

See item (d) below; also, under item (f) in the report, where you describe the classification of high school seats at this site, please clarify note which on site assets would contribute toward the high school's site (class/7/5/7/6/7) for athletics purposes, etc. and note what size the other 3 neighborhood HSs and/or choice HS programs like HBW are currently.

Adjust as discussed at the meeting:
 i) Move Site Description and Analysis higher.
 Discuss the physical aspects of the site.
 ii) Add a section to discuss educational programming.
 iii) Add a final recommendation – see the end.

- Incorporate more information about the educational focus of programs at the Career Center site – we learned about that and it shapes what is here now that should be preserved and improved, and sets a solid foundation upon which to expand seats.
 - Maintain facts and what we learned in forward sections and recommendations/points we want to make to decision makers in separate section (executive summary as appropriate, findings and recommendations as primary location).

- Concur with concept of adding section addressing educational focus of programs at the Career Center site.

- Recommendations/findings section should include: discussion and lack of efficiency and effectiveness of SB is unclear about the educational focus 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 taxpayer 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). Some can be said for recent prior working groups. Perhaps consider larger Arlington-wide focus on these groups. SAWG and TFWG 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 TFWG only.

- No further comments.

- I'm not sure I agree that consensus exists on the long-term vision; I do not feel that all feel the site is suitable to a comprehensive high school campus with full amenities so if we leave this in we should clarify. I do believe that most feel the site can accommodate a larger high school choice or alternative program (including perhaps a large Arlington Tech program if that is properly branded and more educational focus is given on developing the program).

- We should ensure we are clear here or elsewhere in the report that we strongly recommend that APS identify the intended educational focus of future expansions or schools prior to chartering working groups to envision near- or long-term future site uses and/or prior to forming the BUPC. It is very difficult to envision a site for which the intended purpose is not clear. It is a waste of our time and makes these working groups less effective in accomplishing our charter/objectives.

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns; although there does seem to be mixed feelings about student use of alternative methods of transportation and this may be worthy of more discussion prior to finalizing the guiding principle(s) related to transportation.

- No comment/concerns

- No comment/concerns; I feel the recommended study is extremely important and should be prioritized – we need to move beyond the "schools of yesterday" and envision what APS future schools (to include revised uses/structure/student composition and attendance processes at our existing schools) might look like and operate in the envisioned new learning and educational models.

- DPR must be included in the give and take that needs to occur as we envision improved use models of our existing facilities for all community needs, to include student needs during school hours (to include after-school sports). I concur with the recommendations as noted for studies and engagement. Development of commercial and large residential parcels should also consider possibilities of privately built facilities that have community use agreements, to include for school purposes. These can be for fields, labs, technical learning, etc. These public-private models may attract companies for the win-win potential of growing certain industries – such as cyber security expertise – through skills development.

Change "should" to "must" in the first paragraph.
 Add Overall recommendations – (you'll need to edit).
 The C2WG process was put into place after community concerns were raised regarding APS processes for developing new schools and programs. There was a lot of dissent in the development of the Fleet School project, which left a very strong sense of distrust. In addition, there was a belief that APS would approach the project from a school-seat only perspective without considering the needs of the Columbia Pike corridor. Neighborhood associations along the Pike joined in a letter to this effect, attached.

There was a delay in appointing members to the C2WG, then a delay in starting the meetings. This caused the meeting schedule to be out of sync with the CIP process. The C2WG requested information related to the CIP process and budgetary constraints, but this information was not received. The C2WG was surprised and disheartened to learn that CIP plans from APS and the School Board were recommended with no notice made to or input from the C2WG. After many members reviewed at School Board and county board – See comment above as it applies to both fields as well as other needs that support such public-private partnership models.

Other notes – I think the report should indicate that the C2WG believes that the SB and CB owe it to the C2WG members, their representative organizations, and the Arlington Community what their next steps and plans are after receiving the C2WG 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.

There was a delay in appointing members to the C2WG, then a delay in starting the meetings. This caused the meeting schedule to be out of sync with the CIP process. The C2WG requested information related to the CIP process and budgetary constraints, but this information was not received. The C2WG was surprised and disheartened to learn that CIP plans from APS and the School Board were recommended with no notice made to or input from the C2WG. After many members reviewed at School Board and county board – See comment above as it applies to both fields as well as other needs that support such public-private partnership models.