

MEETING SUMMARY

Career Center Working Group

Meeting No. 5

Date: March 10, 2018

Location: Arlington Career Center

Participants: Kathleen McSweeney (KMc), CCWG Chair
Matt Mattauszek (MM), ACG
Sarah Johnson (SJ), APS
Michael DePalma (MD), APS
Derk Jeffrey (DJ), Stantec
Alisa Cowen, Career Center Advisory Group
Betty Siegel (FBC AWG)
Cecilia Ciepela-Kaelin, Budget Advisory Council (BAC)
Christine Ng, Environment and Energy Conservation Commission
Cindy Krech, JFAC
Colleen Pickford, Advisory Council on School Facilities & Capital Programs (FAC)
Elizabeth Gearin, Planning Commission (PC)
Fikru Abebe, Ethiopian Community Development Council
Greg Greeley, Joint Facilities Advisory Commission (JFAC)
Jim Lantelme, Public Facilities Review Committee (PFRC)
Kia Haynes, Arlington Montessori Action Committee (AMAC)
Kim Phillip, Black Heritage Museum of Arlington VA (BHM)
Kristi Sawert, Arlington Heights Civic Association
Kristin Calkins, Transportation Commission
Lander Allin, Pike Presidents' Group (PPG)
Lida Anestidou, At-Large Member
Maura McMahon, Alcova Heights Civic Association
Megan Haydasz, At-Large Member
Michael Shea, Advisory Council on Instruction (ACI)
Nancy Birnbaum, Arlington Tech Advisory Committee (ATAC)
Pete Durgan, Penrose Civic Association
Polly Hall, Washington-Lee HS PTA member/parent of student attending programs at Career Center
Rafael Gould, Student Advisory Board
Sarah McKinley, Columbia Heights Civic Association
Susan Rochard, Arlington Tech Parent Group

1. WELCOME/INTRO

- KMc welcomed the group. She asked that all pick up name tags and information packets.

2. OVERVIEW OF CCWG CHARGE

- Similar to last meeting, KMc began with a review of the CCWG charge. She mentioned the full charge is included in the information packets and posted online.
- KMc reviewed several slides that highlighted specific language from the charge related to optimizing future development; buildings, open space, traffic/circulation, etc., and development beyond 2022.
- Slides were shown that illustrated schedule and next steps, including goals of March CCWG meetings.
- A "What Follows?" slide explained the BLPC and PFRC process to begin in the fall of 2018.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

- KMc explained every opportunity is being made to accommodate public comments. Therefore, 10 min. of meeting time is being set aside at the beginning of each future CCWG meeting for this purpose.
- SJ explained that if a community member wishes to provide comment after the 10-min window has expired, comments may be written and submitted on index cards or posted online.

Comment: Terry from Penrose:

- Concerned about lack of student parking being planned, traffic on Walter Reed. Also, potential issues with lighting, noise and synthetic field concerns.

Comment: Tatyana, Arlington Heights

- Thanked CCWG members for volunteering
- Encouraged all to create an “amazing” high school. Do something all can be proud of.

4. STAFF REPOSES TO QUESTIONS

- SJ says APS/ACG responses to CCWG comments and questions are being vetted through many sources to ensure accuracy.
- All CCGW Qs and As will be posted by the next meeting (March 19, 2018)

5. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF FEEDBACK FROM POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

Question 4: What building heights limited to along Highland or 7th?

- 2 stories on Highland or 7th. Stepped down if possible. 3 stories OK near 9th street
- Limiting everything to what is allowable for residential district.
- Up to 3 stories, in scale with residential. Traffic along 9th or WRD
- Neighbors on Highland wish that 25’ setback would be honored.

Question 5: Which portions suited for playground, field space?

- Young kids toward 7th street, 1/3 for fields, 1/3 for Career Center Building.
- Playgrounds away from Pike, field space on roofs?
- Confused about specific playground program...7th and Highland is preferred for playground.
- If eliminate PHES, could locate big field along Highland and playground along WRD
- All fields community oriented
- Emphasize community facilities at TJ. If PHES moves, playground must go with it. Open to rooftop play facilities. TP playground needs to be considered as part of CC expansion

Question 6: Should vehicular access to restricted to WRD? If not, where else?

