



61 Broadway
Suite 3300
New York, NY 10001
USA
+1 347.549.4141

1201 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Tenth Floor
Washington, DC 20036-2683
USA
+1 202.861.4600

MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT WILSON SCHOOL – 1601 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA
PROJECT # LAD # 056-10002-001; BIG # 14520 WILS
MEETING DATE 09 September 2015
MEETING TIME Wednesday, 7:00pm – 9:30pm
LOCATION 1601 Wilson Blvd, Arlington, VA – Multi-Purpose Room
SUBJECT BLPC #7 : General Update and Project Cost

ATTENDEES		
APS DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION	DCS	Scott Prisco, Jennifer Xu
BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING COMMITTEE	BLPC	Casey Robinson, Karen Gerry, Nancy Caruso, Maggie Wiseman, David Soles, Vanessa Picorossi, Tom Mallan, Bill Podolski, Laura Edwards, Danielle Arigoni, Kristen Colston, Richard Layman, Melissa McCracken, Jae Cho (for Lucia DeCordre), Miles Mason, Stan Karson, Carroll Colley, Paul Mulligan, Dennis Gerrity, Tova Solo, Miranda Baltaxe, Sophie Falkenheim
OTHER ATTENDEES	OTH	Dennis Sellin, Marco Rivero (for Meliha Aljabar)
LEO A DALY	LAD	Jack Chin
BJARKE INGELS GROUP	BIG	Sean Franklin, Ji-Young Yoon

Note: The entire presentation is online.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. DCS gave a general update on the project.
 - 1.1.1. APS and the design team presented to the School Board on August 13, 2015.
 - 1.1.2. The concept design cost estimate is over budget.
 - 1.1.3. APS will re-evaluate the overall 1,300 middle school seat budget.
 - 1.1.4. APS has been meeting with the School Board to discuss the budget concerns.

2. Construction Manager At-Risk (CMAR) Process Overview

- 2.1. DCS explained the new process of engaging a CMAR.
 - 2.1.1. More stream-lined award process that produces a better overall project.
 - 2.1.2. The School Board should vote on September 24, 2015 on the CMAR award.

3. Design Overview by Bjarke Ingels Group (BIG)

- 3.1. A recap of the design concept from earlier this summer was presented along with a few new renderings.

4. BLPC Parking Sub-Committee Update

- 4.1. Laura Edwards provided a summary of the one meeting the committee had over the summer. Copies of the summary have been distributed to the BLPC.
- 4.2. Suggested principles were presented:
 - 4.2.1. APS must provide reliable, sustainable, convenient, and free parking for all staff.
 - 4.2.2. H-B Woodlawn and Stratford will work to determine distribution of on-site spaces.
 - 4.2.3. APS will work with H-B Woodlawn and Stratford to determine number of off-site spaces for staff.
 - 4.2.4. H-B Woodlawn and Stratford support the TDM plan and will encourage staff to become informed of the plan and to participate when practical.
 - 4.2.5. Changes in transportation behavior will gradually occur over time and H-B Woodlawn and Stratford hope to eventually shift to fewer parking spaces. We cannot guarantee there will be a reduction, however, so any plan

has to assume little to no reduction and provide accordingly for parking and regular oversight to determine adjustments in the parking plan as warranted.

