



601 West 26<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1255  
New York, NY 10001  
USA  
+1 347.549.4141

1201 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Tenth Floor  
Washington, DC 20036-2683  
USA  
+1 202.861.4600

**MEETING MINUTES**

**PROJECT** WILSON SCHOOL – 1601 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA  
**PROJECT #** LAD # 056-10002-001; BIG #14520 WILS  
**MEETING DATE** 14 April 2015  
**MEETING TIME** Tuesday, 7:00pm – 9:30pm  
**LOCATION** 1601 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA  
**SUBJECT** BLPC #1 : Kick-Off

ATTENDEES		
APS DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION	DCS	Scott Prisco, Ben Burgin, Jennifer Xu
BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING COMMITTEE	BLPC	Casey Robinson, Karen Gerry, Nancy Caruso, Maggie Wiseman, Davod Soles, Vanesssa Picorossi, Tom Malian, Bill Podolski, Valerie Budney, Danielle Arigoni, Kristen Colston, Richard Layman, Melissa McCracken, Laura Edelbrock, Lucia deCordre, Carroll Colley, Paul Mulligan, Constance Skelton, Colleen Koval, Joan Lawrence, Miranda Baltaxe, Sophie Falkenheim
OTHER ATTENDEES	OTH	Arlova Vohnm, Dennis Sellin, Melina Aljabar, James Meikle
LEO A DALY	LAD	Jack Chin
BJARKE INGELS GROUP	BIG	Sean Franklin, Ji-young Yoon

**1. Wilson School Process Review and BLPC Process Overview**

- 1.1. DCS presented a series of slide detailing the Wilson School project to date including the feasibility study and subsequent School Board decisions.
- 1.2. Richard Layman asked if the BLPC members were considered clients or advisors.
  - 1.2.1. Scott Prisco responded by saying the clients are the students. The BLPC group are advisors or consultants to the process.
- 1.3. Bill Podolski asked for clarification of the yellow band of color on slide #20.
  - 1.3.1. Scott Prisco responded by explaining the important of the street edge that has been addressed during the WRAPs process.
- 1.4. DCS explained that although we are encouraging an aggressive schedule, the group has the ability to slow the process down. The process will take as long as it needs.

**2. Presentation of Consultant Team and Leo A Daly Architects**

- 2.1. LAD explained the consultant team.
- 2.2. LAD gave an overview of Leo A Daly and presented examples of previous projects and experience.

**3. Presentation of the Bjarke Ingels Group (BIG) and Feasibility Study Review**

- 3.1. BIG gave an overview of the Bjarke Ingels (BIG) Group and presented examples of previous projects and experience.
- 3.2. BIG also explained the design philosophy of BIG, "knowledge driven design".
- 3.3. BIG reviewed more in depth the feasibility process and resultant study and design. It was explained that the design seen in the feasibility study is not intended as the final design, and was only done for the purposes of testing the feasibility of the Wilson site.
- 3.4. BIG reviewed the current programming process and stated that the overall area is above what the budget allows. The Principals from both programs are asked to scrutinize the program and find ways to utilize more shared spaces or eliminate spaces that are not absolutely needed.
- 3.5. A question was asked regarding what the target area needs to be.
  - 3.5.1. BIG answered explaining existing building including trailers is around 140,000 SF. The goal for the new building is approximately 150,000 SF, but that there is no hard number.

#### 4. Open Discussion / Questions

##### 4.1. Historic Preservation

- 4.1.1. Joan Lawrence asked if the Wilson School team ever considered integrating the historic building into the plans.
  - 4.1.1.1. DCS explained that the team was not asked to as a result of cost considerations. There is no budget to make it work.

##### 4.2. Transportation/Traffic

- 4.2.1. Richard Laymen asked if the site boundaries are set.
  - 4.2.1.1. DCS explained that the property lines are set and that any potential cut through street will happen outside of the schools property.
- 4.2.2. A participant asked about school buses and the county's idea of making this a school bus free school.
  - 4.2.2.1. DCS answered by stating although this site is unique in its public transportation options, until those options are further developed we have to plan on providing buses in the design. The Stratford program will need buses regardless.
- 4.2.3. David Soles asked if it was possible to have both HB and Stratford share buses.
  - 4.2.3.1. Karen Gery answered "yes" but there are behavioral issues of the Stratford students that need to be accommodated for.

