

5/18 Joint BLPC/PFRC Meeting Minutes

- 1. Welcome/Opening Remarks (7:00 PM) – (Steve/Megan)**
 - Steve Sockwell, PFRC Chair, discussed project process background
 - Megan Haydasz, BLPC Chair, discussed process/procedures for the meetings. Indicated that comment cards would be made available for the public to fill out. Said we would look into the possibility of an online forum for information distribution and public comment. Also noted the possibility of an open community meeting prior to the next joint meeting. Next joint meeting scheduled for June 15th.

- 2. Updates (7:05 PM) – (Steve)**
 - a. Schedule – (VMDO)
 - Wyck Knox, Project Architect from VMDO Architects, presented project schedule. He also provided Discovery ES as an example of differences between final Concept Design and final Schematic Design.
 - b. TJMS – (TJMS Principal)
 - Keisha Boggan, TJMS Principal, presented TJMS concerns: 1. During fire drills, 85% of kids are evacuated to the parking lot on the west side of the site, project must not compromise this. 2. For recess during lunch, kids are using the driveway area on the west side of the site, the conversation pits, the entry plaza, and field areas. The school cones off the area so vehicle traffic is prohibited. 75% of kids go outside except in inclement weather. Project must enhance or have minimal impact on this area. 3. All Students congregate in the front of the school in the morning. Door colors indicate where grade levels enter. Students don't come through the front entry. The different entries for grade levels contributes to smooth operation of the school. 4. Moving of main entrance to 2nd St – if it moves, what happens to main office? They need to be near each other for security and so it is not confusing for visitors and parents. 5. To summarize TJMS staff concerns, safety should be 1st consideration for their fire drills and then maintain or enhance play area/student gathering areas to the west of the building.
 - c. May 4 BLPC Meeting
 - i. Review of 4 Options (VMDO)
 - Wyck Knox provided explanation/detail of 4 schemes shown the BLPC at the 5/4/16 meeting (see PowerPoint presentation from 5/18 Joint meeting).
 - ii. Summary of BLPC Comments (Megan)
 - Megan Haydasz summarized BLPC preference: Scheme 4 (single story, regularized parking deck) appeared to have the most advantages due to lowest cost, highest number of spaces, less customization, partially raised garage will provide natural light and ventilation, high bay for multiple use.
 - iii. Committee Discussion and Preference for Parking Structure (Steve)
 - Q: Does parking lot go under building with one story parking? A: Yes
 - Q: Does option #4 do away with surface parking? A: Depends on # of spots needed.
 - Q: Bus loop at north, is that the only way to bring buses in? Putting loop next to neighbors is controversial. A: There are other ways, but bringing it south reduces spots in deck, reduces height of deck, and increases cost. Keeping it north gets it out of the play area. Placing bus loop up north is also advantageous for construction. North bus loop also pushes the building itself farther away from neighbors.

- Q: Does option #4 push building cost up? A: Possibly, building cost may go up but parking cost would go down, we don't think overall it is significant. Hard to know exact implications on cost at this stage.
- Juliet Hiznay (Friends of TJ Park): concern about underparking the site, need to provide sufficient # of spots, residents have started petitioning county for zoned parking on street.
- Carrie Johnson (At Large): mass of building needs to be pedestrian/community friendly. Need future schemes to address this concern.
- Jessica Lest (TJMS Liaison): Q: where is parent drop off? A: will show it in new schemes
- Q: Where is emergency access? A: will show it in new schemes
- Q: what is impact on play area, and impact on perviousness A: will show it in new schemes
- Q: where are entrance and exit points for garage, how many? A: There are 2 in all schemes spread as far apart as possible
- Molly Calkins (Arlington Heights Civic Association): 3 concerns:
 1. process – PFRC is not bound by BLPC vote on scheme #4. Option #4 may be the cheapest, but it may be the least attractive aesthetically;
 2. parking – why not put all parking under the new building? Saves open space and trees, can hide cars out of site;
 3. Price ; Wyck noted that providing parking solely under the school would be about 4 levels, would be very expensive, and would require underpinning the existing school. May also increase stormwater and utility costs.
- Sarah McKinley (Columbia Heights Civic Association): Q: is the play area on top of garage open to all? Community included? Is parking enough for 2 schools? A: In regard to play area, the intent would be that it be open to the community during off school hours

3. Massing and Site Studies (7:40 PM) – (Megan)

a. Parking (7:40 PM)

i. Review Parking Quantity Range (Toole Design)

- Alia Anderson, project Traffic Consultant with Toole Design, presented parking slides (see 5/18 powerpoint presentation to BLPC/PFRC)
- School, Park, and Theater use do not peak at the same time which has a big impact on site parking need.
- Parking supply and demand counts were taken in late 2014 and will be taken again in spring of 2016 to verify numbers.
- John Chadwick, Assistant Superintendent for Facilities and Operations, expounded on providing parking for capacity of the existing MS, not for an expanded MS. This is prudent because there is no guarantee the MS expansion will occur, or if it does occur, how many seats will be added.
- Rob Gibson, County DES, indicated that they would like feedback from the group in order to develop parking recommendations for the site.

ii. Committee Discussion and Feedback (Steve)

- Maureen Critchley (Arbors of Arlington): Q: residents have current problem with streetparking. Would consideration be given to allow residents use of the garage? A: APS will look into it, we can't have cars parked there in the morning when staff arrives, but in theory have no problem with use of this amenity off hours.

