

# New Elementary School at TJ Community Comments

June 22, 2016

Name (First)	Name (Last)	Share your comments with the staff team and committees:	Entry Date	Response	Response Date	Responding Party
Bill	Staderman	<p>Thank you very much for requesting my input, Steve.</p> <p>I am VERY MUCH NOT in favor of the Concept Design presented as scheme 4.3b on June 15. I point of contention is the construction of 15 step staircase that serves as the main entrance to the school, which is clearly represented on slide 47. This construction mandates a staircase with the switchback ramp on the other side, as can be seen on slide 57. A few of the more particular parts of my opposition include:</p> <p>? The introduction of stairs imposes an intrinsic and the relevant discrimination of students using steps or a ramp.            ? The introduction of stairs is an unnecessary expense.            ? The introduction of stairs in places like surrounding the tree closest to the entrance is arbitrary and a fairly blatant means of discrimination.            ? The switchback ramp mandated by the stairs is expensive. It is a huge concrete structure. It takes up a lot of green space, and it reduces the natural water absorption, causing problems with the storm runoff. Note that the same arguments fell on deaf ears - although several alternatives were proposed -regarding the McKinley ES project in 2014.</p> <p>I am in favor of the "submerged" school concept (considering the safety of students); however, I am sure that a more universal means of egress then steps + ramp can be designed.</p>	06/21/2016			
Lisa	Turcios	<p>Shrinking Elementary School play space            The June 15, 2016, BLPC/PFRC presentation slides broke out play areas for elementary and middle school and even differentiated between grass and landscaped areas for middle school.</p> <p>Two points that I like to see expanded on.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MS - Slide 63 of the presentation neglected to include the existing surface area associated with the parking lot/bus drop off that MS currently uses as part of their play area including the basketball hoop.</li> <li>2. ES. The presentation neglected to include any comparison to existing conditions at the current Patrick Henry site.</li> </ol> <p>According to slide 62 of the June 15 BLPC/PFRC presentation, the new ES will have 53,500 SF of outdoor play space. No breakdown has been prepared yet of how much of that could potentially have natural grass, but I assume close to none.</p> <p>At the current Patrick Henry site, a quick measurement in Google Earth shows:            EAST Side 98,200 SF. This includes the fenced in school garden (6,000 SF), basketball court (9,400 SF), playground area (11,400 SF) and the classroom trailers (5,600 SF). Still leaves about 60,000 SF of wide open play space made up mostly of natural grass play area (minus the dirt ball diamond).            WEST Side 6,975 SF black-top            SOUTH side front entrance park/plaza/water feature 2,440 SF            Add these areas at the existing site together and get nearly double what is being proposed at the new site.</p> <p>Safety            4 stories for an elementary school seems excessive to me (particularly when only the 1st floor is proposed to have at-grade access). Most recently built Discovery Elementary is only 2 stories. The McKinley Elementary addition is 3 stories but two levels have at-grade access. Even the Stafford Middle School addition is only 3 stories.            I am doubtful of the appropriateness of elementary aged children (5th grade) placed on the 4th floor of the building. Will they have sufficient time to exit the building down the stairwells during event of emergency? The school is slated to house several countywide programs for children with various disabilities. Will the 5th grade children with disabilities be safe on the 4th floor? Would it make sense to bump the school out a little wider to be able to fit everyone on 3 floors?            Is there sufficient outside at-grade space in this design for the children and staff of both the 725-student elementary school and 1,086-student middle school to congregate quickly if both schools need to be evacuated that does not impede necessary fire truck and paramedic vehicle access?            Serious concerns have been raised by neighbors about unsafe existing traffic conditions in this area. How much worse are things going to be if appropriate design elements are not incorporated early on to minimize impacts of the new elementary school? For instance, with the garage entrance lining up with 1st Road South, neighbors on that street are anticipating even higher traffic volumes on their little roadway during drop-off and pick-up times.</p>	06/21/2016			

Play Space

As mentioned in one of my previous postings, the proposed SF for outdoor play space designated for the Elementary School in the concept design is about half of what the children have at the current Patrick Henry site.

I am concerned that it appears in the concept design that both the elementary and middle school children will not have access to real soil with natural grass and large shade trees with deep root systems during their recess periods. Will all of the concrete and synthetic materials contribute to the urban heat island effect that will make the play space unpleasant for all?

Significant shade / canopy trees need deep and expansive soil. I don't envision those growing in the ES play area on top of the parking structure nor in the MS play area either.

ES - It may be nearly impossible to grow natural grass on top of the parking garage. Is having children play 11 feet (or more) up in the air good planning? Will fences and walls be used to keep them from climbing out or falling off?

MS – It appears that the middle school play area is designed to mostly be paved materials and small patches of synthetic grass. The proposed pedestrian plaza of 50 foot width may be appropriate for bankers to take their lunch break in a downtown, urban setting. But is it sufficient for 12, 13, and 14-year olds to run around and kick a soccer ball, throw a Frisbee, or play touch football? Wouldn't we better off finding a creative way to get the middle school students during their recess break over to the east side of the park to enjoy the large fields and trees available over there?

The 15,650 SF of "grass play area" shown in Slide 64 (June 15 materials) are in small patches separated by pedestrian walkways. Hard to read the scale, but knowing that the plaza width was reported in the meeting to be 50 ft, then I am scaling that the largest grass play area along the promenade comes in at about 25' x 50'.

I would love to hear from anyone with creative ideas on getting the middle school students over to the east side of the TJ site for lunchtime/recess. This document has a layout of the Middle School and Community Center (not sure how accurate it still is) [https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2014/09/TJ\\_SiteEval\\_1972-TJ-Facility-Booklet.pdf](https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2014/09/TJ_SiteEval_1972-TJ-Facility-Booklet.pdf)

Is Central Storage/Kitchen still being used? Would it be possible for the MS students to non out with a new entrance/exit through Above Ground versus Below Ground Parking Structure

I personally find the aesthetic of an above ground parking structure to be unacceptable for the site. I do not want to walk past the walls and parking structure when I visit the site and wouldn't want the middle school students to see the walls and cars every time they come out of their school building.

For what I consider a reasonable amount of money in the scope of this big dig project, we could instead place all parking underground (hidden away from view). Option C) shared by the architects at the June 15 meeting (slide 29) showed a cost of \$11.8 M for 230 spots of completely underground (hidden) parking. I personally think that this concept should be further explored and so did 3 of my fellow committee members, but unfortunately we did not get the support of the rest of the committee. Although it had been hinted at in earlier meetings that the cost of undergrounding would be prohibitive, it came out close to the costs given for other parking scenarios. But the slides were rushed through and a vote/preference was quickly taken. No substantial discussion or debate regarding pros and cons of totally underground (hidden) versus above-ground or partially submerged parking structures took place.