- 4.3. Three main issues were addressed:
 - 4.3.1. Equity issues arise as a result of the projected parking shortage after taking into account TDM program. APS has always provided free parking to the staff. That may be a challenge in the new Wilson School location.
 - 4.3.2. The \$60 TDM incentive may be inadequate considering the cost of parking near the site and will mean staff will need to pay for parking.
 - 4.3.2.1. The recommendation is to provide adequate, free parking for all staff members.
 - 4.3.3. Sub-committee requested the following information in order to fully understand the fiscal and logistical impacts of parking at the site:
 - 4.3.3.1. Impact on the project budget of eliminating underground parking structure.
 - 4.3.3.2. Impact on the project budget of an underground parking structure with 92 spaces.
 - 4.3.3.3. Impact on the budget of an underground parking structure that includes 146 staff parking spaces in addition to other parking spaces as required by zoning.
 - 4.3.3.4. The cost of APS paying in full for off-site parking for staff per these three options.
 - 4.3.3.5. Trade-offs between facility amenities and on-site parking per these three options.
 - 4.3.3.6. Currently available options for providing free and/or low-cost parking for parents attending school events.
 - 4.3.3.7. Potential sources of additional funding for expanding the on-site parking structure.
 - 4.3.3.8. Investigate and report back on availability and cost of parking garage spaces during the day and evening as well as if APS could lock the garages into long-term contracts for staff and reduced and/or free parking for families attending school events.
 - 4.3.4. DCS addressed the sub-committee.
 - 4.3.4.1. TDM reduction is a program DCS takes seriously and wants to implement. DCS is willing to work with the staff to make it successful.
 - 4.3.4.2. DCS would like to also encourage carpooling and will continue to offer a stipend.
 - 4.3.4.3. DCS believes that providing shuttles from other nearby schools to school events is feasible and it could be a major cost savings.
 - 4.3.4.4. DCS also explained that the parking sub-committee may not be needed as all of the issues may be addressed during regular BLPC meetings.
 - 4.3.4.5. Melissa McCracken explained that the sub-committee was formed because the BLPC did not solve this issue in time prior to the summer break.
 - 4.3.5. Miles Mason questioned the 10% TDM assumption and warned that if it doesn't work, our site does not have the available parking like other APS school sites. He also commented that the issue with providing shuttles for events is a timing and scheduling issue. Many people have different and unpredictable schedules and the shuttle just adds another issue to contend with. Another issue is inequity. More affluent families may choose to pay for parking near the site while others may be forced to take the shuttle from other sites.
 - 4.3.6. DCS asked Dennis Sellin from the Arlington County Planning Department to address the County's position.
 - 4.3.6.1. Dennis reiterated that this project will be submitted for a use permit and will need County approval.
 - 4.3.6.2. Arlington County has a master transportation plan that provides guidelines for issues similar to this.
 - 4.3.6.3. The key goal is the move more people with less traffic.
 - 4.3.6.4. This includes encouraging alternative modes of transportation.
 - 4.3.6.5. Dennis reiterated that the Wilson School project needs to be grounded with overall County policy.
 - 4.3.6.6. This site has a different expectation when it comes to transportation as a result of the density and access to multiple modes of transportation.

5. HALRB Workshop Update

- 5.1. BIG gave a review of the HALRB Workshop regarding the Wilson School held on August 5, 2015.
 - 5.1.1. A project goal is to name the new school "The Wilson School". However, there is a formal naming process that goes through the School Board.
 - 5.1.2. A project goal is to have the main entrance to the building along Wilson Blvd. This brings back the original design of the building that was altered previous which removed the main entrance along Wilson Blvd.
 - 5.1.3. Acknowledging the brick pattern of the existing building may be explored in the design of the new school.
 - 5.1.4. The design of the new building will research the existing interior conditions such as the tin ceiling and provide options of incorporation.
 - 5.1.5. The project will look into incorporating the existing HB-Woodlawn tradition of writing on the walls.

6. WRAPS Update

- 6.1. BIG gave an overview of the current planning process for all of the public spaces in the WRAPs project area and informed the committee that they have been retained as design consultant for Arlington County Parks & Recreation.
- 6.2. BIG hopes to begin those studies next week.

