1. **Introduction**
   1.1. Melissa McCracken opened the meeting and each attendee was identified.

2. **School Board Work Session Update**
   2.1. APS provided an update to the School Board Work Session held on October 6, 2015.
   2.2. It is likely that the School Board will decide on the “West” scheme for the Stratford Middle School project.
   2.3. For the Wilson School, the likely direction is to proceed with three (3) design options.
      2.3.1. A building with 92 parking spaces in a garage under the field (current scheme).
      2.3.2. A building without any parking spaces. APS will lease spaces in adjoining public garages.
      2.3.3. A building with a shared garage with the Penzance development.
   2.4. The following is the expected direction given by the School Board from the Work Session. Likely School Board action item vote will be held on November 16, 2015.
      2.4.1. Stratford program will stay as part of the new Wilson School.
      2.4.2. Maximize shared spaces.
      2.4.3. Provide flexibility in the design for possible future changes.
      2.4.4. Be mindful of the initial project budget.
      2.4.5. Assure that the HB-Woodlawn and Stratford programs are met.
      2.4.6. Provide justification for anything above the original projected project cost.
      2.4.7. Provide a memorandum of understanding between APS and Arlington County regarding the shared use spaces.
   2.5. APS explained that as a result of the shared spaces used by the community, full-time security will be needed for the building.
      2.5.1. Kristen Colston asked why it would be needed as it is different from how existing programs are currently operated.
2.5.1.1. The security policy would need to be changed because the building will have a lot of expensive equipment and we will need to prevent vandalism, trespassing from the homeless including any unauthorized overnight guests.

2.6. APS explained that a communications plan must be developed between APS and the County in regards to the shared spaces. It is important to note that they are not “joint-use” spaces since APS will have priority.

3. School Board Work Session Update Discussion

3.1. Melissa McCracken asks what the milestone for the BLPC is and asked for clarification of what is needed from the committee. Is the $80.2 million bond allocation?

3.1.1. $80.2 million is total project cost including other sources.

3.1.2. Further clarification of what concept design includes:

3.1.2.1. Site approach

3.1.2.2. Site access

3.1.2.3. Locations of major outdoor elements such as the field.

3.1.2.4. Meets basic programmatic needs.

3.1.2.5. Includes a projected project cost.

3.1.2.6. Education specifications comparison.

3.1.2.7. Massing of the building

3.1.2.8. Sustainability approach

3.1.2.9. Major building systems

3.1.2.10. Schedule

3.1.2.11. Endorsement by the BLCP and PFRC committees.

3.1.3. It does not include the location of every space.

3.2. Bill Podolski stated that he believes the School Board understands that the initial $80.2 million is hard to reach but how far is the latitude when it comes to the overall budget?

3.2.1. APS reiterated that the cost is not an issue of the BLPC. The BLPC discusses design schemes such as whether it is the Fanning Bars versus the Box.

3.3. Danielle Arigoni asked what the exact number of the bond funding is.

3.3.1. The exact number won’t be known until April 2016.

3.4. Miles Mason stated that, in his opinion, conflicting messages are being sent by the School Board. The School Board supports the Stratford Program being at the Wilson School. It also supports the black box and the Fanning Bars scheme but the resultant projected cost is above the budget. It sounds like if the BLPC want these elements to remain we need to justify it to the School Board. The BLPC cannot possibly discuss cost but it can suggest and comment on program related issues.

3.4.1. APS reiterated that the black box question is an instructional issue for the educators and is not under the umbrella of the BLPC.

3.5. Both Casey Robinson and Tom Mallan asked for clarification regarding the educators. Are they BLPC educators or APS?

3.5.1. It will be APS with the Principals of each program.

3.6. Miranda Baltaxe explained that the black box is needed because it is how “we” are and asked how students or other interested parties can be heard in regards to some of these decisions.

3.6.1. APS will make additional accommodations to include additional voices from the community and reiterated that the School Board information session scheduled on November 5, 2016 will include presentations from the Principals and the BLPC chairperson.

3.7. Stan Karson asked what happens with the circulation for the Box scheme.

3.7.1. It is presumed that the Box scheme will make it harder to manage because more students will be using the elevators.