In a recent email exchange, the BLPC Chair indicated that there were expressed "concerns about young children entering/exiting a multi-level, totally submerged parking structure." I don't recall hearing that particular concern. If I had heard that concern, then I would have expressed that it is my opinion that if the parking structure were placed completely underground (hidden) then I do not believe that kiss-and-learn (parent drop-off and pick-up) should occur within the parking structure. I would advocate having parent drop-off and pick-up above ground in that scenario.

I would propose reserving the completely underground parking structure for PARKING (staff and visitor spots).

[In that scenario, yes, there would still be times when a child would accompany their parent in the underground parking structure, but it shouldn't be a daily occurrence for everyone (except perhaps for those using extended day care)].

Various configurations for drop off/pick off lanes would need to be further explored with the completely underground parking scenario. Looking at the latest concept drawings, perhaps a third lane next to the bus loop in the north. Or going back to the idea of the creation of a new driveway / extra lane along S Old Glebe Rd. I do not see a need for a covered drop-off lane.


	<p>Opportunity Cost and Replacement Cost of Land  I worry that the above ground parking structure is a poor use of a large portion of the site. Keep in mind that the County voted this weekend to spend nearly \$700,000 to acquire one private home lot (8,500 SF) to enable expansion of Benjamin Banneker Park (near East Falls Church metro station). Why is the County essentially "giving away" the designated parkland on the west side of TJ to have it be converted into a parking structure with inappropriate and inadequate play space on top?</p> <p>Is the Land Value shown here for 24-011-037 accurate? Are any of the Improvements considered to be on the west portion?  <a href="https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2014/10/TJSiteEval_Assessed-Value-County-Acquisitions.pdf">https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2014/10/TJSiteEval_Assessed-Value-County-Acquisitions.pdf</a></p> <p>As a rough estimate, I calculate that the County is giving away \$3.5M worth of parkland (3.83 acres) by allowing the new elementary school to be built in the western portion of the parcel.</p> <p>I do concede that the TJWG did and the current PFRC/BLPC planning process is attempting to ensure that the new elementary school building itself will be made available for community use. I am aware that many (if not all) APS buildings are used for non-school uses in the evenings and weekends.</p> <p>Furthermore, I do see that TJWG and PFRC/BLPC concept designs are attempting to make the outdoor space attractive and available for community use in the evenings and weekends.</p> <p>I don't think it is fair to give away \$3.5M worth of parkland that were bought with park bonds in one neighborhood; and then buy up other private home lots to add to parkland elsewhere.</p> <p>Here is my quick math. Columns will shift in cutting-and-pasting.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>County Land</th> <th>SF</th> <th>Acres</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Land Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>West</td> <td>167,003</td> <td>3.83</td> <td>0.21</td> <td>\$3,461,409</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East</td> <td>635,612</td> <td>14.59</td> <td>0.79</td> <td>\$13,174,091</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>802,615</td> <td>18.43</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>\$16,635,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Equity in Spending Public Funds</p> <p>A budget of \$59 M for the project at TJ is currently being stated at the committee meetings. Is this enough money to properly address all of the concerns that are raised because of the desire by APS to place the new elementary school in this tight location (4 acres) that must be shared by elementary and middle school users during the day time and also community Theatre users at other times?</p> <p>The School Board approved CIP shows that the new school being planned for the Wilson Site is being designed for only 775 students and is proposed to use more than \$100 M.</p> <p>78.4 M 2016 bond, \$7.5 M from last bond (2014), \$7 M from reserves, \$6 M from Joint, and \$1.9 M from other = \$100,800,000 (<a href="http://www.apsva.us/cms/lib2/VA01000586/Centricity/Domain/110/G-1%20School%20Board%20Proposed%202017-2026%20Capital%20Improvement%20Plan.pdf">http://www.apsva.us/cms/lib2/VA01000586/Centricity/Domain/110/G-1%20School%20Board%20Proposed%202017-2026%20Capital%20Improvement%20Plan.pdf</a>) Slide 15</p> <p>If we need a bit more money at TJ to accommodate everything that needs to be done to make this the best possible school and community use site, then we cannot be afraid to ask for an modest increase in the budget. Spending more resources may be needed to provide adequate parking and safety considerations and vehicular/pedestrian traffic flow. The TJ site needs to serve the elementary school; a middle school; a county-wide used community center and theatre; and accommodate the neighbors.</p> <p>Will we see equity in funding for the population served by the new elementary school and TJ middle school?</p> <p>Wilson (HB Woodlawn) 12.9% of Students on Free or Reduced Lunch – 63.7% White Students</p> <p>Henry 37.8% of Students on Free and Reduced Lunch - 38% White Students</p> <p>Jefferson 43.99% of Students on Free and Reduced Lunch – 30.9% White Students</p> <p>Free and Reduced-Price Meal Statistics <a href="http://www.apsva.us/Page/33492">http://www.apsva.us/Page/33492</a></p>	County Land	SF	Acres	Percentage	Land Value	West	167,003	3.83	0.21	\$3,461,409	East	635,612	14.59	0.79	\$13,174,091	Total	802,615	18.43	1.00	\$16,635,500				
County Land	SF	Acres	Percentage	Land Value																					
West	167,003	3.83	0.21	\$3,461,409																					
East	635,612	14.59	0.79	\$13,174,091																					
Total	802,615	18.43	1.00	\$16,635,500																					
Susannah	Keefe	06/16/2016																							