##### 4.3. Field/Open Space

- 4.3.1. Danielle Arigoni stated that including the 7/11 site is an obvious solution for the new school and that having contiguous green space should be a main goal.
  - 4.3.1.1. DCS agreed with the concern but added that having green space be a certain size may not be necessary in the overall educational goals of the project.
  - 4.3.1.2. Danielle Arigoni added that the county site adjacent to our site is important for open space as well.
  - 4.3.1.3. DCS responded by saying that how the county property relates to any potential open space on our site will depend on the program that occurs on that site. It may not be all open, green space.
  - 4.3.1.4. DCS also added that swapping land would delay the project and jeopardize the planned opening date.
  - 4.3.1.5. Any contiguous open space will also depend any possible cut thru road from Wilson Blvd to 18<sup>th</sup> Street.
- 4.3.2. Bill Podolski asked how far we are off in providing an Ultimate Frisbee field.
  - 4.3.2.1. BIG answered by providing the dimensions of the site and that it is physically impossible to provide an adequate field especially when you consider all of the additional buffer zones in addition to the regulation play field.
  - 4.3.2.2. A participant reiterated that HB currently uses Longview Park for their competitions.
- 4.3.3. Casey Robinson added that the need is to provide adequate outdoor space for 775 students aside from Ultimate Frisbee.
- 4.3.4. A participant asked if the Frisbee field will fit diagonally.
  - 4.3.4.1. BIG answered that it was tried but still will not fit.
- 4.3.5. David Soles reiterated that if the open space is integrated with a potential open space on the county property, it would make a field more possible.
- 4.3.6. Bill Podolski asked if there is a county regulation or guideline stating the amount of open space required per student.
  - 4.3.6.1. DCS answered that there are sets of guidelines but those guidelines are meant for suburban schools. They do not apply to an urban area and those guidelines are not mandated.

##### 4.4. 7-Eleven

- 4.4.1. Richard Layman asked if we are to assume the 7/11 stays.
  - 4.4.1.1. DCS answered "yes" and that we want to be conservative. If the plan truly doesn't work, DCS will consider options and using its leverage for purchasing the property. Funding is a big consideration as eminent domain is expensive.

##### 4.5. Process Comments/Questions (WRAPS, BLPC, PFRC)

- 4.5.1. In response to the WRAPS concept plans, Richard Laymen asked if the site boundaries are set.
  - 4.5.1.1. DCS explained that the property lines are set and that any potential cut through street will happen outside of the schools property.
- 4.5.2. Casey Robinson asked how the agendas for each BLPC meetings will be set.
  - 4.5.2.1. DCS answered that BIG will lead the discussion and set the agenda.
  - 4.5.2.2. BIG explained the BLPC process as BIG sees it and the pace of the meetings will be as necessary for everyone to be comfortable with.
  - 4.5.2.3. DCS explained the schedule as it relates to the summer break and how that relates to the aggressive schedule and again reiterating that the process will take as long as it takes.

- 4.5.3. DCS asked the group if anyone is interested in becoming the chair of the BLPC committee to please identify themselves.
- 4.5.4. A participant asked about the PFRC process and purpose.
  - 4.5.4.1. DCS explained the differences between the BLPC and the PFRC process and that no new information will be presented to the PFRC before the BLPC has a chance to review.
- 4.6. General Comments/Questions
  - 4.6.1. A participant stated that this project will provide a great opportunity to have common uses with the community.
    - 4.6.1.1. DCS responded by mentioning Karen Gerry's idea of providing the space of the Stratford program for the Wounded Warriors.
    - 4.6.1.2. Karen Gerry explained further her idea of allowing them to use the new space for their own rehabilitation purposes.
    - 4.6.1.3. DCS added that if anyone knows of alternative funding sources to enhance the budget of the project to please identify them.
  - 4.6.2. Maggie Wiseman asked Sean Franklin what the presentations of "shapes" mean during the concept design phase.
    - 4.6.2.1. Sean Franklin explained the design process.
  - 4.6.3. David Soles inquired about the cost of construction underground versus above ground in regards to potential drop off scenarios.
    - 4.6.3.1. BIG and DCS reiterated that constructing underground is more expensive by using the cost of parking as an example.
  - 4.6.4. DCS reiterated the grade change challenges this project has between Wilson Blvd and 18<sup>th</sup> Street and how the Stratford program wants to be at grade.
  - 4.6.5. A participant asked as a result of the specialization of the 2 programs and the potential design for them, if the school design can be flexible for the future.
    - 4.6.5.1. DCS answered "yes". It would be treated similar to a "tenant fit out" space in an office building in regards to demolishing stud walls and rebuilding them elsewhere. This is easier in modern buildings than in older existing schools.
    - 4.6.5.2. DCS also mentioned the success of the H-B Woodlawn and Stratford programs and anticipates them lasting for quite a while into the future.

## **5. Conclusion.**

- 5.1. Next BLPC meeting on April 29,2015

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@leoadaly.com](mailto:jchin@leoadaly.com) within seven days of receipt.

Submitted by: Jack Chin  
Date: 16 April, 2015