

3 June 2015

MEETING NOTES

RE: BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING COMMITTEE #5
STRATFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA
31406600



2121 WARD PLACE, NW, 4TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
202 298 6700

Meeting Date & Time: 01 June, 7:00-10:30 PM
Location: H-B Woodlawn Library

Attendees:

BLPC

Graham McBride – Asst. Principal H-B
Karen Gerry – Principal, Stratford program (Not Present)
Renee Harber – Asst. Principal Swanson
Carol Burger – H-B Staff
Kathleen Meagher – Director, Secondary Education
Eve Reed – Cherrydale Representative
Ray Sendejas – Cherrydale Representative
Dot Green – Donaldson Run Representative
Susan Cunningham – Donaldson Run Representative
Amanda Davis – Maywood Representative
David Barish – Waverly Hills Representative
Doug Taylor – Woodmont Civic Association
Caroline Holt – Lyon Village Representative
Deb Pearson – PTA Taylor
Jen Thompson – PTA Glebe
Rohini Chopra – PTA ASF
Whytni Kernodle – PTA Key (Not Present)
Joseph Delogu – PTA WMS (Not Present)
Michael Henry – PTA SMS (Not Present)
Laura Saul Edwards – PTA H-B Woodlawn
Jeff Turner – FAC Representative
Robert Dudka – HALRB Representative (Not Present)
Charles Craig – HALRB Representative
Rebecca Ballo – CPHD staff – Historic Preservation

APS Staff

Scott Prisco – Director, Design and Construction
Ben Burgin – Asst. Director, Design and Construction
Bill Herring – Project Manager, Design & Construction (Project Point of Contact)

County Staff

Diane Probus – DPR
Jane Kim – DES

Other Attendees

Mark Bildner – PFRC
Stu Dziura - PFRC
Betty Dziura – neighbor
Peter Swain – neighbor
Doug Gellie - neighbor
Barbara Jazzo – neighbor
Joan Perry - neighbor
Vicki Mendelowitz– neighbor
Mike Regan– neighbor
W Savalino – neighbor
Gregg Buksbaum – neighbor

WASHINGTON, DC
ANN ARBOR, MI
DETROIT, MI
MADISON, WI

WWW.QUINNEVANS.COM

Tegan Holtzman– neighbor
Candace Abbey– neighbor
Andy Botticello – neighbor
Kathleen Igar - neighbor

Design Team

Dan Curry –Quinn Evans Architects
Julia Siple –Quinn Evans Architects
Atara Margolies – Quinn Evans Architects
Carl Elefante – Quinn Evans Architects
Jeff Luker – Quinn Evans Architects

Jim Elliott – Toole Design Group
Jeremy Chrzan – Toole Design Group
Lauren Delmare – Toole Design Group



This was the fifth meeting of the Stratford Middle School Building Level Planning Committee (BLPC). The BLPC is appointed by the Arlington School Board to assist the Facilities and Operations staff and advise the School Board on each major capital / renewal project.

Discussion points are summarized below. This summary presents Quinn Evans Architects' understanding of discussions, decisions, and recommended actions. We request that all attendees review these Meeting Notes and notify APS with recommended revisions or questions.

1. REVIEW OF PROJECT SCHEDULE

- a. Scott Prisco (APS) thanked everyone for coming, mentioned that there is a lot of material to cover so meeting will likely run late. He asked everyone to hold comments until the presenters stop at various points specifically for questions.

2. REVIEW OF RECENT MEETINGS

- a. Dan Curry (QEA) reviewed the schedule, and gave a review of what was discussed at BLPC #4.
- b. Carl Elefante (QEA) reviewed the workshop with HALRB on May 20.

3. TRAFFIC DATA AND ANALYSIS

- a. Jim Elliott (TDG) started with update on analysis and observations to date.
- b. Stated that the presentation will focus on traffic analysis, with parking, pedestrian recommendations and bike discussion to be discussed in a future meeting. The BLPC has voiced the need to hear the traffic data and analysis first in order to move the process along.
- c. Bike and pedestrian considerations will be discussed but will be improved in all solutions. Options for traffic movement and site roads have greater variations in approaches and more impact on other elements of the project; making these traffic movement and site decisions in June will help keep us on schedule.
- d. Vehicular Traffic
 - i. 13 buses projected for 1,000 seat school; 17 buses for 1,300 seats.
 - ii. Reviewed student surveys from 2013 and compared H-B with other neighborhood middle schools. Average MS have higher percentage of walkers and bikers.
 - iii. Williamsburg has second highest drive rate, Swanson has highest walk rate.
 - iv. For new Stratford school used 75% percentile drive rate which is a conservative estimate and similar to Williamsburg. Trips projected represent either a non-TDM projection for 1,000 students or a TDM projection for 1,300 students.