<p>Bruce Boyd</p>	<p>I have two concerns about the proposed design for the new elementary school and parking lot on the Thomas Jefferson property.</p> <p>The first concern relates to traffic and possible queuing along the 3600 block of 1st Road South.</p> <p>Currently, there are two “peak times” – drop off for TJ students in the morning, and pick-up of TJ students in the afternoon. During both of those peak times, automobile traffic is not allowed into the surface lot on the west side of TJ through the entry way directly across from the point at which 1st Road South intersects South Old Glebe Road. Between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., and between 2:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. on school days, that entry way into the surface parking lot is restricted to buses only. There are signs at that entry way that indicates this restriction.</p> <p>As things stand now, parents who drive their children to school at TJ, go north on Old Glebe Road, past the parking lot entry way near 1st Road South, and enter the TJ parking lot at an entry way north of the 3600 block of 1st Road South. This entry way is marked with a sign indicating “Drop Off Turn Here”, and is directly across Old Glebe Road from a small parking lot and walkway into The Arbors.</p> <p>Parents dropping off their children at TJ then proceed into the TJ parking lot, make a left hand turn into the “Drop Zone” [in the parking lot], drop off their children, and proceed straight ahead where they encounter a sign directing them to make a left hand turn (still in the TJ parking lot). After making this left hand turn, parents with automobiles drive along the northernmost part of the current TJ parking lot and exit the TJ parking lot onto Old Glebe Road across from the large parking lot for The Arbors.</p> <p>The design of the new school and parking lot, however, changes all of this. Instead, under the proposed design, all automobile traffic (for the two current peak times, as well as for the two additional peak times that will result with the addition of a new elementary school) will be directed into the entry way directly across from point at which 1st Road South intersects Old Glebe Road. Instead of this entry way being (as it currently is) an entry only for buses during peak times, this entry way will become the only way for both buses and automobiles to enter the new parking lot.</p>	<p>06/18/2016</p>			
	<p>At the PFRC/BPLC meeting on Wednesday, June 15, I asked the design team how drop off traffic would flow into and out of the new proposed parking lot. The answer, as I understood it, was what I have stated above – ALL traffic will enter the new parking lot through the entry way near the 1st Road South intersection with Old Glebe Road. I also understood the member of the design team to say that, after dropping off their children, parents in automobiles will have the option of proceeding through the parking lot to an exit point north of the intersection of Old Glebe Road and 1st Road South OR doubling-back through the parking lot and exiting the parking lot near the 1st Road South intersection with Old Glebe Road.</p> <p>I am very concerned about this, since I think it has a very high possibility of increasing traffic along the 3600 block of 1st Road South.</p> <p>Under the current drop-off flow, parents in automobiles dropping off or picking their children at TJ have no incentive to use the 3600 block of 1st Road south in order to gain access to the entry into the TJ parking lot that they are required to use. As I indicated, the current drop off and pick-up entry point to the TJ parking lot is on Old Glebe Road – north of the intersection with the 3600 block of 1st Road South.</p> <p>But by placing the only entry point for both buses and automobiles at the point where the 3600 block of 1st Road South intersects Old Glebe Road, the proposed plan provides an incentive for both buses and parents with automobiles to use the 3600 block of 1st Road South as a straight-line approach to the only entry point to the proposed drop-off and pick-up point in the proposed parking lot.</p> <p>Parents who drive along Glebe Road from either Ballston or Columbia Pike will soon realize that if they turn from Glebe Road onto the 3600 block of 1st Road South, they will have a straight shot down 1st Road South into the new entry way into the drop-off and pick-up point for their children. These parents will realize that by using 1st Road South, they will avoid the inevitable bottleneck that currently occurs (and which will, without question, get worse with the addition of a new elementary school) at 2nd Street South and Old Glebe Road.</p> <p>This will also likely cause some queuing of traffic along the 3600 block of 1st Road South as parents wait for traffic along South Old Glebe Road.</p>				

	<p>This additional traffic and queuing will take place 4 times every school day along the 3600 block of 1st Road South.</p> <p>As others who live along the 3600 block of 1st Road South and I have indicated, this block is already very dangerous for children and pets. People routinely speed along this one block, using this one-block stretch of road as a way to by-pass a red light at the intersection of South Glebe Road and 2nd Street South. [People traveling south-bound on Glebe Road who are in a hurry and don't want to wait for a red light at South Glebe Road and 2nd Street South will turn onto the 3600 block of 1st Road South, speed down it, and then turn right onto Old Glebe Road, and then left onto 2nd Street South.] Additionally, people routinely enter into the 3600 block of 1st Road South, and then enter one of the driveways along that block, do a 3-point turn, and proceed the wrong way back towards Glebe Road.</p> <p>Incentivizing additional traffic (by locating the only entry point into the drop-off and pick-up zone for two schools with a combined population of over 1,000 children) at the end of the 3600 block of 1st Road South is inviting a serious accident involving children to occur along this block.</p> <p>I realize that the PFRC voted at the June 15th meeting to move ahead with the parking lot (and its entry point) that I have described above. But the PFRC did so without allowing the President of the Arlington Heights Civic Association (where both TJ and the new elementary school are/will be located) the opportunity to discuss the proposed parking lots with her community. The PFRC did this despite the fact that Molly Calkins, President of AHCA, requested the opportunity to discuss the parking lot options with the people in her civic association. I would certainly hope that the PFRC and the BPLC will not, in its zeal to move things along, overlook the concerns of people who live closest to the proposed new elementary school.</p> <p>The second concern I have involves the safety of TJ students in the event of a fire or other emergency that requires the evacuation of TJ.</p> <p>As I understand the proposed architectural plan, the surface grade along the west side of TJ would be lowered, so that the lowest level of TJ would open, on the west side, directly onto the surface. (Currently, the 2nd level of TJ is at grade, so that when a person enters TJ from the west side, that person finds a set of stairs that leads up or a set of stairs that leads down).</p>					
	<p>The current plan also contemplates a walkway between 40 and 60 feet wide that will run along the west side of TJ. I also understand that some of the TJ students would be directed to this walkway in the event of an emergency requiring the evacuation of TJ.</p> <p>But this walkway will also be used as a driveway for fire trucks and other emergency vehicles in the event of an emergency at TJ.</p> <p>My concern stems from the fact that to the west of this walkway, the current plan (as I understand it) proposes a structure. That structure is a portion of the parking lot. While it is true that the parking lot will not be completely underground, and that students will be able to walk through a portion of the parking lot and emerge onto South Old Glebe Road, I am concerned that in an emergency, the walkway along the west side of TJ will be a place where confused and frightened students will, instead of walking through a parking lot full of cars, walk south along the parking lot toward 2nd Street South. They will do this at the same time fire trucks and other emergency vehicles will be trying to access this same walkway from 2nd Street South. This has a real possibility, in my view, for a tragic outcome in the event of a true emergency at TJ. My own view is that in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation from TJ, TJ students should exit into a space that is as unobstructed as possible, so that they can clearly see the quickest way to get as far away from the school as possible. This is absolutely crucial, it seems to me, if the space into which the students are exiting is also a driveway that will, in the event of an emergency, be rapidly filling up with fire trucks and other emergency vehicles.</p>					
Maureen	Critchley	<p>Early during the joint meeting on 6.15.16 the chair of the former TJWG mentioned that a portion of S Old Glebe might be widened. I'd like to know what area she was referring to??Whether it's on the E or W side of S Old Glebe. Thanks</p>	06/16/2016 15:35			
Maureen	Critchley	<p>Please explain the purpose of checking the box that indicates "Yes, add my email address to this project's distribution list." I have NOT received any "distribution-despite checking the box when I've entered new comments." Initially I thought it would allow for distribution of COMMENTS being shared by email with staff team and committees as they were received...but that hasn't happened. Thank you.</p>	06/16/2016 15:32			
James	Dankovich	<p>Regarding last night's parking layouts. (Slide 28, parking option B). If the southernmost portion of the top parking level were removed, there would still be 250 spots (32 more than option A) and space to put an on-grade playground at that location. <input type="checkbox"/> I don't understand why APS staff insists that a playground over structured parking is an acceptable solution. <input type="checkbox"/> What is the cost of the solar panels that the staff wants to add? In my opinion a quality on-grade playground is a higher priority than solar panels. I'd rather see funds diverted from that luxury to modifying the parking solution to allow for an on-grade playground.</p>	06/16/2016 14:43			