- Q: In the average elementary school parking numbers that formed the basis of parking needs calculations, were current Patrick Henry ES parking numbers considered? A: Yes
- Q: will there be a dedicated pickup and dropoff? A: Yes
- A high % of ES school kids will be driven to school, and it is appealing for them to park and stay on site because of TJ park and other site amenities, this will impact parking needs.
- Jordan Cross (Dominion Square townhomes): property owners are concerned about 2nd st parking. Concerned about shared parking between schools on the west side of the site and community center/park on the east side. Not providing extra onsite parking impacts street parking for them. His personal experience is that people circle to find street parking. They will push for permitted spots along 2nd St.
- Katie Rouse (Patrick Henry PTA): Q: What assumptions around parking counts have been made for future ES and MS staff? A: 140 staff for MS and 99 for ES. Numbers were taken as an average around APS schools. Keisha noted current TJMS count is about 150 staff, that includes part time people as well, does not include 4 or 5 additional staff anticipated for next year. Counts include full time and part time staff. Per Megan, Patrick Henry ES currently has 110. Title one schools tend to have more staff per students. Need to verify counts based on discussions.
- Juliet Hiznay (Friends of TJ Park): will need good signage to distinguish parking. 62 spot now on eastern side of site are not assured in the future pending TJ park master planning. Current number of parking spaces for the park and community center (95) may need to be increased if facilities are upgraded. Alia noted that peak park use probably won't occur during school day.
- Monique O'Grady (At Large): Parents and staff will likely not use parking on east side because it is not convenient and they may have items they need to carry to and from school. Concerned about daytime use for large school events and parents unable to park during those times. Alia indicated that the parking calculations include visitor parking, so they are accounted for, but the calculations do not account for special events like back to school night.
- Elizabeth Gearin (PRC Rep): Q: is a 10% TDM reduction what we have seen at other schools? A: No, but the % has improved over the years. Cash and other incentives have gotten better.
- Green up area where the current 22 and 6 spot parking lots are now located. Wyck noted that the new site plans would show this.
- It was noted that it is difficult for teachers to carpool because of their hours and no metro conveniently located for this site.
- Alisa Key (BLPC): Q: if nearby residents are applying for zoned parking near school, will that require new parking calculations? A: Per Rob Gibson, no. Parking on school and park side frontage will not be zoned. Street parking counts are appropriate.
- Q: is parking budget separate from school building budget? A: no, they all come from project budget.
- Lisa Turcios (Dominion Arms Apartment Rep) – 215 spots in parking lot. 237 passes handed out, although some may be expired or not used. Most evenings there are a few spaces left in lot, so some may be parking in street.

- Bothered that Patrick Henry ES has not been surveyed, need to survey them. Alia reiterated that PHES was surveyed, but we didn't take their exclusive numbers, we averaged among several schools.
- b. Site Design (including bus loop, pick-up, and drop-off) and Building Design (8:20 PM)
 - i. Review options (VMDO)
 - Wyck Knox and Philip Donovan presented new schemes 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 (see Powerpoint presentation from 5/18 joint meeting)
 - ii. Committee Discussion and Feedback (Megan)
 - show fencing on play areas on future renderings. There is separation between MS and ES play areas
 - Q:do you lose spaces if queueing takes place in the parking garage?
A:Depends on parking counts that will be required.
 - Q:what is light blue area in the northwest corner of scheme 4.1 slide?
A:potential canopy for pickup and dropoff.
 - Norma Palmtier (Urban Forestry Commission): Q:urban forestry likes that a lot of trees are not destroyed. Would white birch currently in conversation pits be removed? A:Yes
 - Keisha Boggan (TJMS Principal): Q:what is impact of schemes on natural light for TJMS at the conversation pits? A: In all schemes we would improve potential for daylighting on the west side of the existing school. Of course new windows would be needed to realize this potential and this is not currently in project scope.
 - Need to clarify size of play area/gathering space that is accessible from 1st story of TJMS for all schemes
 - Joye Murphy (Douglas Park Civic Association): maximize parking onsite. Q:What scheme's massing has the most shadow for residents to the south? A:None. Also bus loop put building farther away from north neighbors and thereby helps keep shading off north side houses.
 - Stacey Snyder (Ashton Heights Civic Association): Q:how would MS wall be finished if conversation pits are excavated? A:We would try hard to find money for new windows, but at a minimum we would dress up the wall. Also a future renovation could add windows.
 - Q:all entrances come out of the cafeteria, could outside dining happen?
A:Yes
 - Terri Prell (PFRC At Large): Q:storm water management for each scheme? Explain interior layouts and impacts to number of stairs required. A:Bio-retention areas on surface. Probably some underground detention. Will be developed as design progresses. Possible cistern in garage for flushing toilets. No difference in number of stairs needed for 3 or 4 story building. Space will be lost in garage for elevators stairwells, etc. Design needs to be advanced to determine that.
 - Q:gym next to playground for community use is a positive, can that be incorporated into other schemes? A:Possibly, need to look at that. Q:Can community use of gym occur? A:Yes per John Chadwick, our schools typically have shared spaces with community, and this school will be no different.
 - Juliet Hiznay (Friends of TJ Park): Q:like the idea of digging out the pits, nice pedestrian plaza. How do MS access ES play area? A:Need some thought on that. Needs to be some separation of play areas for MS and younger kids. Needs to be a shared facility. Q: will size of gym

