

| Final Report Outline Feedback | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Findings/Recommendations should come before the Public Library section (as it was unanimous) |
| 2 | Needs to be a section dedicated to Lessons Learned (as part of larger section or independent?) |
| 3 | Executive Summary should capture a general sentiment of the group as it relates to the process and overall frustration (not limited to just the letter) |
| 4 | Introduction section should cover recent SB meetings where SB members publicly questioned earlier actions to consider CC as a high school |
| Suggestions for Appendix | |
| 5 | Table comparing HS amenities to CC should be embedded in the report (not just left for an appendix) |
| 6 | Written Correspondence from Penrose, Arlington Heights/Ashton Heights, Aquatics Committee, and the CASE Petition, other resolutions |
| 7 | New matrix comparing all high school sites with CC for staff, students, parking, etc. |
| General Report Feedback | |
| 8 | Use words "must" or "need" for areas of consensus (highlight + emphasize progress of group); in other areas, rely on "should" and "could" |
| 9 | Need to confirm if the public library relocating is a condition for most where this can become a 4th HS. We only mention PH has to leave |
| 10 | Add maps for transit, transit/walk scores - for all high schools |
| 11 | Need to capture somewhere (specifically) what APS considers to be a HS education |
| 12 | Issues with the process and equity for all students should be raised |
| 13 | Over-arching statement should reference that public expenditures on facilities not included in the vision established by the CCWG should not be approved |
| 14 | Some of the sections should find space to provide feedback to APS that purchasing/developing parking off-site may be cheaper |
| 15 | Additionally, report should encourage the SB to change student parking policy to preclude (if not limit) students driving and parking on school properties or in the neighborhood. |
| 16 | Investments should be focused on transit (not more parking supply) |
| 17 | Reinforce that educational/extracurricular experience of students at CC should not be compromised due to lack of access to facilities regardless of the choices made |
| 18 | Make sure one of the sections describes the educational focus of the programs at the CC |
| 19 | <p>- Recommendations/Findings section should include: disconnect and lack of efficiency and effectiveness if SB is unclear about the educational use intended for sites when they establish working groups to envision sites. In joint use cases, CB needs to push this fact and support SB decision-making early. Budget ranges also are helpful – it is ineffective to envision outside of a budget (you would not do that for a home renovation or major personal purchase or effort, why should we do that when considering taxpayers dollars or using taxpayers time). Composition of working groups from the beginning can then be more appropriate. I feel that the working group would have benefitted from less Columbia Pike/Arlington Heights membership and a wider interest set that was concerned in general with HS seat needs (and other APS seat needs). Same can be said for recent prior working groups. Perhaps consider larger Arlington-wide focus on these groups. SAWG and TJWG had similar biases that perhaps impeded larger consensus – there is obvious desire and need to attend to and consider neighboring interests, but we should/need to balance those with community-wide interests. Involvement of the SB and CB liaisons again fell away – they may have been meeting with staff and chair, but the rest of the CCWG only evidenced sporadic attendance that waned at the end. They ask investment of our time but fail to engage throughout the process, and to a large extent the SB also then veered off from the process (number of changes, most noticeably the CIP) which diminished trust and the CCWG effort.</p> <p>- Ensure public comments and other comments are included in the report, at a minimum in an appendix.</p> |
| 20 | - See comment above as it applies to both fields as well as other needs that support such public-private partnership models. |
| 21 | Other notes – I think the report should indicate that the CCWG believes that the SB and CB owe it to the CCWG members, their representative organizations, and the Arlington Community what their next steps and plans are after receiving the CCWG final report. We have invested a significant amount of time and effort into our work and care to hear what the plans are from here for the site, near-term and long-term. |
| 22 | See item (d) below; also, under item (6) in the report, where you describe the classification of high school seats at this site, please clarify note which on site seats would contribute toward the high school's size (class4?/5?/6?) for athletics purposes, etc. and note what size the other 3 neighborhood HSs and/or choice HS programs like HBW are currently. |
| 23 | There must be adequate underground parking. A few dissenting opinions in the group does not reflect the will of the community. You are asking the community to take on a lot of extra density. The report must explain how PH only has 2 to 4 buses, but Montessori will be bringing in 15+ buses. There also must be more restricted parking in the surrounding neighborhoods to MAKE people park in offsite leased spaces. The community absolutely opposes use of on-street parking. |