Eric	Lanman	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for the hard work and best intentions of all involved. My wife have several <b>concerns over this project that have only been heightened as the process has played out.</b> ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>We have watched and participated in this issue as time and energy levels allowed - but have been largely dismayed and beaten down by the seeming inevitability of APS getting their way in the build of a school at the TJ site and the moving of PHE. ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>We are concerned both as long time APS parents (14 years and counting) and AHCA residents (17 years and counting) that ultimately decisions are being made that will be bad for the neighborhood and sub-optimal for the children attending the neighborhood schools (PHE, TJMS). In fact the only true beneficiary seems to be the county wide Montessori program which will <b>get a better and more central location and facility.</b> ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>We have long understood that the position taken by APS is that the PHE site was not available for expansion or a new PHE building was one largely driven by their desire to preserve the PHE/Career Center complex for other purposes. Interestingly, we now understand this may no longer be the case. Presuming this is true (or even if it's not) - then the hope would be that we could quickly reconsider and find a way to keep the neighborhood school (PHE) in the middle of the neighborhood - with actual playgrounds vice a rooftop activity center.. This would then still allow the build of a smaller footprint county-wide Montessori building (if in fact really needed) at the TJMS site. Alas, our fear - expectation - experience - is that this potentially much better way forward will be ignored by the county unless forced. The bureaucratic tendency will be to continue down the path already on even if it will ultimately make less sense, cost more, and provide more negative impacts to the neighborhood, traffic, and most importantly the students. ☐</p> <p>☐</p>	06/15/2016 18:44			
		<p>It's curious that APS planning was quick to point to the Williamsburg ES site as an example of why co-siting can work and to state the problems with rebuilding or renovating an in place school, and yet didn't discuss the successful model they've used to build three high schools while school remained in session in the old buildings. A model that potentially could be used at various existing elementary school sites such as Patrick Henry in order to expand capacity.</p> <p>Our family's first preference is of course for the decision to build an elementary school at TJ to be reversed and for some smart folks to be found who can make the needed expansion to the PHE site as a neighborhood school. Our second would be for only a small footprint Montessori school to be built at the TJMS site and our third and absolute last and bottom preference would be to for a small footprint PHE to be built at the TJMS site. I recognize that throws out the Lobster design as beyond preference worthy. This is because I've seen the new Williamsburg ES building that I fear is the way the current APS design mind is thinking. It's unbelievably sprawling, extravagant, and totally unsuited for the available footprint and the density of this neighborhood.</p> <p>We've come to this opinion and perspective as part of our continued advocacy for comprehensive planning, transparent government, and good decisions.</p>				
		<p>Our opposition to the current proposal is not coming as residents of an insular neighborhood that prefers to keep the rest of the county distant from the safety of a comfortable and less traveled enclave. This is a neighborhood that is the site of a community center and theater heavily used by residents from all over the county. This is a neighborhood that welcomes the county fair every year as well as other county wide activities and sports. This is a neighborhood that witnesses the use of this great community asset by neighbors of all demographics from all over the county. This is a neighborhood that has been more than willing to consider the expansion of our local elementary school as a part of a solution to address capacity issues and to consider the need for a future upward (not outward) expansion of the middle school itself when and if needed.</p> <p>What we and others in this neighborhood are reticent to do is to lose even a little precious green space as well as to invite additional traffic and child safety issues vice finding ways to encourage even more walkable and bikeable streets. This is a neighborhood that is particularly reticent to do this when other superior solutions are available, other sites better suited, and better more creative ideas not even been explored.</p> <p>We fully understand that any actions taken to address the need for school capacity will have costs and trade-offs associated with them. While we accept these facts and know that there is no universally perfect solution, some ideas are definitely better or worse than others. Unfortunately, the proposal to site an elementary school on the TJMS property definitely falls into the "worse" category and smells of desperation and an insistence on proceeding with a bad plan since a good plan can't be done as quickly...</p> <p>Thank you for your continue time, attention, and hard work on this matter.</p>				
Valynda	Mayes	Please begin addressing the traffic implications! It has been my main concern since destroying the park was taken off the table, yet I have yet to hear how traffic will be addressed. It seems integral to the design phase to explore the impact on the neighborhood at drop-off and pick-up--as well as for the safety of the few children who will be walking.	06/15/2016 17:08			
Maureen	Critchley	Every time I review APS' slides I'm reminded how frustrating it is to deal with them because they are NOT numbered. I know that at one of our early meetings I clearly requested that all slides be numbered. ☐ Please tell me why there seems to be resistance, perhaps stubbornness to NUMBER ALL SLIDES. Thanks.	06/15/2016 15:46			

