



61 Broaway  
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** 29 April 2015  
**MEETING TIME** Wednesday, 7:00pm - 9:30pm  
**LOCATION** 4100 Vacation Lane, Arlington, VA  
**SUBJECT** BLPC #2 : Transportation and Site Analysis

ATTENDEES		
APS DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION	DCS	Scott Prisco, Jennifer Xu
BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING COMMITTEE	BLPC	Casey Robinson, Karen Gerry, Maggie Wiseman, David Soles, Vanessa Picorossi, Tom Malian, Bill Podolski, Valerie Budney, Danielle Arigoni, Kristen Colston, Richard Layman, Melissa McCracken, Laura Edelbrock, Lucia deCordre, Miles Mason, Paul Mulligan, Dennis Gerrity, Neda Bolurchi, Colleen Koval, Tova Solo, Sarah Hodzic, Miranda Baltaxe, Sophie Falkenheim, Joseph DeBor
OTHER ATTENDEES	OTH	Arlova Vohnm
LEO A DALY	LAD	Stephen Wright, Jack Chin
BJARKE INGELS GROUP	BIG	Sean Franklin
TOOLE DESIGN GROUP	TDG	Carol Kachadoorian, Christina (Tina) Fink

Note: Name cards were not distributed to attendees. As a result, not all comments or questions will be tagged to a specific person or group.

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1. DCS asked the committee about preferences for future BLPC meetings. The options presented were to continue at HB-Woodlawn or Key Elementary School. The existing Wilson School, site of the 1<sup>st</sup> BLPC meeting is not an option.
  - 1.1.1. A vote was taken and the majority of people indicated that the location does not matter. DCS will make a decision and forward that information on to the committee

**2. Multi-Modal Transportation Analysis Presentation By Toole Design Group - (Presentation is online.)**

- 2.1. TDG started to present initial data regarding transportation on the existing school and upcoming schedule for research, analysis and recommendations.
- 2.2. A question was asked regarding the existing parking counts and how those numbers broke down between students, staff and visitors and how the project parking for the new building broke down similarly.
  - 2.2.1. TDG provided further detailed data available as handouts to the committee.
- 2.3. TDG explained that the data will include neighborhood parking availability including on-street and privately owned, public garages.
- 2.4. DCS explained that there will be no student parking at the new facility.
- 2.5. A question was asked pertaining to the no student parking decision and why that decision was not part of the BLPC process.
  - 2.5.1. DCS explained that the decision on parking was set during the budgeting process but if we need it, we may revisit that decision. If any amount of parking is added, it will be at the cost of other program elements.
  - 2.5.2. DCS also explained that the design team will look at various parking layout and options that may increase the parking count without increasing budget such as tandem parking.
- 2.6. A question was asked how the proposed parking count of 81 spaces were decided if the projected population increase is 10%?
  - 2.6.1. DCS stated that if the student population increases by 10%, the staff population does not increase as much.

- 2.6.2. DCS also reiterated that there will be a TDM (Transportation Demand Management) plan forthcoming and that other modes of transportation (carpool, public transit) needs to be considered, some of which may include incentives or other financial benefits.
- 2.7. A suggestion was made regarding renting available spaces at neighboring garages.
  - 2.7.1. TDG is evaluating the neighborhood parking situation.
- 2.8. What about part-time teachers?
  - 2.8.1. DCS explained a scenario at Abington where there is an agreement between the school and the community of Fairlington in regards to parking spaces.
- 2.9. Can county give out passes or permits to school population that allows for parking in restricted spaces?
  - 2.9.1. DCS stated that it will be looked at as part of a larger coordination between APS and county on transportation issues.
- 2.10. TDG gave statistics regarding current daily visitor counts: Stratford – 7 visitors; HB-Woodlawn – 17 visitors = 24 total.
- 2.11. Is there a plan to resurvey the student, staff and parents since we now have chosen a site for the new school? The current surveys were completed over a year ago and prior to a site selection.
  - 2.11.1. DCS stated that it can be considered.
- 2.12. How is APS and the design team working with WRAPs and Penzance?
  - 2.12.1. DCS explained the WRAPs process.
- 2.13. Is the team looking at traffic data in regards to proposed, approved development?
  - 2.13.1. TDG will present that data in a future BLPC meeting.
- 2.14. It was suggested that the design team consider the 8:20 class time components for analyzing drop-offs.
- 2.15. Has APS considered commercial investment?
  - 2.15.1. DCS is not optimistic regarding that possibility it will cost staff parking spaces and have impossible time constraints. DCS can look into it though.
- 2.16. A question was asked whether or not it would make sense for the bus drop-off to occur a block away.
  - 2.16.1. DCS explained that APS would want have bus operations on site to control all aspects of bus operations such as requesting favorable signage during bus drop-off or pick-up. DCS can explore other options as well.
- 2.17. A suggestion was made to provide the committee any decisions that have been made in advance so as to not spend time debating those points during the meeting.

### **3. Site Analysis Presentation by Bjarke Ingels Group (BIG) - (Presentation is online.)**

- 3.1. BIG gave an analysis of the site including zoning constraints, topography, adjacent buildings, solar orientation and site access.
- 3.2. A question was presented regarding the ability to share open space with APAH.
  - 3.2.1. Both DCS and BIG explained that it is possible but it will not be guaranteed because it is not our site and we ultimately have no control over it. The process becomes complicated. The opportunity can be explored though.

### **4. Workshop**

- 4.1.1. The purpose of this workshop is to educate the committee members on the various constraints that the design team has to consider while siting the building, including open space, field space, entrances and vehicular circulation.
- 4.1.2. The design team distributed site plans, sketch paper, pens and model elements for groups of committee members. Each group was tasked to come up with their own design in terms of building and play area location and orientation as well as site access for parking, buses and main entrances for both schools.
- 4.1.3. Each team was asked to submit a number of their designs to be presented to the larger group. Those design are now part of the presentation that is online.

### **5. Conclusion.**

- 5.1. A suggestion was made to allow the committee members to view the presentation in advance of the meeting.
  - 5.1.1. DCS explained that the BLPC process operates in this and a lot of the graphics may not be completely understood without some form of presentation or explanation.
- 5.2. Next BLPC meeting on May 13, 2015
  - 5.2.1. Agenda for next meeting will be a presentation of the architectural team's initial schemes derived from their research and understanding with the information and opinions gathered from the BLPC Workshop.

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](mailto:jchin@leoadaly.com) within seven days of receipt.

Submitted by: Jack Chin  
Date: 4 May, 2015