

19 February 2016

MEETING NOTES

RE: BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING COMMITTEE #20
STRATFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA
31406600



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

Meeting Date & Time: 1 February 2016, 7:00-9:00 PM
Location: H-B Woodlawn Library

Attendees:

BLPC

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

APS Staff

John Chadwick -- Assistant Superintendent
Ben Burgin – Acting Director, Design & Construction
Bill Herring – Project Manager, Design & Construction (Project Point of Contact)
Deb DeFranco – Physical Education Instructional Supervisor

Design Team

Dan Curry – Quinn Evans Architects
Atara Margolies – Quinn Evans Architects

CMAr Team

Ross Miles – Preconstruction Manager, Turner
Adriana Nino – Senior Project Manager, Turner

Public

Richard Giza, neighbor

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

WWW.QUINNEVANS.COM

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

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



1. INTRODUCTION

- a. John Chadwick (APS) reported that the Superintendent and the County Manager have been discussing the “driveway” vs “no driveway” options. The County Manager would like to “reset” the conversation. As stated previously, the design team is proceeding with the driveway in the scope since it is the most stringent option.

2. REVIEW OF SCHEDULE AND MEETINGS

- a. Dan Curry (QEA) reviewed the schedule and recent meetings.
- b. Dan stated that since the previous BLPC/PFRC was cut short due to bad weather, the design team would present the material that was not presented on 1/20 and then recap any site information the BLPC wanted to discuss.

3. BUILDING DESIGN UPDATE

- a. Dan Curry (QEA) reviewed the intent of the draft Design Guidelines in terms of historic materials present in the existing building and suggested precedent materials for the new addition.
- b. Dan described proposed new materials for the addition which currently include copper panels, channel glass, metal panels, terracotta, brick, and ashlar stone.
- c. Dan also reviewed various historically significant architectural features of the existing building such as the iconic central stair tower.
- d. The design team studied the fenestration of the existing building in terms of opening size, opening proportion and pattern of window grouping to design the windows proposed for the new addition.
- e. Two options were presented for exterior cladding of the new addition:
 - i. Option A: Dark brick (manganese ironspot) base for Level 1. Levels 2 and 3 clad with pre-patina copper panels. Auxiliary gym on a base that is a visible plinth above the ground plane with channel glass above. Heart-of-school “hyphen” to be glass curtainwall.
 - ii. Option B: Ashlar stone base for Level 1 similar to existing stone at Level 1 south façade adjacent to new addition. Levels 2 and 3 clad at north and south facades with sand-colored terracotta panels or brick; west façade with metal panel cladding. Auxiliary gym to be channel glass that meets the grade at the exterior with no visible base. Heart-of-school “hyphen” to be glass curtainwall.
- f. Several members of the BLPC asked for clarification about channel glass. Questions included:
 - i. Can it be transparent in places so those walking by can see into the auxiliary gym?
 - ii. Would the “glow” at night disturb the neighbors?
- g. Atara Margolies (QEA) reviewed a study of opportunities for restroom(s) to be located in the new addition with exterior access provided for DPR Park users.
 - i. Relocating the planned restrooms for the addition to a location along the exterior uses valuable space with daylight that is better suited for classroom space.
 - ii. Shared restrooms with access both to exterior and interior may present access problems. APS did do this at Discovery Elementary.



- iii. Design team identified two potential locations for single restrooms that would be accessible from the exterior:
 - 1. Option 1: Adjacent to the mechanical room serving auxiliary gym. Would be at-grade entrance at parking lot level just south of the Park. This restroom would not be accessible from the school addition interior.
 - 2. Option 2: Adjacent to the existing cafeteria in one of the spaces currently used for cafeteria storage/receiving. Access from the exterior would be provided. Connecting to existing sanitary service in this location would be more difficult than in the new addition.
- iv. If a restroom was to be provided that served the park, APS would ask that it be funded from the joint fund.
- h. Atara reviewed the scenarios for improving the accessible path to the west elevator. The option to replace the existing cab with two sets of doors that open at opposite sides of the cab and demo/replace the existing electrical closet at the first floor is being explored and will be included in the SD pricing exercise.