Matt	Barrone	<p>First, I wanted to thank everyone involved in this process. There are a lot of different stakeholders and it's hard to find a compromise that works for everyone. I wanted to speak up as one of the handful of residents on Arlington Blvd who will now literally have the elementary school in their backyard. If you look at the proposed diagram, my house is the third one as you make the turn from Old Glebe to Arlington Blvd and directly above the R in the diagram which represents the new ES drop-off loop. When I purchased my house, I knew I had the noise of Rt 50 in my front, but also knew I had the tranquility of trees and a quite parking lot in my back. This will now all change with the addition of the school and I have yet to receive a clear understanding of how close the parking lot and school will come to my back property and fence. There are currently beautiful evergreens and magnolia trees that give character and privacy to the area. Are they going to be removed and replaced with concrete? Also, what are we doing about the turn from Old Glebe to the Rt 50 Access Rd. It's a very narrow road and the turn provide little visibility to oncoming traffic, I've witnessed many a close miss to a head-on collision. Have we considered making it one way to allow for better traffic flow? Especially at drop-off and pick-up times when the queue could back up well into a road that is very narrow. I'd welcome any thoughts or feedback from those involved who has insights into my questions.</p>	06/15/2016			
Brian	Meenaghan	<p>I think it is imperative that the traffic and safety issues are resolved on 1st Rd South (speeding, wrong-way driving and bus usage). Additionally, I believe more parking may be necessary than what was discussed in the recent public review session. These issues will be materially impacted by the design of the garage associated with the school. In addition to the garage design, I would like to see the following considered: a fix to the light at 2nd and Glebe to allow smoother outflow at peak times (including church on Sunday), speed bumps on 1st Rd South, additional signage to make sure drivers know alternatives to enter and leave the site (like Old Glebe to 50 east), and full traffic planning for peak usage times.</p> <p>My worry about peak usage goes beyond what was discussed in the public meeting. If both schools release at the same or similar time, there will be an absolute crush of traffic. I also think that max-use times will severely strain the proposed parking facility. The estimates take 10% off the top for car-alternative incentive users which I believe may be unrealistic for snowy/rainy days. I was always told to plan for the worst and hope for the best. In regards to parking, I think the current plan plans for the best and hopes to avoid/ignore the worst-case scenarios.</p>	06/15/2016			
James	Dankovich	<p>Solar panels, like underground parking are not critical to educating our children, but are very expensive. It is probable the cost of the panels will be the same as the cost of underground parking. To me it is better to spend the money on parking and conserve open areas on the ground. Also, you can always buy &amp; install rooftop solar panels later, you cannot dig a garage under an existing building later.</p> <p>Parking is critical to the success of a facility, real open areas are important to the education and lifestyle of our children, solar panels are a luxury.</p>	06/15/2016			
Molly	Calkins	<p>The PFRC and BLPC process for the proposed new school at TJ hurtles forward, frighteningly close to APS deciding it has checked the box for "community engagement" and gone through enough perfunctormotions to justify its plans. In fact, at tomorrow night's joint PFRC/BLPC meeting, (Wednesday, June 15), APS purports to force the PFRC and BLPC to "approve" a concept scheme for presentation to the School Board on July 1. That plan is premature and ill-conceived.</p> <p>Our BLPC delegate Lisa Turcios has been posting good write-ups, along with a number of involved neighbors who attend the meetings and lend their voices to the public comments. I write as AHCA's delegate to the PFRC. It is my duty to describe to my Arlington Heights neighbors what I'm seeing and hearing, including the severe shortfalls of this process and disrespect for our neighborhood.</p> <p>At each meeting about the new elementary school, the PFRC and BLPC members are informed by APS and its Toole (consultant) how the "preferred" building schemes have been further distilled to reflect someone's preferences, and it's neither the PFRC's nor the BLPC's. Neither committee has taken votes – the presented schemes simply get narrower and narrower as we're herded through this parade of foregone conclusions. Here is the presentation from last week's Community Forum: Presentation; and here is the video: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=35xJYbQIwGQ">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=35xJYbQIwGQ</a>. APS is shamelessly steering the PFRC and BLPC toward a concept design that will cost more to operate and is utterly disrespectful to the surrounding neighborhood. The scheme being shoved down our throats has not and should not be approved.</p> <p>At this stage we're asked to consider two schemes, 4.2a and 4.3a, which have been given cutesy names: "Biscuit" and "Lobster." This subliminal appeal to people's appetite for luxury assumes everyone will salivate for lobster over biscuit. Won't be long before some "lobster" scheme advocate asks, "What do YOUR kids deserve -- a lobster or a biscuit?" Show little kids a biscuit and a lobster and most will choose the biscuit and run from the lobster, but of course these schemes are not about kids, or even education.</p> <p>The Colonial and the Claw  These two concepts could as easily be dubbed the "Colonial" and the "Claw." Concept 4.2 is shaped like a colonial home – compact footprint, floors neatly stacked for efficient to heating and cooling. Colonial is the predominant building shape in Arlington because it's practical for our climate. Why not for this school? In contrast, Concept 4.3 claws its way</p>	06/14/2016			

		<p>toward the street and nearby residences, taking up twice as much of the site's acreage and doubling the surface square footage of the building in an unnecessary sprawl not befitting Arlington's limited open space.</p> <p>The Scheme Comparison Chart camouflages problems with the Claw and attempts to mischaracterize its weaknesses as strengths. For example, as set forth in the bottom row, the Claw has a whopping 41,000 square footprint, which is double that of the Colonial (only 20,000 square feet). Not only will that excessive square footage cost more to maintain, but it also reveals just how much unnecessary square footage the Claw grabs.</p> <p>How does APS characterize that difference? "Excellent" for the Claw, and only "fair" for the Colonial, because that excessive square footage means more "Opportunity for solar exposure/panels." That's not just steering – that's grabbing us by the nose, leading us to a pile, and telling us it smells "excellent."</p> <p>The Colonial's more efficient layout requires less energy to heat and cool it in the first place. That is what green design is about – not slapping solar panels on an energy-wasting construct. How much will twice as many solar panels cost up front, and how much will they save in energy costs? The community asked, but APS does not know and has not answered. Bloating the footprint and hat size of a building to make room for more solar panels is putting lipstick on a pig. Or rather, lipstick on a lobster.</p> <p>The Scheme Comparison Chart blatantly steers people toward the Claw in other ways, too. The "General Description" of the Colonial presumes a drop-off lane along Old Glebe, while the Claw would place drop-off inside the parking structure. This is misleading because as the architects explained, many concept features are interchangeable, so the Colonial's drop-off could be placed inside the structure, and the Claw could have drop-off along Old Glebe. Attributing the sheltered drop-off only to the Claw steers the audience toward the sprawling structure.</p> <p>The next row misleadingly describes the schemes in a biased manner too. "Building Height, set back and stacking strategy," says the Colonial has "4 stories along South Old Glebe." What it does not mention is the relatively short stretch of Old Glebe that the Colonial faces compared with the Claw. The Colonial is tucked back much farther north on the very corner of the site, whereas the Claw's pincher reaches way down Old Glebe in front of most of the residences. Building height is therefore a red herring. Or a red lobster?</p>				
		<p>"Pedestrian plaza width between parking structure and TJMS" is stated at 40 feet for the Colonial, and 60 feet for the Claw. Wider is not better. That "plaza" is neither grass, nor play nor picnic area -- it is pavement. Middle School representatives specifically asked the designers to preserve the outdoor recreational space that middle school students currently enjoy on the west side of the existing school building. The proposed concrete plaza will dig up that space and pave it over, leaving middle schoolers to emerge from their building facing the wall of the parking structure. If you haven't lately, I encourage you to visit the site, stand at the northern corner of Second and Old Glebe, look toward the Middle School, and behold the lovely rolling lawns, grand old shade tree, and numerous younger trees where middle school students currently eat lunch and recreate, all of which will be dug up and paved over to make room for the proposed plaza and parking structure. Grass and trees are so much better than pavement. Who disagrees?</p> <p>The Comparison Chart further touts two-sided "Parking Garage Daylight and Ventilation" for the Claw but not the Colonial. Besides the fact it remains unclear why cars would enjoy more air and reading light only in the Claw and not the Colonial, given how interchangeable the architects emphasized the various features are, do students, residents and passersby really want a view of parked cars? Remember, the proposed scheme rises above grade, so instead of grass and trees we'll be looking at concrete with cars inside. And a fence on top to keep kids from falling off the synthetic play area.</p> <p>"Number of Parking Spaces" assigns 3 more spaces to the Claw than the Colonial. This belies the architect's express statement that parking space numbers are estimates and spaces get lost or gained during design and construction process. So the higher number of parking spaces attributed to the Claw is another red herring/lobster.</p> <p>UNANSWERED QUESTIONS Indeed, too many questions remain deliberately unanswered:</p> <p>1. How much higher will the Claw's operating costs be, given its sprawling, inefficient design? Any project needs an operating costs analysis, yet this school design is being hurriedly pushed along with no such analysis. If it were a more efficient design, APS would have touted those stats.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>				

