, 2008

Points Allocation Process

1. This points system is a tool designed to provide guidance in prioritizing projects for the NCAC during its Funding Round deliberations. However, it should be recognized that given process requirements to have NC staff scope and develop projects well in advance of the Funding Meeting itself, this Point System should be considered the primary driver of actual funding decisions.
2. **Neighborhoods may submit only one project for funding per Funding Round.**
3. Projects must be fully **Qualified** no later than the cutoff date announced for each Funding Round.
4. Each neighborhood project will receive all the points allowable based on the attached updated Point System Worksheet. NC staff will determine the point allocations for all **Qualified** projects that have been submitted. Point disputes will be resolved by the NCAC.
5. Large and/or complex neighborhood improvement projects may be done in phases. County Staff will advise the NCAC and the concerned neighborhood whether a project requires Planning funds. In such cases, Planning funds will be treated as a stand-alone project for funding and will be subject to NCAC points rules. Each of the implementation phases will be awarded 5 additional points and treated as individual projects when they are presented to the NCAC for funding.
6. The NCAC Points Committee will review the submitted project point assignments and resultant project rankings in advance of the Funding Meeting.
7. A table of the **Qualified** projects and the corresponding point assignments, based on the current points system, will be presented by staff at the NCAC meeting prior to each Funding Meeting.
8. At the Funding Meeting, the final points-based ranking of **Qualified** projects will be presented by NC staff. Neighborhoods may make brief presentations on their submitted projects at this Funding Meeting.
9. The NCAC at its Funding Meeting makes the final decision on which projects to recommend to the County Board for funding.

Points System Review and Adoption

1. Between funding sessions, the standing Points Committee will formulate any recommended changes for approval by the NCAC.
2. A Points Committee led by the Vice Chair, with membership including NCAC officers and other volunteer NCAC members, will prepare a draft of changes to the points system for discussion and adoption by the full NCAC. The Deputy Vice Chair will act for the Vice Chair in the event the Vice Chair is not available.
3. Any changes to the Points System must be adopted by a vote of the NCAC at a meeting in advance of the cutoff for project submissions for a future Funding Round.

Point System Worksheet
Final: Adopted April 10, 2008

Project _____
Neighborhood _____

Category I - New or Updated Neighborhood Plan (only available within 10 years of plan adoption)	
• First project	35
• Second project	30
• Third project	25
• Fourth project	20
Category II – Number of Rounds with an unfunded project¹	
• 10 points for each consecutive funding round with a Qualified project that does not get funded, to a maximum of 70 points	0-70
Category III – Other Programmatic Considerations	
• First project after a new Neighborhood Plan	5
• Written commitment for additional funding from an alternate source ²	
1. 5% of the total project cost, or a \$1,000 minimum to a maximum of \$150,000, whichever is greater	5
2. Greater than \$150,000	10
• Small Project bonuses	
1. Costing \$80,000 or less	10
2. Costing greater than \$80,000 but less than \$150,000	5
• Follow-on phase of a multi-phased project as defined by a previously funded planning project (see paragraph 5 of NCAC Project Ranking Procedures)	5
Category IV – Neighborhood Infrastructure Plan Considerations	
• Sidewalk project which abuts any Arterial(s) ³	5
• Sidewalk project which is within ¼ mile of any School(s) ⁴	5
• Sidewalk project where currently there is no complete sidewalk on either side	5
• Park project	5

Notes:

1. Neighborhoods may change their first priority project and continue to accrue Category II points as long as they have a qualified project in the queue.

2. Neighborhoods are encouraged to seek alternate funding sources (e.g., Neighborhood Traffic Calming, Small Parks Grants, Parks and Recreation, Federal Funding Sources, Developers). Alternate funding commitment must be demonstrated via written commitment from the funding body.
3. "Arterial" is defined in the Master Transportation Plan, types A-F.
4. "Schools" are defined as day use educational facilities, both public and private, having a weekday enrollment of more than 100 students. Non-public schools will need to be validated by the neighborhood association and specially mapped by County staff.
5. Signs are not considered "projects."

Communication Summary, DES and Neighbors
Regarding Construction at the Water Pollution Control Plant
Prepared September 24, 2008

The local community brought forward several issues in the spring of 2008 and at the community meeting on June 26, 2008. An email and a hard copy of the summary of the meeting were sent to Aurora Highlands Civic Association President Mr. Cameron, Arlington Ridge Civic Association President Mr. Herbst, and Aurora Highlands Civic Association Corresponding Secretary Mr. M. King on July 15, 2008. Mr. Cameron has discussed staff's response to the challenges, after the June 26, 2008 meeting, and at that time he was appreciative of the County's efforts. A copy of the information that was sent to the above mentioned individuals on July 15, 2008 is attached.

Below is a summary of the progress that has been made to date.

The community informed the WPCP on 5/22 of contractor employees parking on S. Joyce St.

