

**Public Facilities Review Committee
McKinley Elementary School Expansion
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, January 22, 2014**

Attendees

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

Public Comment:

There were no public comments.

Sustainability

HCM provided an update on opportunities for sustainability on the site. Some of the opportunities include outdoor classrooms, taking advantage of the site's topography for development, safe routes to school for walking and bicycling, rainwater management, and renewable energy opportunities. The full presentation can be found at:

<http://www.apsva.us/cms/lib2/VA01000586/Centricity/Domain/105/PFRC%20-%202005%20-%2020140122.pdf>.

Joan Kelsch of DES gave the staff response, stating that the project is going in the right direction in terms of sustainability. She also raised the point that it is more difficult to achieve energy efficiency with an addition because the older parts of the building are not as efficient. Scott Prisco of APS noted that HCM was selected in

part because sustainable development is an integrated part of their approach to designing buildings.

Some of the comments related to the sustainability presentation included:

- Will the indoor air quality be impacted by construction?
 - Construction will be separated from any part of the school that is occupied.
 - There will also be a comprehensive evaluation of the existing condition before any construction takes place
- In order to minimize disturbance, consider designing the addition to the south to be able to support a second story.
- Are bicycle locker room/shower required by code?
 - School staff has requested them
 - Could potentially be cut

Concept Design Update

HCM presented an updated concept design 3c, which was the consensus option selected by PFRC and BLPC. There continues to be a 3d, which would retain the existing pentagon structure instead of tearing it down and replacing it with a small addition in the same location. APS is recommending that the School Board increase the budget to allow for the demolition and reconstruction of the Pentagon addition.

Some of the comments related to the concept design update included:

- How much of the play field (that existed before the addition of the relocatable classrooms) will be impacted by the proposed addition to the northeast?
 - Potential for some impact, up to approximately 12 feet
- Does the addition to the south change the impact to the neighbors to the south and west?
 - The proposed addition is set back farther from the western property line
 - There would be less impervious surface with the proposed addition.
- Is there the budget for option 3c?
 - APS and HCM continue to refine the cost estimates for the addition and expressed the intention to be on budget by the time the concept design is submitted to the School Board.
 - Costs have already been reduced because the retaining walls needed for the entire addition to be located in the south have been removed and the overall square footage for the addition has been reduced because of the double loaded corridor on the lowest level of the NE addition.
- Has there been discussion about making the pentagon replacement addition two stories?
 - Two stories is doable, but the cost is disproportionate to the benefit of an additional four classrooms. The vertical circulation (two fire stairs

and an elevator) would add a significant amount of square footage to the relatively small addition.

- HCM is reviewing making the addition capable of supporting a second story; will be cost dependant.

Civil Engineering Update

The new stormwater management regulations will be in effect as of July 2014; the site is being designed to meet the new, more strict standards. Rain gardens will be provided to treat new impervious areas, and will address water quality (a design capacity of ½ inch is planned for the rain gardens). Also proposed is a pipe underneath the play field (200 feet long by 60 inches wide) to provide water detention on site. This pipe is proposed to be steel.

Some of the comments related to the civil engineering update included:

- Will the new rain gardens be maintained?
 - The current rain garden has plants that die frequently.
 - APS does not have a groundkeeper currently.
 - Rain garden plants are designed to be neglected (it is possible that the current rain gardens were not planted with the correct plant types).
 - APS will be required by condition to maintain the plants.
- Will there be pervious paving materials used in the new parking area?
 - APS will consider pervious paving; cost and maintenance is a concern.
- It was suggested that no new parking be provided in order to limit disturbance and new pavement.
- The new parking area does not appear to have any trees proposed between the end and McKinley Road. Can there be a buffer between the sidewalk and the parking area?
- Sidewalk gets covered with leaves, can be a hazard during wet weather.
- Could evergreens be used to screen the parking area instead of deciduous trees?
 - Maybe, but there are other considerations.
- Pervious pavement reduces runoff, could call for a smaller rain garden.
 - The proposed rain garden will be sized according to the drainage area.

Tree Update

The preliminary tree survey was presented. The consultant has looked at the existing trees, those that will be impacted by the addition, those that will be saved, and potential areas for adding new trees. The number of new trees that will be planted is greater than the number of trees that will be removed. The trees are evaluated based on species, age, condition, and what they contribute to the site. The tree in the courtyard adjacent to the pentagon addition is a silver maple tree that is reaching the end of its useful life. Also evaluated is the percentage of the root system that will be impacted and whether the tree would survive construction. Most of the root system

is in the top 12” of soil. The priority 2 red oak tree in the parking area may be impacted by construction.

Some of the comments related to the tree update included:

- Prefer to preserve trees over providing new parking
- The neighborhood would like the teachers to have more parking
- Concern about teachers carrying heavy loads, particularly pregnant women if adequate parking is not provided on site.
- How high will the retaining wall proposed for the parking area be?
 - Approximately 6 feet.
- Why are 2 trees adjacent to McKinley on the north side of the driveway identified as being removed?
 - The trees could potentially be impacted by creating two new barrier free access points from McKinley Road to the school.
- Requested a listing of the number and species of the trees proposed to be removed (available in the presentation:
<http://www.apsva.us/cms/lib2/VA01000586/Centricity/Domain/105/PFRC%20-%2005%20-%20140122.pdf>).
- How much piping will be needed to manage stormwater and will there be construction impacts for adding pipes?
 - There are existing pipes on site; they are being studied.
- Trees to be preserved will be protected by a fence during construction.
- There are ways to work around the critical root zone of trees in order to protect them.
- The construction site will be monitored by Arlington County staff in order to ensure that the trees are protected as required.
- What kind of management goes into making sure that the trees are protected?
 - APS construction managers monitor the site
 - Fences are installed and verified before construction starts
 - There is a tree protection bond
- A concern was raised about the number of trees that were cut down during the installation of relocatable classrooms at schools around the county.
- How to prevent a similar situation to Ashlawn happening at McKinley?
 - Scott Prisco responded with lessons learned from Ashlawn
 - There is an arborist involved much earlier in the process
 - The potential impacts to trees from construction are very conservative, showing any tree that could potentially be impacted. The hope is to remove fewer trees than shown.
 - Better communication between APS and the community
 - Final construction documents will be presented to BLPC and PFRC
- When are the final plantings determined?
 - Starts at the schematic design phase, ends at construction documents

- The urban forestry master plan gives guidance on priority species. The school site is an excellent opportunity for larger trees.

Final comments:

Members of the PFRC summarized their final comments about the concept design. Most were generally pleased with the concept, citing the larger setback from McKinley Road, the continued sensitivity to the neighborhood, the play area preserved on the south side of the site, and the two new pedestrian access points from McKinley. Areas identified for further discussion include focus on goals in adopted plans such as the community energy and urban forestry plans, drainage continues to be a concern, providing locker rooms and showers are important if parking is going to be reduced, and the entrance needs more definition.

Next Steps

The next steps in the process include:

- January 28, 2014 – BLPC
- February 6, 2014—School Board information item on final concept plan
- February 11, 2014—BLPC
- February 19, 2014—PFRC
- February 20, 2014—School Board action on final concept plan

The meeting adjourned at 9:30pm.