		<p>2. Why can't the Colonial's gym be built at ground level? The designers put the Colonial's gym on the third floor to make that scheme less attractive. The Claw's gym and its outdoor covered play area are just steps away from residents to the west. Those residents will suffer the full brunt of gym noise and spillover. And if there's a public restroom accessible to the outside, as APS has suggested it will include, residents on the west will also be subjected to public restroom traffic. Why must the Claw's gym be located so close to homes, instead of on the east side of the new building (toward the Park)?</p> <p>3. What other events will the sprawling, above-grade parking structure be used for outside school hours? Somehow APS thinks it a selling point that the parking structure can be used for other events when not housing cars. For example, APS suggested bike races or even the Arlington County Fair might be held in the parking structure. Consider the implications for residents. When events such as the Home Show &amp; Garden Expo are currently held at the TJ Site, they are held inside the Community Center, so the community is shielded from the noise and loudspeakers inside the solid brick walls of a building that sits a good distance from homes. When the County Fair is held at TJ, it is on the east side of the Middle School. If the Fair or Expo are held in the new parking structure, that's just steps from numerous homes across Old Glebe. The sprawling parking structure with all those open-air cut-outs that provide reading light for cars will allow all the event noise to spill out into the neighborhood. Currently neighbors might hear kids playing at recess during school hours. In the future neighbors will hear noise from two schools full of kids at recess and after school, plus broadcasts and commotion from events in the sprawling parking structure during non-school hours. Is that really what the community "prefers?"</p> <p>4. Why not place all the new parking spaces under the new school building? Residents have repeatedly asked why all the new parking spaces can't be located under the footprint of the new building, by digging down far enough to eliminate the need to dig up the rolling lawns and trees to build a sprawling concrete structure. APS says it would be too expensive, yet admitted it never performed any such cost analysis. I encourage everyone to watch at least a couple minutes of the video (starting at 1:52:33), for one resident's polite but persistent questions about all-underground parking, and the architect's and APS's unsatisfying response, which include a weak security argument soundly refuted by another resident (video at 2:02:02). Finally APS agreed to get a cost estimate for an all-underground parking structure (video at 2:06:51). APS said obtaining that estimate would not require a large amount of work or money, and that the architects would bring that information to the next meeting or the one after that. Given the community's strong preference to preserve green space by putting the parking structure under the building rather than removing grass and trees to build a sprawling concrete structure that residents will have to see and hear, we look forward to a sound (and not deliberately</p>				
		<p>inflated) cost analysis before APS claims the PFRC and BLPC have approved any concept design.</p> <p>Interloper from the North  During the discussion of potentially placing all the parking under the school footprint, one white-haired man said loudly (but off-microphone) "I don't want to pay for it anyway!" (video at 2:05:00). After the meeting I asked him where he lives. He mumbled "near Tuckahoe, on 24th." Should the views of someone who lives so far north of the proposed school site outweigh those of actual neighbors?  Most insulting slide  Besides discounting our concerns and insulting our intelligence, one slide in the presentation is particularly insulting to our neighborhood. APS and its architects stubbornly refuse to number their slides even though it would make for easier reference, but I refer you to the 15th page of the Community Forum Presentation, titled "Transportation Analysis." It also appears in the video from 31:36 to 33:24. That slide kicked off the Toole presentation that recycles slides and analysis from a 2014 County Board Work Session. (Yes, APS and its Toole use the same traffic slides they've used since 2014).</p> <p>The "Transportation Analysis" slide displays a sidewalk-level photograph of our current neighborhood. It is the only non-aerial photograph in the entire Toole presentation, and since it was an overview slide containing the most bullet points, it was displayed on the screen longer than any of the other slides.</p> <p>Instead of capturing one of the intersections around the proposed school site, or one of the sidewalks adjoining the school, Community Center or Park, this photograph displays the corner of Glebe and Second, with the 7-11. In fact, the 7-11 sign, complete with gas prices, appears right there in the photo. The photographer was standing on the north side of Second Street looking west toward Glebe, with his or her back toward the TJ site. The photographer was not even at the Old Glebe intersection, but halfway down the block toward Glebe. This is one of the ugliest stretches of sidewalk in our neighborhood.</p>				