- a. County staff met with the local community on 6/4. The community is pursuing permit parking and petitions are currently being circulated.
- b. A meeting was held with the contractors 6/27 to implement the go forward plan. Contractor personnel who park on S. Joyce St. will be barred from the WPCP jobsite.
- c. County staff and Program Manager staff will periodically inspect the area and residents were asked to inform Phil Loar of suspected contractor personnel who park on S. Joyce St.
- d. **Update:** Staff from the plant, Program Manager, and contractors were regularly inspecting this area and taking corrective action as needed. Transportation Engineering and Operations (TEO) performed four (4) surveys of the area on June 20, July 7, 8, and 9, 2008. The results were that the area did not meet the criteria for implementation of permit parking. In addition, the surveys indicated that the overall public space parking occupancy dropped from 71% with 73% out of area on June 20 to 48% occupancy with 46% out of area on July 9. TEO discussed the survey results with Mr. Bruce Queen, who initiated the permit parking petition. Mr. Queen indicated that the contractors were not parking on the street as much after the petition was submitted. TEO requested that Mr. Queen contact TEO if parking issues arose again. To the best of our knowledge there have been no calls received from Mr. Queen or others concerning parking challenges in this area.

Two traffic issues were discussed.

- a. There has been significant reduction of pedestrian traffic on S. High and S. Hill Streets after the contractors informed employees to use S. Fern St. to S. Glebe to get to the WPCP.
- b. Trucks are using neighborhood streets in violation of the contract's Maintenance of Traffic Plan (MOT). Drivers who inappropriately use local roads will be barred from the job site.
- c. **Update:** In the fall 2007 and spring 2008, the local community expressed concerns about contractor employees and vehicles using local streets. Staff has discussed the employee pedestrian traffic and this issue was resolved prior to the June 26, 2008 meeting. However, contractor employee turnover requires continued diligence concerning this issue. Concerning the truck/vehicular traffic, the contract language is clear that this is not allowed. Staff discussed this with the contractors and has been monitoring the area. When vehicles violate the terms and conditions of the contract the driver is given one (1) warning. A second violation results in the employee being barred from the jobsite. Staff is not aware of any complaints since the June 26, 2008 meeting concerning this issue.

Early morning noise

- a. A resident noted work beginning prior to the 7 am weekday and 10 am weekend start times and cables hanging from tower cranes not properly secured overnight. Contractors were informed to not perform noisy work prior to the contractually required start times and to secure all equipment on tower cranes at the end of each workday.
- b. Staff explained it is desirable to allow contractors to perform quiet work prior to the official start time to reduce the overall contract duration and lessen the impact on nearby residents. Quiet work is defined to exclude backup alarms, heavy diesel equipment, gas powered saws, etc. Residents in attendance agreed that quiet work could continue if it is quiet.
- c. Staff has required the contractor to install more noise blankets along S. Glebe Rd and to utilize additional blankets when the contractor utilizes mason mixers, diesel pumps, etc.
- d. A concern was raised about tower cranes moving at night. Staff indicated the cranes are not designed to remain in a fixed position and must move to minimize the impact of the wind.
- e. **Update:** The work hours, use of noisy hand tools, securing crane cables, etc. have been addressed. Staff is not aware of any new issues concerning this challenge since the June 26, 2008 meeting.

Pile driving

- a. Staff discussed building requirements, the community's request to reduce noise, vibration, and duration, past mitigation efforts, and which efforts proved viable and effective. 1,882 H-piles have been driven (approx. 84% of the total)
- b. Piles yet to be driven (estimated)
 - i. Maintenance building - 43
 - ii. SGF facility - 74
 - iii. Aeration tank channel - 261
 - iv. Clarifier #9 - 109
- c. Engineers are attempting to convert the maintenance building and SGF to auger cast piles
- d. Results of a second value engineering proposal for the aeration tank channel are pending.
- e. Clarifier #9 – there are no options other than to install the driven H-piles
- f. Staff presented a comparison between a diesel hammer and a hydraulic hammer with a shroud. Although noise levels may be reduced by approximately 6 – 9 dBA, the frequency of vibration could increase by 67%, the duration of the overall pile driving may take approximately 2.5x as long, and the cost would increase by approximately \$2.7 to \$5.5 million. It is estimated that the Clarifier #9 pile driving will take approximately 30 days for a diesel pile driver versus 75 days for a hydraulic pile driver with shroud. **Many details were discussed and the community indicated its preference to minimize the overall duration and continue with diesel pile driving.**
- g. Staff is proceeding with the diesel pile driving option for areas that require driven piles, based on analysis, community feedback, and to avoid delaying the project.
- h. **Update:** Status remains the same.

Resident asked about dust suppression during demolition.

- a. Contractors are required to spray water on structures during demolition to control dust. Street sweepers will continue to clean service roads and local streets and the schedule will be adjusted for more frequent sweeping as necessary.
- b. **Update:** Staff is not aware of any new issues concerning this challenge since the June 26, 2008 meeting.

Resident asked if the County noticed an increase in the rodent population this summer.

- a. The County's pest control contractor has not reported increased activity
- b. **Update:** Staff has been monitoring the rodent activity. Actions taken approximately five (5) weeks ago include addressing brush areas and reallocation of various bait stations to address high activity areas. Staff received positive feedback from the local community concerning the timeliness of the response.