7. School Board Meeting Update

- 7.1. BIG reviewed the August 13, 2015 School Board meeting which included slides documenting the cost of the building directly from the meeting. The School Board presentation is online at the Wilson School project site run by APS.
- 7.2. The School Board asked APS and the design team to address three (3) points:
 - 7.2.1. What does a basic box building cost?
 - 7.2.2. What can we get for \$80.2 million?
 - 7.2.3. Where can we save money?
- 7.3. BIG explained the premiums associated with the current concept design as it relates to a basic box. The resultant difference is \$2,832,000.
- 7.4. BIG explained scenarios regarding reductions in area.
 - 7.4.1. A 20,025 SF reduction will save approximately \$6,809,000. However, the capacity of students will drop to approximately 725 students (the range is between 704-730 students depending on actual program cuts).
 - 7.4.2. A 57,000 SF reduction will be required to bring the project cost to \$80,200,000. However, the capacity of that building will be cut dramatically to approximately 352 students (the range is between 340-370 students depending on actual program cuts).
 - 7.4.3. BIG explained where some of the area increases between existing and proposed reside. The performing arts, Stratford administration and related services as well as the library all had the greatest percentage increases.
- 7.5. BIG presented what would need to happen if this current concept design scheme were to be built for \$80,200,000.
 - 7.5.1. All of the occupied terraces would be removed (-\$1,933,000).
 - 7.5.2. The parking garage and athletic field would be eliminated in favor of surface parking (-\$7,944,000).
 - 7.5.3. Both sunken outdoor courtyards that provide needed light to below grade rooms will be eliminated (-\$792,000).
 - 7.5.4. Minimize the fenestration of the building to only the required rooms and size of openings (-\$2,212,000).
 - 7.5.5. Reduce program by 21,629 SF resulting in a capacity of approximately 743 students (-\$7,354,000).
- 7.6. BIG presented some targeted modifications that may be feasible in the current approved concept design. Please note that these targeted modifications require further levels of development to fully understand the impacts and cost savings.
 - 7.6.1. Optimize structure, reduce tonnage (-\$365,000).
 - 7.6.2. Optimize enclosure (-\$350,000).
 - 7.6.3. Reduce 2,500 SF of exterior glazing (-\$82,000).
 - 7.6.4. Reduce 2,000 SF of program (-\$534,000).
 - 7.6.5. Remove one passenger elevator (-\$370,000).
 - 7.6.6. Total of all modifications: \$1,671,000.
- 7.7. Some cost reduction scenarios were presented.
 - 7.7.1. Option 1 (saves \$8,535,000 = \$91,900,000):
 - 7.7.1.1. Surface field, no garage
 - 7.7.1.2. Optimize enclosure
 - 7.7.1.3. Optimize glazing
 - 7.7.1.4. Optimize structure
 - 7.7.1.5. Remove 1 elevator
 - 7.7.2. Option 2 (saves \$7,976,000=\$92,449,000):
 - 7.7.2.1. 20,025 SF area reduction
 - 7.7.2.2. Optimize enclosure
 - 7.7.2.3. Optimize glazing
 - 7.7.2.4. Optimize structure
 - 7.7.2.5. Remove 1 elevator

8. Discussion

- 8.1. A request was made to explain what the joint fund is.
 - 8.1.1. DCS explained that it is an account that both the County and APS pool money into to pay for certain shared amenities. The money comes from many sources.
- 8.2. A question was asked what the proposed performing arts space could be compared to.
 - 8.2.1. Wakefield or Washington & Lee are precedents the design team and APS have been looking at as examples.
- 8.3. Melissa McCracken asked DCS what the current schedule is.