- v. 15% Transportation Demand Management (TDM) based on experience at other APS schools and analysis of similarities and differences to other APS middle schools.
 - vi. Question from Eve Reed: Doesn't safety affect whether or not student walks or is driven? TDG answers that pedestrian safety will be addressed later but it will be safe to walk to school no matter what option is chosen.
 - vii. Lauren Delmare (TDG) explained why the traffic analysis is focusing on arrival:
 - 1. Arrival has more family vehicles than dismissal
 - 2. Arrival has greater overlap with commuter traffic
 - viii. Vehicle trips explained – total of 438 trips inbound (353 for drop-off) projected for new Stratford school during drop-off and 366 trips outbound. Each parent that enters and exits site = 2 trips. Visitor = anyone who is not staff who enters site and parks.
 - ix. Looking at Lorcom, Military and Old Dominion, projected drop-off peak time before 7:50 am bell will be before the highest peak in morning commuter traffic on those surrounding roads.
 - x. Speed study and crash locations reviewed for surrounding streets.
 - 1. Question from Susan Cunningham: Are speeds different at different times of day and how would this impact safety at arrival times?
- e. Intersection Operations
- i. Lauren Delmare (TDG) explained which intersections were studied and when counts were completed.
 - 1. Question from David Barish: were the March counts adjusted for seasonal impacts? TDG answered no, because March is good representative period. No rainy day counts have been done for this site.
 - ii. Reviewed intersections that are challenge locations.
 - 1. Question from Laura Edwards about waiting at drop-off on Vacation Lane; TDG answers it is a queuing issue and will be discussed later.
- f. Preliminary Site Assessments
- i. Jeremy Chrzan (TDG) reviewed the evaluation criteria for the site options and explained TDG's colored rating system. Green = optimized to meet criteria, yellow = ok but needs a little optimization, pink = needs to be improved to meet criteria, red = does not meet criteria and would be difficult to improve.
 - ii. Option A:
 - 1. Full signal at Lorcom and Vacation
 - 2. Additional through lane on Lorcom northbound at Vacation.
 - 3. Impacts local streets significantly, does not have adequate queuing for cars, bikes and pedestrians need to cross bus area.
 - 4. Susan C: wasn't a light previously studied? TDG answers yes, but now it could be warranted because of additional volume, but would still require further study by the County. Also a request for a sketch showing the cars in the queue and where they would go.
 - 5. Light would be studied to determine if it would have a protected left signal.
 - iii. Option A1:
 - 1. Full signal at Lorcom and Vacation
 - 2. Additional through lane on Lorcom northbound at Vacation.
 - 3. Generally scored well on evaluation; no pink or red squares.



4. Question: Is this one-way? No, but expanded lane for buses could also be used for cars at certain times.
 5. Question from Doug Taylor (?): Some parents would avoid the light on purpose and use North Randolph.
- iv. Option A2:
1. Full signal at Lorcom and Vacation
 2. Additional through lane on Lorcom northbound at Vacation
 3. Generally scored well on evaluation; no pink or red squares.
- v. Option A3:
1. Full signal at Lorcom and Vacation
 2. Additional through lane on Lorcom northbound at Vacation
 3. All green and yellow ratings except there is not sufficient parking provided.
- vi. Option C:
1. Additional through lane on Lorcom northbound at Vacations
 2. No left or U-Turn at Thomas St from Old Dominion
 3. Adds some traffic to streets that may worsen congestion.
 4. Expanded lane for buses is limited by drive through site so may not provide enough queuing.
 5. Question: would drive be open? Scott Prisco (APS) responds that drive would be controlled. Explains how APS generally controls parent drop-off and guides parents where to go.
 6. Question from Amanda Davis: what happened to buses on this drive? TDG answered that with buses on the drive the traffic analysis would be similar to an "A" option; they attempted to model the scenarios with the greatest differences.
 7. Question: Is remote drop-off / use of church lot still under consideration? TDG/APS answer yes.
- vii. Option C1:
1. Additional through lane on Lorcom northbound at Vacations
 2. Adds some traffic to streets that may worsen congestion.
 3. Expanded lane for buses is limited by drive through site so may not provide enough queuing.
 4. Does not provide enough parking.
- viii. Option G:
1. No recommendations to alleviate the additional burden of five points intersection to handle the new school traffic coming through that intersection.
 2. Red squares in evaluation indicate additional traffic at intersections that are already challenging, one-way movements that may increase congestion. Parent drop-off may not have sufficient queuing because of proximity of entry to Old Dominion.
 3. Does not provide enough parking
- ix. Discussion
1. Question from Laura Edwards: what about impact on parking during constructions? APS answered that there are always ways to solve it during construction and that will be handled.
 2. Question about whether parent drop-off could be at multiple locations.
 3. Questions about sidewalk locations? Scott Prisco (APS) explains that sidewalks will be introduced where they are needed to fill in gaps to create safe pedestrian paths to the school. Sidewalks are in the public right-of-way, they do not take people's private property. It is not a separate



community process; it is part of this school planning process. Mentioned "safe routes for schools" as a possible funding source through the county.

