



BLPC Meeting #14, November 9, 2015

Attendees:

BLPC

- Dot Green
- Jeff Turner
- Charles Craig
- Debra Pearson
- Susan Cunningham, BLPC Chair
- Carol Burger
- Raymond Sendejas
- Graham McBride
- Doug Taylor
- Caroline Holt
- Michael Henry

APS Staff

- Benjamin Burgin
- Bill Herring, Jr.

County Staff

- Diane Probus

Other Attendees

- Richard Gizal
- Reid Goldstein
- John Peck

Meeting commenced at 8:05 pm

The meeting opened with public comment where the Mr. Giza requested further detail on the cost difference between the “High Road” and “No Road” options. APS staff replied that the estimated cost for the “No Road” option is \$2.36 million less than the “High Road” option.

APS staff and Susan Cunningham provided a summary of the November 5, 2015 School Board meeting where the project was presented for information. There was a description of the recommended concept design (west option with the high road) including the following elements:

- 35,000 SF addition on the west side of the existing building
- On-site driveway providing exit only vehicular movement to Old Dominion
- Safety and traffic improvements on Vacation Lane
- Safe pedestrian crossing at Old Dominion Drive
- An alternative site plan without a driveway connection between Vacation Lane and Old Dominion, should VDOT not approve the proposed design
- Fire access would have to be reviewed and addressed if the decision is made to reject the high road access.

In an effort to get the project closer to the funding available, the design team has suggested a reduced renovation scope and a 10,000 SF smaller addition. Both of these measures continue to

cause concern from the BLCP and was the motive behind its request for an addition \$5 million in funding. Specifically, the BLPC is concerned that the reduced renovation costs would likely mean that enhancements would be more cosmetic than substantive, building interfaces and connection points will be utilitarian and the re-configuration of the Stratford space may not be configured to best fit the student space requirements.

Susan expressed concern that the School Board might not have as clear an understanding of the nuances of the presentation as might be necessary to make a good interpretation of the points. Furthermore, the School Board did not have a unified point of view across its membership. She felt that the BLPC had provided clearly articulated information in its November 3, 2015 letter and the group concurred.

Susan asked how APS staff plans to respond to the School Board request regarding the capacity of the existing building if no addition was provided. APS staff replied that they are currently calculating the capacity of the building. Additionally, staff is analyzing the variances between the existing building and the most recent educational specifications to notate any deficiencies.

The BLPC agreed that a supplemental letter to the School Board may be helpful to clarify its recommendations and address questions raised by the School Board at the November 5, 2015 meeting. Susan agreed to draft a succinct letter to the School Board highlighting key recommendations and reminding them that the team has faithfully executed the task with which the Board presented and that the recommendations of the group represent its interpretation of moving the school forward to meeting the population changes over the next time horizon. The BLPC agreed to review the letter and make a final determination on whether to submit it.

The next meeting is November 23, 2015. It is the final scheduled meeting. APS staff agreed to develop a proposed schedule of meetings for the schematic design phase, which is expected to continue through February 2016.