

**Public Facilities Review Committee
McKinley Elementary School Expansion
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, November 20, 2013**

Attendees

<u>PFRC Members (√ = present):</u>	<u>Arlington Public Schools (APS):</u>
√ Steve Sockwell, Chair	Ajibola Robinson, APS
Lander Allin, Schools	Scott Prisco, APS
Jeff Certosimo, Housing Commission	Kevin Moran, HCM
√ Christopher Forinash, Planning Commission	Jeff Hagan, HCM
√ Elizabeth Gearin, Parks & Rec. Commission	Peter Winebrenner, HCM
√ Karen Kumm, Planning Commission	Om Khurjekav, HCM
John Miller, At-Large	
Heather Obora, Schools	<u>County Staff:</u>
√ Michael Perkins, Transportation Commission	Freida Wray, DCPHD
√ Terri Prell, At-Large	Justin Falango, DCPHD
√ William Staderman	Sophia Fisher, DCPHD
√ Gabriel Thoumi, E2C2	Rob Gibson, DES
Jason Widstrom, Fiscal Affairs Adv. Comm.	Jane Rudolph, DPR
	Robin Leonard, DPR
<u>McKinley Project-Specific PFRC Members (√ = present):</u>	
√ Jason Ackleson, Dominion Hills CA	
√ Brian Hannigan, Dominion Hills CA	
Jenny Capone, Madison Manor CA	
√ Anne Ladewig, Madison Manor CA	
√ Tim Bakos, Westover Village CA	
Craig Esherick, Sports Commission	
Ed Hilz, Urban Forestry Commission	

Public Comment:

There were no public comments.

Update from the Department of Parks and Recreation

Jane Rudolph, Director of DPR, provided feedback on the County's position with regard to open space areas on the McKinley Elementary School site. She confirmed that the County has no interest in recommending synthetic turf and/or lighting for the play fields, and is supportive of retaining the grass turf. Ms. Rudolph noted that while the County does not own the open space areas, it does significantly program use of the open spaces and building for children's activities and summer camps. Expansion of current programming is not planned.

Transportation

HCM provided an update on the status of the Transportation Study. They are working with TDG to develop a transportation management program and recommendations for transportation-related improvements. TDG will present detailed updates on data and

observations, site analysis, and parking and transportation-related recommendations, at the next PFRC meeting on December 18th. Preliminary data and observations can be found in TDG's Executive Summary, which is located on the PFRC website at <http://www.arlingtonva.us/departments/Commissions/PublicFacilitiesReviewCommittee/file90655.pdf>. APS presented the relocated kiss & drop-off area, and reported that parents and staff are supportive of the new location on the north side. The larger district-wide Transportation Study will be completed in August 2014. Public presentations will be conducted between February and August 2014. County staff, as well as the Transportation Commission and the Multi-Modal Transportation Work Group, will provide input.

Placement/Massing

HCM presented the initial site organization diagrams – four (4) options that were also discussed at the BLPC meeting on November 19th. The options were discussed in detail at the PFRC meeting, and can be reviewed in the following presentation:

<http://www.apsva.us/cms/lib2/VA01000586/Centricity/Domain/105/Meeting%20Minutes%20-%20BLPC-06-131119.pdf>. Some of the comments included:

Option 1 (\$15.2 million cost)

- Provides no direct pedestrian access to the gym from the parking lot. Must enter the main school to gain interior access to the gym.
- Will retain most of the existing pedestrian walkways around the building.
- Slope on adjacent open space appears too steep for ADA accessibility. APS prefers to have direct access to the gym. HCM will study ADA accessibility.
- The plan appears to expand the paved surfaces. Concerned about its consistency with the goals and objectives of the County's Community Energy Plan, and the State of Virginia requirements for pollutant load reductions (MS4).
- APS staff indicated that the plan must balance two (2) competing priorities: maximizing the open space and meeting the higher parking standards.
- Consider the use of permeable paving surfaces.
- There is a family of hawks nesting in the southwest corner of the site.
- What is the status of the vacant, undeveloped County-owned property adjacent to the site's southwest corner?
- Will the existing building be adapted to meet the long term requirement for reduced carbon footprint?
- Will the library contain daylighting elements?

Option 2 (\$16.7 million cost)

- Provides easier pedestrian access from the parking lot to the gym.
- Would it be more energy efficient to construct the addition on top of existing structures? APS responded that the proposal is for a very efficient, high performing 27,000 square foot addition. While it will not be LEED certified, it will be designed to conform to LEED.
- Has the option of retaining the pentagon. APS staff explained the pros and cons of retaining the existing pentagon structure. It would require an additional \$1.7 million in construction costs to renovate and bring it up to the current code.

- Has the ability to incorporate 5 parallel visitor parking spaces.

Option 3 (\$17 million cost)

- Retains and renovates the pentagon structure.
- Does it result in less footprint and paved area than Option 2? APS responded that it is about the same because it retains the pentagon structure.
- Which of the four options would be better suited for further additions in the future? HCM and APS staff responded that each of the options take into consideration the potential for relocatables in the future. The planned capacity is 700 students and the school is currently almost there. Student enrollment is cyclical.

Option 4 (\$15.3 million cost)

- Places the addition on the north side of the building.

After discussing the options, the PFRC members each indicated their preferred option. The majority preferred Option 1 (approximately 12), with 2 members preferring Options 2 and 3. Some of the comments included:

- Although this is a suburban location, the location of the addition in Options 2 and 3 does not take full advantage of the opportunity to provide a prominent street presence adjacent to McKinley Road.
- Option 1 consolidates the open space areas and allows the playgrounds to be separated by grades.
- Option 1 is most compatible with the neighborhood.
- Option 1 provides better pedestrian flow and access to the site.
- The addition in Option 1 takes better advantage of the site.
- The addition in Option 1 does not impact the open space as much.
- Option 3 provides less of a slope in order to achieve ADA accessibility and universal design.
- Option 2 may exacerbate the potential for kids hanging out in the rear play field at night.

APS staff reported that the BLPC preferred both Options 1 and 2. They felt Option 4 would provide a greater visual impact on adjacent neighbors. Both Options 3 and 4 had issues with interior layout and programming. There was some concern that adjacent neighbors may feel that Option 2 will also provide visual impacts. There were pros and cons about the addition's presence (or lack thereof) adjacent to McKinley Road. Because of these outstanding concerns, the BLPC decided that their December 4th meeting would be open to the public to allow their feedback on the options. The PFRC is also invited to participate.

For the next PFRC meeting on December 18th, APS was asked to:

- Provide street cross-sections, site sections, and street level perspectives.
- Provide square footage of the existing building and building additions.

- Consider long term improvements, including the potential need to construct additions in the future.
- Provide more detail on the surface parking and the proposed number of parking spaces.
- Present the neighborhood feedback from the BLPC public forum in December.

Next Steps

The next steps in the process include:

- December 4, 2013 – BLPC public meeting on the concept plan options. PFRC members are invited to participate.
- December 17, 2014 – BLPC
- December 18, 2013 – PFRC
- January 14, 2014 – BLPC
- January 15, 2014 – PFRC
- January 23, 2014 – School Board information item on final concept plan
- January 28, 2014 – BLPC
- January 29, 2014 – Optional PFRC meeting on SB meeting feedback
- February 6, 2014 – School Board action on final concept plan

The meeting adjourned at 9:30pm.