4. Question from David Barish: How will the HAWK signal be put in place? APS answered it is part of the project.
5. TDG explains that they did not use numbers for evaluating because then some criteria would need to be weighted and that would have required additional BLPC input.
6. Jim Elliot (TDG) offered additional mitigation approaches to increase walkers and bikers including remote drop-off, changes in bus times, changes in bell times, how walk boundary is drawn relative to location of school.
7. TDG explains HAWK signal and its effectiveness (97% yield rate); APS and QEA mention examples of successful HAWK signals (i.e. at Wakefield).

4. BUILDING SITING AND MASSING

- a. Julia Siple (QEA) and Atara Margolies (QEA) presented building site options related to each site option and how the site options present certain opportunities or constraints on addition locations for Phase 1 and Phase 2.
- b. Review of potential buildable sites and why Phase 1 cannot be located on the Park property.
- c. Option A/A1:
 - i. Connects to school circulation efficiently
 - ii. Entry at east end of addition to respond to drop-off from Vacation Lane
 - iii. 2-story mass responds to historic preservation concerns
 - iv. Question from David Barish: would adding Phase 2 above Phase 1 be feasible? Scott Prisco (APS) and Carl Elefante (QEA) answered that yes; would be planned for now but is feasible.
- d. Option A2:
 - i. Arrival at west end of field, building steps down into the "bowl"
 - ii. Program at basement level in new courtyard
 - iii. Question about parking: parallel parking provided along new drive.
 - iv. Question from Susan C about need to focus on Phase 2.
- e. Option A3:
 - i. HALRB requested team study placing building addition on existing lower lot.
 - ii. Connecting to existing building somewhat challenging because floors do not connect or align; corridor that does connect is too narrow.
- f. Summary evaluation of A/A1/A2/A3
 - i. A3 has some pink and red squares because of stormwater impact (building site is in area on site where stormwater currently flows), and because of challenging connection to building circulation.
 - ii. A/A1/A2 are not as efficient as A3 in terms of building construction.
- g. Option C:
 - i. Road that crosses through the site is at elevation +290' – at the elevation of the existing courtyard.
 - ii. Constrains building site, so building is 4 stories in courtyard.
 - iii. Question from Susan – was a cantilever solution considered? QEA answered that it was studied but wasn't solving any problems.
- h. Option C1:
 - i. Road can be low at building (field level - +280') but then needs to wind around the site to exit at Old Dominion north of the baseball field.



- ii. New entry at center of courtyard at basement level with single-loaded corridor addition south of the existing gym. Connection to existing central stair.
- i. Summary evaluation of C/C1:
 - i. C is not as flexible for Phase 2; C1 has too much impervious surface, and is more expensive, less efficient building.
- j. Option G:
 - i. With Old Dominion loop, addition is focused at west end of the building and a new renovated entry is at the existing west parking lot at 2nd floor of existing building.
- k. Option G evaluation
 - i. Impacts park, a lot of environmental impacts, expensive. Only one criteria (field and site amenities) ranked with green; no other criteria are met and optimized for this option.
- l. Group discussion
 - i. Debate about what to do next – group agreed it was too late (10:30 pm) to vote or decide on dropping any site options.
 - ii. Request for further information on the PFRC discussion, Phase 2 opportunities in the Options, and Ed Spec analysis incorporated in the options.
 - iii. Scott Prisco (APS) suggests a straw poll if any option is particularly not appealing to the BLPC.
 - iv. Discussion about possibly adding another meeting because only 2 meetings are left before choosing a concept to present to the school board.
 - v. Susan C and Dot G both expressed that more time is needed. Scott stresses that he is not trying to rush the process and additional meetings are possible.
 - vi. Laura E posits that we need to leave more time for the architecture presentation in the next meeting. Also requests more input on what is discussed at PFRC.
 - vii. Mark Bildner (PFRC) says that the PFRC would appreciate input from the BLPC before the next meeting on June 11th.

5. NEXT STEPS

- a. Scott Prisco suggests that no decisions be made at the meeting, rather there will be an email sent out and members will be asked to rank their top two choices and their bottom two choices of the seven (7) site options presented. Further direction to come from Bill Herring (APS).
- b. The next BLPC meeting is Monday, June 15, 7pm-9pm, in the H-B Woodlawn Library.

END OF MEETING NOTES