3.8. Karen Gerry supports the inclusion of the black box theater and reiterated the Stratford Programs use of the space.

3.9. Karen reiterated her initial suggestion on inviting the Wounded Warriors to use part of the spaces and that may provide additional funding.

3.9.1. DCS and APS is in support of the idea but have very limited resources to push for the relationship. It can be pursued as an “add on” item.

3.9.2. Bill Podolski commented that the support for the Wounded Warriors idea is there but the power to manage is not currently present.

3.10. Laura Edwards is in favor of retaining the black box theater as well as the idea of inclusion for the Stratford Program at the Wilson School.

3.10.1. APS stated that inclusion is a goal. The School Board and the Department of Student Services will be behind it.

3.11. Melissa McCracken stated that the committee will need to outline the “shared” spaces for the School Board.

3.12. Miles Mason asked what the committee is producing.
3.13. Melissa McCracken stated that the committee will highlight the big topics such as Fanning Bars versus the Box and why.

3.14. Kristen Colston asked if the black box is a concept design issue.
   3.14.1. Yes because it takes up area.

3.15. Dave Soles commented that the committee should be justifying what is wanted to the School Board.
   3.15.1. APS agreed and reiterated that for the “shared” spaces, the committee should make it clear that those spaces such as the theater and the black box are used all of the time.
   3.15.2. Casey Robinson agrees that justification is needed.

4. Construction Manager Introduction
   4.1. Gilbane Building Company was introduced as the Construction Manager At-Risk.
   4.2. David Childress from Gilbane gave an overview of the company.

5. Parking Scenarios
   5.1. Three parking scenarios were presented:
       5.1.1. 92 parking spaces as currently designed.
       5.1.2. No parking
       5.1.3. Shared parking with Penzance, the neighboring developer.
   5.2. Bill Podolski asked if the 92 spaces can be negotiated with any of these alternative parking scenarios.
       5.2.1. Melissa McCracken suggested that the BLPC tell the School Board what the school needs for parking.

6. General Discussion
   6.1. Melissa McCracken asked the committee if there is any need to discuss the details to a “not in favor” list. The list would include:
       6.1.2. Smaller Stratford program
       6.1.3. Elimination of the black box theater from the program.
   6.2. The committee members agreed that no discussion is needed.
   6.3. Bill Podolski asked how the capacity of the Stratford program is determined.
       6.3.1. Karen Gerry answered that the Department of Student Services creates the capacity. Currently the capacity is 60 while actual enrollment is 56 students.
       6.3.2. APS reiterated that the capacity is just a number and that number is flexible.
   6.4. Melissa McCracken created a list of shared spaces:
       6.4.1. Black Box Theater
       6.4.2. Library
       6.4.3. Clinic
       6.4.4. Cafeteria
       6.4.5. Auditorium
   6.5. The design booklet will list the shared spaces in the building.
   6.6. Melissa asked what the entry would be like if the project did not have a parking garage.
       6.6.1. BIG answered that the design would be very similar to the current scheme, which includes a garage.
       6.7. BIG also emphasized that the current size of the cafeteria/dining space is smaller than the required because it assumes a lot of the students will be congregating throughout the public spaces in the new building. The current size does adequately accommodate the Stratford program.
   6.8. Tom Mallan also reiterated that the corridors and the lobby should be considered shared spaces.
   6.9. Unanimously the BLPC supported the Fanning Bars concept over the Box concept and will outline in the memo to the School Board the following items and potentially others if they are raised later.
       6.9.1. Five floors of the Fanning Bars scheme is preferred over the 7 floors for the Box scheme.
       6.9.2. The vertical connections in the Fanning Bars scheme give a sense of community.
       6.9.3. The Fanning Bars scheme creates more outdoor spaces. The more spaces the building provides, the less likely the students will be elsewhere.
   6.10. Melissa McCracken reiterated that if the Box scheme is adopted, the schedule would need to be pushed back and that cost has not been determined.
   6.11. The committee again discussed parking and the need for it on the site. It was also reiterated that all other schools have parking available within the community the school is in. The new Wilson School will not have that available.

7. Conclusion
   7.1. The BLPC committee members will provide a draft recommendation for the School Board for the committees review during the following BLPC #9.
7.2. Next meetings:

7.2.1. BLPC#9 October 28, 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@leogadaly.com within seven days of receipt.
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