4. SITE DESIGN RECAP

- a. Atara Margolies (QEA) reviewed the fire access requirements at the site and summarized what the design team and APS have discussed thus far with the County and the Fire Chief's staff. The team will continue to update the BLPC as this issue progresses. Several locations for driveable fire lane access are under consideration including at the north entrance across the grass, in the existing courtyard and south of the new addition frontage.
- b. Tree impact as presented at the last meeting was reviewed as well.
 - i. Question: could existing trees that are removed be reused on site somehow, or in the building?
 - ii. Turner team members present responded that all removed trees will be recycled and there may be opportunities to reuse them either for this project or for another project. Sometimes the schedule does not allow for the time it takes for the tree material to be ready for reuse (as mulch, for example).
- c. BLPC members asked that the design team study and report back to the group what size field could fit that would lessen the tree impact along the south of the field.
- d. Comment was raised about screen for the dumpster at the loading dock to improve the pedestrian experience at that entrance to the building.
- e. Ross Miles (Turner) reviewed the construction access diagrams that were presented at the previous meeting.

5. DISCUSSION

- a. John Chadwick (APS) reviewed the alternate phasing plan that was discussed with the School Board at the January 5th CIP School Board work session.
 - i. Original phasing was to start construction in June 2017 and complete in June 2019. APS does not need 2 years to complete the project, so construction has been shortened to a 14 month schedule.
 - ii. Alternate phasing plan would begin construction in June 2019. Renovation of existing building would take place in summer 2019 and in fall of 2019 school would open as a neighborhood MS for 6th and 7th grade only. Construction of the new addition would be from fall 2019-summer of 2020 with some additional renovation taking place in summer 2020. School would open in fall 2020 for full 1,000 students including 8th grade.
 - iii. Parents of 8th graders for the school year of 2020/2021 would have the option of allowing their students to remain in their existing MS, or to transfer to the new MS for 8th grade.



- b. APS identified several factors for considering this alternate phasing plan:
 - i. APS sees the benefit of only relocating the Stratford program once and does not want to expose the students in that program to construction. They would also prefer that the program remain co-located with H-B as there is a relationship between the two programs. Thus, Stratford program will only be moved out of the existing space when the space in the new Wilson building is complete (targeted for spring/summer of 2019).
 - ii. APS currently has three major construction projects scheduled to be completed in 2019 and that will be a challenge.
 - iii. There are financial challenges in terms of accessing the cash available from the bond funding for all three construction projects. Pushing one project out would alleviate the pressure.
 - iv. By offering a phased opening of the new neighborhood MS, APS is addressing some parents concerns about continuity of student support and instructional programming by allowing 8th graders to complete middle school in the building where they attended for 6th and 7th grade.
- c. Delaying the Stratford project as described would add costs due to escalation. These costs would not be included in the current project budget.
- d. Question: if Wilson completion is delayed, how would that impact this project?
 - i. John answered that there is some space already built into the Wilson schedule to allow for a few months delay that would not impact the alternate Stratford phasing plan. APS will have contingency plans in place.
- e. BLPC members expressed that some parents would likely support their students to transfer to the new school in 8th grade, while some would rather leave their student in the current MS; it will vary by family/student.
- f. Question was asked about the process re: alternative phasing plan, and in response to questions, APS stated that there will not be relocatables in the scenario where the school opens in 2019 for 6th and 7th grade. The existing building will be able to handle that capacity of students without any relocatables.
- g. Where would relocatables go in the future after the addition is complete? APS indicated in such a scenario they would likely use the parking lot before any other space on site.

6. NEXT STEPS

- a. Next BLPC is 2/22 – 7 pm at HB Woodlawn.

END OF MEETING NOTES