- 8.3.1. DCS explained that the plan is to go back to the School Board on October 8, 2015 with an action item. The BLPC is encouraged to make a recommendation to the School Board with cost saving ideas.
- 8.4. Melissa commented that an additional slide that shows the field lined with relocatables should be shown as an extreme option to the School Board.
- 8.5. Stan Karson asked what the design fees are for this project.
 - 8.5.1. DCS explained that it is around \$8 million and it was already negotiated prior to any budget issues. Although these fees do not include Toole Design, it does include all other consultants other than the architects.
- 8.6. Maggie Wiseman commented that she is against the reduction of program.
- 8.7. Melissa McCracken reiterated that the Stratford program is extremely stretched in its current location and the major point to make to the School Board is that any additional areas added in the program is meant for functionality.
 - 8.7.1. Karen Gerry reiterated that certain new rooms like the gymnasium (multi-purpose room) are needed. A classroom (existing) is inadequate.
- 8.8. Miles Mason commented that he would feel uncomfortable making programmatic reductions related to cost cutting. Any decisions in program must be made by the Principals.
- 8.9. Miles Mason suggested that the elimination of the parking garage may work as long as APS provides complementary parking for all staff. That and some area reductions will be supported by Miles.
- 8.10. Jae Cho asked if any parking stipend for the staff to park in neighboring garages would come out of a separate budget.
 - 8.10.1. DCS explained that it would.
- 8.11. Laura Edwards suggested that the committee wait to hear the outcome of the program meeting with the Principals on 9/10/15 before taking any actions. Laura reiterated that a reduction in space is directly related to education and that cannot be compromised.
- 8.12. Laura Edwards also would support eliminating the parking garage.
- 8.13. Richard Laymen asked about the CMAR process and whether it would lead to cost savings.
 - 8.13.1. DCS confirmed that cost saving could be one of the benefits of the CMAR process.
- 8.14. Richard also encourages a closer inspection of the program to identify ways to make the building more efficient.
- 8.15. David Soles asked if the project can limit the amount of occupied roofs.
 - 8.15.1. The design team agreed that will be looked into it further as the design develops. It was also reiterated that this is still concept design and the roofs have not been programmed yet.
- 8.16. Melissa McCracken asked if it is too early to discuss any cost cutting measures.
 - 8.16.1. DCS explained that the biggest impact on any decisions will come from the early phases and that we have sufficient information to make some valid decisions.
- 8.17. Richard Laymen commented that green roofs are expensive.
- 8.18. David Soles asked if there will be more escalation to be aware of.
 - 8.18.1. Escalation is a factor of when and how long construction will be. The escalation factors will change depending on those variables.
- 8.19. Bill Podolski commented on how some of the assumptions of the project from before it begun have been proven wrong and that the process needs to improve.
 - 8.19.1. DCS explained that in a project of this size there are a lot of unknowns and it is always anticipated to have some issues arise that may conflict with previous assumptions.
- 8.20. Kristen Colston commented that any cuts from the program are minimal and that the School Board will need to make the ultimate decision.
- 8.21. Tova Solo recommended that the School Board increase the budget, change the schedule to minimize escalation or consider eliminating the Stratford Program.
- 8.22. Jae Cho commented that she feels the H-B Woodlawn program is perfectly suited for this location.
- 8.23. Paul Mulligan was concerned about the inflation and expressed an opinion that the escalation is not the fault of the school. The program cannot be minimized as a result. The county should not get in the way of building good schools.
- 8.24. Sophie Falkenheim followed up Tova Solo's comment about separating the HB-Woodlawn and Stratford programs and explained the important relationship and history between the two programs. The dynamic between the two programs is an integral part of the success of both.
- 8.25. Melissa McCracken asked DCS if there has been any thought in changing direction for the project.
 - 8.25.1. DCS admitted that there have been talks at the higher level but reiterated that the BLPC should concentrate on the task at hand.
- 8.26. Tom Mallan commented that the program cannot be cut.
- 8.27. Melissa McCracken asked if the garage can be built later assuming APS will still provide complimentary parking for all staff at neighboring garages.
 - 8.27.1. It's a possibility that can be explored but it will take more than the summer to complete and will be disruptive.
- 8.28. Numerous comments were made by the committee members that the school should not be held accountable for market factors and suggested that the School Board needs to solve this issue themselves.

9. Conclusion.

- 9.1. The BLPC committee members agreed to wait until the design team and APS has a programming meeting with the Principals and what the outcome of that meeting is.
- 9.2. BLPC will need to be ready to make a suggestion to the School Board prior to the meeting this project will be presented as an action item (October 8, 2015).
- 9.3. Next meetings:
 - 9.3.1. BLPC#8 October 14, 2015 at 7:00pm at the Wilson School (1601 Wilson Blvd)

The above represents our understanding of the topics discussed, and the decisions reached. Should any recipient notice significant omissions or errors, please notify Jack Chin at jchin@leoadaly.com within seven days of receipt.

Submitted by: Jack Chin
Date: 07 October, 2015