



POPS Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

October 30, 2017

7:00-9:00pm

Courthouse Plaza

In attendance:

POPS Advisory Committee

- Caroline Haynes, Park and Recreation Commission
- Jane Rudolph, Department of Parks and Recreation
- Claire O’Dea, E2C2
- Elizabeth Gearin, Park and Recreation Commission
- Jane Siegel, Planning Commission
- Carrie Johnson, At Large
- Leo Sarli, Arlington Commission for the Arts, Alternate
- Justine Wilt, Sports Commission
- William Gillen, APS
- Dean Amel, Urban Forestry Commission

Absent:

- Janet Kopenhaver, Arlington Commission for the Arts
- Toby Smith, At Large
- Jim Feaster, NCAC
- Lisa Grandle, Department of Parks and Recreation

Department of Parks and Recreation Staff:

- Erik Beach
- Irena Lazic

Public:

- Jose R. Reyes
- Gail Harrison
- Roy Gamse
- John Foti



Summary:

On October 30, 2017, the POPS Advisory Committee met to discuss preparation for additional public meetings in December 2017. The Committee also discussed draft synthetic conversion criteria and issues about dog runs on private properties.

Upcoming Public Meetings Discussion

The POPS Committee discussed the benefits of having a more informal discussion with the community on land acquisition. Members suggested to present acquisition tools and funding sources to the community.

The Committee agreed that a panel discussion would be an appropriate format for the meeting on natural resources, trees and causal use spaces. The issues with the loss of trees due to the private development and applicable laws were also discussed. Some members suggested that the revised POPS draft could include an appendix explaining all different policies that exist for tree replacement, others argued that any policies and recommendations that dealt with private development belong to the Urban Forest Master Plan. Members agreed that an issue with trees and the impact of development should be acknowledged, although not solved in the POPS document.

Members discussed the format for the meeting on synthetic fields and lighting, and agreed that asking a targeted feedback on synthetic turf conversion and lighting mitigation would be preferable.

Draft Synthetic Conversion Criteria

Preliminary synthetic conversion and lighting mitigation criteria were presented to the Committee. The Committee members suggested creating separate criteria for adding lights to fields. Some members questioned if synthetic conversion and lightning need to go together. Specific feedback on synthetic conversion criteria included the following: some of the terms used for criteria, such as, community or combination field, should be better defined; impact on trees should be determined by assessing impacted tree health; relate location criteria with gaps in access identified as part of a level of service analysis; recognition of RPA or other environmental impacts of synthetic conversions.

Members also discussed some other items related to the level of service analysis. Some members suggested that more discussions are needed to clarify how trends data or any un-documented use could be utilized to better understand the need for different facilities. The Committee also suggested clarifying how the investment in synthetic fields and lighting is providing long term benefits.

Dog Runs & Private Properties

The following items were discussed related to dog runs on private properties: encourage sponsor groups on private dog runs to help with policing and education of users; have more intentional training for sponsor groups; develop temporary dog runs; explore revising current policies to allow dog runs on private properties and encourage private developers to provide dog runs.



The Committee discussed next steps in the POPS process, and concluded that updating a comment matrix after each commission meeting would be very helpful. Members also discussed updating the POPS implementation matrix to keep it current and also posting it on the website after the Plan is adopted.

Other ideas that were discussed with the members of the public were keeping field gates unlocked so the community can use them when they are not programmed; making fields multipurpose; using field allocation data to determine how fields are being used; assessing the benefits vs. cost per hour of play on APS fields; developing lighting criteria were appropriate for non-urban settings.