

Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee
February 17, 2022

Meeting Notes DRAFT

Meeting location: Virtual through MS Teams

1. Kathy Reeder welcomed the Committee to the meeting
2. Roll Call and Neighborhood Report
 - Jacki Wilson (Old Dominion) neighborhood is ready to begin updating their NC Plan
 - Kathy Reeder (Glencarlyn) 4th St S project is moving along at an amazing pace, very impressed with the work thus far
3. Approval of the January 2022 Minutes
 - Motion to approve the minutes (Motion made by Jacki Wilson (Old Dominion), seconded by Ginny Farris (Shirlington) – January 2022 minutes approved unanimously
4. Officers and Staff Report:

Kathy shared that John and she met with Takis on January 27th for the first quarterly meeting to discuss the NC Program and is looking forward to upcoming meetings; Kathy and the Executive Committee gave kudos and appreciation to the NC Staff for their availability and good work. In addition, thanks and appreciation to the people who helped with the CIP recommendation, Rob Swennes, Howard Solodky, Gretchen Carter, Audrey Clement, and John Kirkpatrick.

Tim shared that there is some internal vetting with the name change and we will come back next month with an update as to where we are, what we've done and what our plan is moving forward.
5. Discussion / Action Items:
 - Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Implementation Framework (IF) Discussion
 - **Implementation Framework (IF) Introduction – Laura Simpson (presenter)**
 - Questions/Comments:
 - David Litman – how much of this IF can be shared publicly, as well as with our civic associations? Tim stated that at some point it'll have to be shared with the CA and we do want everyone to know about the changes and the updates that have been done with the program. Tim will place this presentation on the NCAC Commission website
 - Ed Hilz – Are these recommendations ready to be implemented and do they have to be approved by the Board? Tim stated that they are

not formally approved by the Board. It was publicly accepted by the County Manager, and we will keep the CM updated.

- Bill Braswell – What are the County-wide priorities for street improvements and what are the real priorities in CA? One of our goals in this implementation framework is how we look at and implement projects, keeping in mind that the nature of this program is a ground up. So, one of the things that I will be doing is meeting with the staff in Transportation, Vision Zero and Neighborhood Complete Streets to understand what their priorities are and figure out a strategy to work more closely together – being more transparent on both ends. We’ve already gotten a list of priority projects from Transportation and expecting them as well from NCS and Vision Zero. Stay tuned, there’s more to come.
- Sarah McKinley – Commented that the CB asked us to develop this IF and that tonight’s presentation is a continuation. Also, she doesn’t believe the program should be diluted from the original intent, which is to give neighborhoods a say in what they wanted to do. This is a unique program, and my neighborhood has benefited from it.
- **Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) – Kathy Reeder (presenter) – NCAC Letter of Support for FY2023 NCAC Funding**
 - Questions/Comments:
 - Bill Braswell – Is the \$6M for one or two years? Kathy stated that it’s for two years, 2023 (\$3M) and 2024 (\$3M).
 - Ed Hilz – Are you accepting comments on the letter itself? Yes, comments will be accepted once Kathy goes over the letter.
 - Claudia Fetter – What are some of the contributors to the limited bandwidth in regard to projects? Tim stated that it is a combination of soft and hard cost rising and a lot more mandates.
 - Kristin Gilley – The \$6M that we currently have is it obligated towards any specific projects? Steve stated that the \$4M will be committed to funding new projects, and is not 100% available right now because of old projects close-outs, etc.
 - Ed Hilz – Would like to enhance the first paragraph in terms of the value of the neighborhoods.
 - Virginia Farris – Break up the larger paragraphs into smaller chunks; stressing the value of the program, and in the larger paragraph, break it up or put into bullet format.
 - Howard Solodky – One of the things that he likes about the letter is that it is factual. Do we have any data or feedback from neighborhoods that captures successes of some of the projects that we’ve built? Tim indicated that we really don’t have data/feedback,

aside from the feedback and comments we receive from individuals about how nice the project looks, etc.

- Bernie Bern – commented that sometimes staff put items in a project that the neighborhood didn't ask for resulting in cost increase. He suggests that we include this information in the letter.
 - Bill Braswell – suggested to put in the letter the Big Walnut Park and Patrick Henry Drive projects to showcase the benefits of both projects. The BWP renovation welcomed more people, than “dog poop”, and PHD improvements helped with slowing down drivers, as it was a drag strip.
 - Eileen Janus – recommends that the first paragraph should say something to the effect, “the NCAC is requesting \$6M for FY2023 CIP” etc. and right off the bat, they know what we need.
 - Claudia Fetter – suggested to mention that this group supports and funds good items that cannot be found elsewhere. Where there is a lot of data and facts, convert to bullets, if possible.
 - Ed Hilz – the NC public engagement process is somewhat front ended in working the neighborhood in initiating the project. He doesn't think there is a back-end process with NC, like go back to the neighborhood to get feedback. Suggest using the County's public engagement process on the back end of NC projects. In the last paragraph, restate the amount of money (\$6M) that we are requesting.
- Motion that the NCAC authorize the Executive Committee to send a letter on its behalf in support of FY2023 CIP funding based on a draft presented at the meeting and comments provided by NCAC Members (Motion made by David Litman) seconded by Bill Braswell seconded the Motion
 - (29) in favor, (0) objections, (0) abstentions

6. Meeting adjourned at 9PM