		<p>As I sat and stared at this photo, I wondered why was it included? Why was this particular photo carefully chosen to represent the neighborhood around the school, even though it's not even adjacent to the school? Why include the 7-11 sign? To assure parents their children can grab a snack or Slurpee on their way to/from school? To assure parents they can grab coffee, gas, beer, wine or cigarettes on their way to or from picking up or dropping off their kids? Did APS or its Toole receive an advertising kickback from the merchant?</p> <p>Most realistically, I think APS and its Toole used this photograph to imply this is a downscale commercial/industrial neighborhood that the shiny new school, with all its traffic, noise and concrete can only improve. They've chosen the wrong neighborhood to disrespect. Our neighborhood already has more schools and public buildings than the surrounding communities combined (count them: TJ Community Center, TJ Middle School, Patrick Henry Elementary, Career Center, Arlington Tech, Fenwick, Columbia Pike Library...), and now APS wants to shoehorn yet another school into our neighborhood, on the already maxed-out TJ site. We must not rubber-stamp their plans.</p> <p>What do you think?</p> <p>Let's hear from everyone about the proposed school schemes and traffic analysis. You can post up to this list serve, email me or Lisa Turcios directly, and/or post your public comments on the PFRC/BLPC site (PFRC NES at Jefferson ). And attend tomorrow night's PFRC/BLPC meeting at TJ Middle School.</p> <p>We have not passed the point of no return on the proposed school. The County pulled the plug on the street car much later in the process than anyone thought possible, and backed down from building this new elementary school at Kenmore, so do not assume this school is a done deal, either. Our elected officials have a duty to listen to the community on these plans, and no design has been officially approved by the School Board or County, let alone by the PFRC or BLPC.</p>				
Maureen	Critchley	<p>As a resident who lives on S Old Glebe Road, I'm wondering what kind of events will APS NOT permit taking place in the NES' parking structure? (examples - flea markets, Master garden shows auto shows, and shows that have sometimes taken place in the TJCC such as home shows, antique shows.) ☐  <b>And while we're on the topic, what kinds of events does APS envision would be permitted?</b>☐          Thanks</p>	06/12/2016 11:35	<p>APS could envision many uses taking place in the parking structure including county fair activities or support, farmer's market, etc. The subject event would have to lend itself to the level of overnight security available in the garage and would have to be appropriate to the space height restrictions and proximity to the neighborhood and school, of course. It is difficult to say at this time what events would not be permitted, that would have to be reviewed on a case by case basis, with impact on the neighborhood and schools among the considerations</p>	06/14/2016	APS
Maureen	Critchley	<p>I understand the AC transportation commission feels that hawk lights are sometimes just as effective as traffic lights, and that I wonder if APS' consultants agree? ☐          I also wonder whether hawk lights may be used at "high volume" intersections that students use enroute to &amp; from TJMS &amp; NES that don't have APS crossing guards? If so, please mention which intersections might become less dangerous if hawk lights were installed?☐          Thank you.</p>	06/12/2016 11:28	<p>HAWK beacons can be a very effective means of increasing driver yielding at marked crosswalks. They are particularly appropriate for multi-lane, high-volume, and/or high-speed roadways where crossing pedestrians have difficulty finding gaps in traffic. The conditions at a crosswalk must meet certain thresholds in order for a HAWK beacon to be "warranted." These thresholds are based on a combination of factors, including motor vehicle speeds, motor vehicle volumes, and pedestrian volumes, and that must be determined by an engineering study. In collaboration with Arlington County, Toole Design Group has been exploring the potential need for HAWK beacons and other safety features around the TJ campus. Decisions about off-site transportation improvements will be made with committee/community input during the Schematic Design phase of the project.</p>	06/14/2016	TOOLE

Melissa	Leupp	<p>I am writing with feedback regarding the design of the new elementary school. As the parent of a future Patrick Henry student, I attended the public meeting on June 8. My concerns arise, however, based on my 17 years as an APS early childhood/elementary school educator and occupational therapist. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>It is my understanding that "the biscuit" has the gym and music on the third and fourth floors of the school along with upper grade levels. The Biscuit also has the smallest footprint. Providing quality instruction with the gym and music in such close proximity to classrooms would be challenging and frustrating for teachers and staff. Today's students need fewer distractions not more. They also need time when they can move and interact. Gymnasiums are also potential sites for assemblies and other wonderful but noise-generating events. There is a reason that most schools have gyms located away from learning environments. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>My second concern with the gym location is security. Gyms are frequently used after hours and on weekends. Having the gym on the third floor provides access to more of the school for much longer periods of time without staff members present. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>My final concern is related to accessibility. Henry currently has at least three county-wide special education classes. These programs have students with various disabilities. With the Biscuit's small footprint, a limited number of classrooms are located on each floor. My understanding is that preschool or kindergarten classes would be on the first floor. The county-wide programs may need to be on or near the first floor for students with limited mobility. It is prudent to think about emergencies and how young students can exit in a safe, efficient manner among a group of 725.</p>	06/11/2016 22:59	Comments Noted. Similar comments have been noted during BLPC, PFRC, and public meetings. The design team is working to address these issues in future schemes.	06/14/2016	APS
Lisa	Turcios	<p>Forwarding from Arlington Heights Civic Association member (7th St S) □</p> <p>□</p> <p>we emailed a while back, I'm an AHCA member and resident and parent of two (that will go to the new school). □</p> <p>□</p> <p>I had meant to send feedback on the parking, too, but then that architect that is an AH resident as well, had send in a long letter with seemingly valid concerns and questions, and I thought we'd be hearing back on a response first - now I can't figure out what happened! □</p> <p>Including what happened to the parking! □</p> <p>□</p> <p>My quick feedback on parking: □</p> <p>-Bus loop to the north (closest to 50) is by far the best to keep buses away from the neighborhood and all the walkers. (Also idling buses are awful.) □</p> <p>-in the side profile almost all the parking was almost completely ABOVE ground - AWFUL mistake. □</p> <p>Do not budge on this - the parking must be underground. And it should be completely underground- in the side profile it looked like the partially underground parking was only partial on one end but completely above ground on the other end. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>- the newest schemes are all only 4 story options!!!?? Really? Wow! □</p> <p>The biscuit is awful! □</p> <p>I like the lobster!! The school needs a bigger footprint and it needs outdoor spaces all around, like Discovery!!! □</p> <p>□</p> <p>- Tell the committee to look to Discovery for the ideal elementary school design and function, and look to the currently in progress HB Woodlawn construction for absolutely stunning ways in making the most of space options working with rooftops!! □</p> <p>They are a little ahead in the design process and it looks amazing! □</p> <p>Accept no less for our kids in this neighborhood! □</p> <p>□</p> <p>Also: Some of the options in the presentations are not always well enough labeled by APS to really follow and understand completely (for the person who could not attend)! □</p> <p>□</p> <p>Things are moving fast (as they should): it's so easy to miss the boat on comments when you, the committee members, need</p>	06/07/2016 4:44	Comments Noted.	06/14/2016	APS
Maureen	Critchley	<p>I heard someone say that the PFRC is moving along at a rapid pace, and will soon be voting on which architectural concept APS should accept. Does anyone else think we need to SPEND MORE THAN A FEW MINUTES DISCUSSING AND UNDERSTANDING the COSTS of the various concepts under consideration before we're asked which scheme we think is best?</p>	06/06/2016 21:45	The concepts schemes offered to date will generally be similar in cost for the building and site amenities. The largest driver of cost is the parking. As has been noted at previous BLPC/PFRC meetings, underground parking is more expensive in cost than surface parking. Order of magnitude cost per space for underground vs surface parking have been communicated to the Committees. In general, it has been noted that the further down the parking deck is excavated the more expensive the construction becomes.	06/14/2016	APS
Melissa	Williams	<p>Hello -- □</p> <p>□</p> <p>I'm very concerned about the estimation on parking figures. In the summer, South Irving Street and Second Street South are regularly chock a block with parked cars of people using the community center and fields. Estimating usage downward doesn't map to our local experience on this issue.</p>	06/06/2016 17:17	Comments Noted	06/14/2016	APS