- No. Highland could also support. 9th street should be bus drop off. Main entrance convenient to parking.
- County should buy property east of ECDC to create new road from Columbia Pike to 9th street to create new bus loop. All traffic on WRD seems problematic.
- No. 9th street and 7th at WRD also possible. Just avoid S. Highland St.
- No. Rather, buses come up 9th thru Highland. Narrow WRD, keep bike lane.
- Yes. Restrict to WRD. Buses on 9th street. Do not impose on 7th or Highland.

6. PRESENTATION 1: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

- Slide that reviewed policies and principles to assist with priorities
- Street network map illustrated surrounding areas, zones of density and volumes of traffic
- Transit network map in area of Columbia Pike also discussed.
- Images of street views...plan enough space for sidewalks, etc. trees, utilities, etc.
- Planning, design and construction timeline. BLPC/PFRC process drill into details of transportation planning
- Key considerations: Reduce the conflicts. Provide safe areas between cars and pedestrians.
- Reduces issues of all traffic and entries along one street. WRD may not be best for buses, for example.

- Spread out the time things occur...avoid rush of traffic.

Questions:

- No bike lane on 7th?
 - Answer: In process of updating bike element of masterplan.
- What % of teachers bike or use public transit?
 - Answer: To be answered in detailed phase. Student/teacher surveys used to provide such data
- Missing sidewalk links—seem to require property owner buy-in which can be difficult. Many times, the off-site improvements receive lower priority
- Safe routes to schools/sidewalks. Still some missing links. Plans don't address a cut-through to the Career Center site. How can internal site connections be used to support appropriate movement between all points of access?
- What can be done to improve use of public transit to support teachers and students?
- Any change in composition in data in terms of how teachers and students get to school?
- Street classification of WRD? Any possibility of changing that?
- Would WRD remain an artery? If walkable, is that a conflict with traffic?
 - Answer: not either/or. An artery can be walkable.
- Existing condition map shows some unbuilt roads: explain?
 - Answer: Blue hatched area shows master plan overlay that suggest how blocks may be developed over time. Arlington likes to break down "super blocks."
- Nancy Van Doren addressed the CCWG: Board liaison to county to improve transportation. This school site are leaders in multi-modal transportation. Students and teachers here are already practicing best habits for TDM. This neighborhood already ahead.

Question:

- Andy in Penrose: ways to calm the traffic and improve safety.
- Pedestrian improvements along WRD?
 - Answer: In process by county.
- Terry from Penrose: County narrowed 2nd street to 50.

BREAK:

7. PRESENTATION: WALK ZONE DEVELOPMENT

- Finding the sweet spot of what's achievable in terms of avoiding congestion.
- Data and background: 2016 APSGO survey.
- Goal is to move towards more multi-modal forms of transportation.
- MS/HS students have a 1.5mi. walkability zone, meaning bus service not provided.
- As bus ridership increases, walking decreases.
- Survey looked at grades 6-10, 9-10, and 11-12th.
- Walk zone working group studying proposed walk zones throughout the county.

Questions:

- Possible to have more crossing guards in morning?
- For 1.5 mi. walk zone, any projections of how many students will be within walking distance of career center by 2022?
- Concerns expressed about the number of parking spaces for students given the number of internships being offered through Arlington Tech.
- Also, high number of students who work to support themselves and their families need to drive and have parking space.
- Number of potential walkers in 2017: request that numbers be reviewed by staff. Seems low.

8. PRESENTATION 3: OPEN SPACE, PARKS

- POPs overview, Public Spaces Masterplan planning framework discussed
- Process and timeline slides presented.

- POPS Advisory committee membership acknowledged.
- Draft report completed in summer 2017
- Population-based level of service. Reflects use trends based on survey data.
- Also, level of service evaluated in terms of access: walking, biking, driving, transit.
- Final slide offered many considerations for the CCWG.

Questions:

- Neighborhood sentiment is open to sharing of practice fields more than a stadium.
- DPR perspective on building fields on rooftops?
- Multi-use fields (softball on soccer, for example) is a DPR preference.
- Football: Consider that football may disappear, so best not to emphasize a stadium.
- Flag football is on the rise nationally.
- Football fields are already multi-sport (field hockey, soccer, lacrosse)

9. DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- 2-page attachment included in packet regarding design principles. KMc emphasized the importance of capturing and creating a list of principles to reflect CCWG concerns.

10. WRAP UP

- MM informed the CCWG of a new use permit application submitted by APS for this summer's planned internal renovations to accommodate the initial expansion of 150 students on the site. MM indicated this application would be considered by the County Board in May of this year.

- NEXT MEETING: March 19, 2018, 7-10PM

END OF MEETING SUMMARY