accommodate adult play? A:Per John, Ed Specs dictate a standard ES size gym. 725 seat school may need a larger gym as we revisit the Ed Spec. Also as a school community gathering space, may need a larger gym. Need to make sure we have a gym that is big enough for the school. Entries into the MS on 1st floor improve HC access. We are not proposing to add elevator.

- Jordan Cross (Dominion Square townhomes): walkability to the school a big concern. Queuing on 2nd St not good for walkability
- Alisa Key (TJ PTA): clarify emergency vehicle access for each schemes. Emphasize security in parking structure. Wyck pointed out that's why we're looking to include natural daylighting in the parking deck.
- Monique O'Grady (At Large): creativity of design is good, urban plaza between the buildings is a great feature, scheme 4.3 is good for community access to the gym. Q:Parking concerns – can we dig down below urban plaza? A:Yes, but may require underpinning of existing MS and would be expensive. Also need to consider geothermal well location. Moving MS office closer to the 2nd St side should also be considered.
- Extended day pickup and drop off needs to be considered.
- Carrie Johnson (At Large): Q:any of the turns too tight at the bus loop, garage entry, etc.? Should Old Glebe Rd be widened? A:Per Wyck, widening of Old Glebe Rd has a negative impact on setbacks and size of garage. Rob Gibson suggested that maybe the widening could occur just from 1st St south to 2nd St. Likes scheme 4.2 that doesn't hide theater entry, need to think about how to avoid screening theater. Play spaces needs to be visually accessible. Think about connections between spaces on site. Maybe recess garage a bit to allow for better visibility and community engagement with play area on top of garage. At southwest corner of garage, 8' height is much less than 11'.
- implement more 4 way stops. Q:1700 students at the site between the 2 schools, where do they evacuate to in emergency? A:Design team needs to meet with fire marshall to explore this further.

4. Public Comment (9:00 PM) – (Steve)

- Q:have intersections of Old S. Glebe Rd and 1st and 2nd Streets been studied? A:Yes. That will be a point a discussion at future meetings
- Q:have we looked at traffic controls during construction? A: Yes and we will attend to that discussion at future meetings
- Q:any push to get more bussing and less cars? A:Yes, TDM incentives for APS staff and APS is also focusing on student TDM.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON INDEX CARDS LEFT AT MEETING:

- maximize parking where ever possible
- Stephanie Chong: 1.please dig out and prepare the TJ “pits”/amphitheater during the summer break, if possible; 2. In the garage, please offer counterclockwise drop off space for parents to decrease congestion on Old S. Glebe Rd. The dropoff on scheme 4.1 is too small for ES; 3. Thank you for your efforts, creativity, and patience!
- Jenna Pietropola: with dedicated drop off lanes opportunity exists for parents to drop off on S Old Glebe as well allowing for illegal u-turns and increased accident rates. Also removes parking spots from S Old Glebe so 12 spots wouldn't be available from 7-9am so teachers couldn't park there. Since the public is only invited to the joint meetings once a month questions

from the public should take precedence as the members have other opportunities to ask questions. With 12 parking spaces allocated to Old S Glebe – can't park on east side from 7-9am so teachers can't park there – so spots don't really exist.

- Friends of Thomas Jefferson Park: Regarding parking and parking garage, it is important to consider park needs when looking at parking, especially since the far eastern lot is the best location for a new community playground. It is critical to consider bus access and parking accessibility if the main entrance for the middle school is moved to 2nd Street at a later date.

5. Closing Remarks/Adjournment (9:15 PM) – (Steve/Megan)

- a. Next Steps – separate back to back meetings for PFRC and BLPC will take place on 6/1/16