Maureen	Critchley	It will be helpful to know what kinds of activities are likely to take place "afterhours", and what will the evening & weekend hours be for afterhours activities in the NES' gym?	06/06/2016 17:10	It is not yet known exactly what after hours use will be, but given the history of after hours use at APS schools, it will likely be extensive. Using Discovery ES as an example, there is Parks & Rec use of the gym for league and recreational play after hours and weekends, and throughout the building in the summer for camps, the school has an Extended Day program, and PTA meetings occur regularly in the library. Summer school may occasionally occur in the building. The buildings are a community amenity and APS encourages after hours usage.	06/14/2016	APS
Carlisle	Levine	I am most concerned that the new elementary school's design takes into consideration separating elementary school students from middle schoolers, since middle schoolers are so much bigger and are going through transitions that elementary school students shouldn't have to deal with. Also, please take into consideration traffic and safety for the elementary school students. Already, we have had incidents where the middle schoolers have been hit by cars on the way to school. Thanks!	06/06/2016 9:44	Comments Noted.	06/14/2016	APS
Bruce	Boyd	<p>Many thanks for all your are doing regarding the new elementary school at TJ.</p> <p>I have attended the meetings the past two weeks(June 1 and June 8).</p> <p>I have a concern, and my concern is that it appears the agenda for the June 15 PFRC meeting does not include any consideration or discussion of traffic. More specifically, there appears to be no consideration of traffic at two intersections: (1) South Old Glebe Road and 2nd Street South, and (2) South Old Glebe Road and the 3600 block of 1st Road South..</p> <p>At both of the recent meetings, a woman spoke about data she and her firm had gathered regarding traffic. As best I recall, her data seemed to indicate that any increase in traffic as a result of the new elementary school would be at times different from the current drop-off and pick-up times for the middle school. It seemed to me that her main point was that the neighborhood could expect some increase in traffic, but that instead of the current situation in which there are two "peak times" (drop off for TJ in the morning and pick-up from TJ in the afternoon), there would be four "peak times" with the addition of a new elementary school (drop off for TJ in the morning, drop off for elementary school later in the morning, pick-up from TJ in the afternoon, and pick-up from elementary school later in the afternoon).</p> <p>This woman (whose name I cannot recall) acknowledged that there was concern about the intersections at Old Glebe Road and 2nd Street South and at Old Glebe Road and 1st Road South, but she did not indicate (as best I recall it) what recommendations or even what plans she or her firm had in mind. It seemed to me that she was most concerned about getting to consensus around whether there would be "shared" parking or "non-shared" parking. She seemed most concerned about this issue since it impacted the number of parking spaces that would need to be built.</p> <p>During the public comment portion of the June 1 PFRC Meeting, I mentioned my concern about the increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic at Old Glebe Road and 2nd Street South, and I expressed my hope that the PFRC would be looking at the issues concerning that intersection. I left that meeting feeling pretty sure that the PFRC had been - and would continue - looking at the issues concerning that intersection.</p> <p>At the June 8 meeting, I mentioned my concerns (concerns that were also echoed by another resident of the 3600 block of 1st Road South who attended the June 8 meeting) that there are speeders along the 3600 block of 1st Road South, and that there are people who drive the wrong way down this block (this block is a one-way street, with legal traffic going east-bound from Glebe Road to Old Glebe Road). I also voiced my concern about the intersection at Old Glebe Road and 1st Road South. The only take-away I received from the June 8 meeting was the name and phone number of a person I could call if I observed Arlington County School Busses using the 3600 block of 1st Road South.</p> <p>Yesterday, I stood along my block (the 3600 block of 1st Road South) between about 2:15 and 2:35 pm. I noticed several cars speeding from Glebe Road to Old Glebe Road. More frighteningly, I noticed at least two cars who failed to stop at the stop sign where the 3600 block of 1st Road South intersects South Old Glebe Road. One of the drivers who failed to stop at the stop sign crossed South Old Glebe Road and entered the TJ parking lot.</p> <p>People along the 3600 block of 1st Road South have recently shared pictures and reports of people speeding and going the wrong way down our block. I am very concerned that people who speed along our block are likely to be in such a hurry that they will fail to come to a complete stop at South Old Glebe Road. That, of course, could result in a very serious accident.</p> <p>My larger point is this: With the increase in traffic (both pedestrian and vehicles), and with the increase in elementary-age children who will be attending a new elementary school at TJ, I think it is vital that the PFRC devote attention to the traffic at the two intersections I mention above. I am very concerned that the agenda for the June 15 appears to give no attention to traffic at all.</p> <p>I should add that the Arlington County Police Department has stepped up its efforts to enforce the traffic laws along the 3600 block of 1st Road South, and I am grateful for that.</p>	06/10/2016	<p>Thank you for your input and questions related to traffic and the APS/Thomas Jefferson project. APS's transportation consultant, Toole Design Group, has a thorough traffic analysis underway that uses modeling software to analyze traffic around the school site related to the middle school and future, new elementary school. That analysis includes a close look at Old South Glebe and, in particular, the intersections of Old South Glebe with 1st Road South and 2nd Street South. Although these issues are critical to the success of this project, they are not required as part of the first project milestone: the concept plan submittal to the School Board. For this reason, we anticipate presenting the results of the traffic analysis at a late July or early August meetings of the BLPC/PFRC (exact schedule is still being finalized with APS).</p> <p>Advancing in coordination with the traffic analysis is a careful consideration, in partnership with Arlington County transportation staff, of off-site infrastructure or operational improvements to nearby streets that could improve traffic conditions, bicycle and pedestrian safety/access, speeding, and other issues occurring nearby and related to transportation. Some recommendations that are adjacent to the school site and directly associated with the school project may be advanced as part of the APS project (i.e. on a similar timeline and through a parallel budget process), while others may be longer-term projects that are recommended for future implementation by Arlington County. These off-site recommendations will also be presented for discussion and consideration by the community at a late July/early August meetings of the BLPC/PFRC.</p> <p>We have made note of your input and concerns related to 1st Road South and South Old Glebe Road and will certainly consider this as the project advances, with the goal of working the County to address traffic concerns like this one. Thank you for taking the time to participate in this important project.</p>	06/14/2016	TOOLE