

# Inlet View Elementary School Replacement



## Ongoing Record of Project Responses & Comments

**COMMENTS RECEIVED  
BEFORE THE OCT. 9TH, 2021  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**SECTION 1:**

**PAGE 2**

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS  
FROM THE OCT. 9TH, 2021  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**SECTION 2:**

**PAGE 12**

**COMMENTS VIA CHAT  
FROM THE OCT. 9TH, 2021  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**SECTION 3:**

**PAGE 19**

**COMMENTS RECEIVED  
AFTER THE OCT. 9TH, 2021  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**SECTION 4:**

**PAGE 21**



**Anchorage School District**  
*Educating All Students for Success in Life*

# COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE SPECIAL MEETING

These comments were used to develop the project briefing document that was distributed for the October 9th SACC Special Meeting.

At the September 23rd South Addition Community Council (SACC) meeting, community members were invited to provide comments and questions. The questions were directly used to develop the questions and answers in the briefing document. The comments also shaped the briefing document, and are included here to act as a record. They are provided with responses.

We encourage people to review the briefing and question/answer document which is available at the following website, in addition to other project documents.

The project website is: [www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)

**If project documents do not have comments you have provided, and you wish them to be seen, please submit them to [peters\\_charlie@asdk12.org](mailto:peters_charlie@asdk12.org) and also indicate whether you wish to be identified by name or anonymously.**

**If you do not find an answer to your questions within project documents, please submit your question(s) to [peters\\_charlie@asdk12.org](mailto:peters_charlie@asdk12.org).**

**From: <attribution being checked>**

Dear Mr. Peters, we recently learned that the decision to build the new Inlet View school on the south side of the school grounds was made by ten people.... The principal, a few teachers and a few parents. None of the parents involved in the decision live within sight of the school. The decision was made as a convenience to the current school population without regards to the people who will live here for many more years than any students who attend the school.

- We understand the concern and appreciate the communication regarding this. We can confirm that the decisions made were not done lightly and were not made for convenience. The decisions made were based on valuable input from the Building Design Committee (BDC) that is comprised of 10 members and has a very good spread of all the different stakeholder types from the community such as the principal, teachers, staff, parents, and neighbors. In fact, there are three members on the BDC that live in the neighborhood adjacent to the school.

My question is what other plans did you consider and will you please present the plan that included building on the same site. Let the neighborhood give serious consideration to plans that will affect us for the next fifty plus years long after the students and teachers have gone.. I have lived here for over 30 years and had four children at the school. I support a new school but I also support limiting the problems your current plan could very well create for our neighborhood..... Drainage, traffic, ill conceived parking at the end of 13th to name of a few.

- As presented in the special community council meeting on 10/9/21, several options regarding location and size of the new school have been explored as part of the design process. All the different criteria that are listed as concerns in the comment above, plus others not listed, were looked at and analyzed thoroughly. Through this process all the pros and cons were reviewed and the design that has been presented is how ASD currently plans to proceed. Please note that all the information and concerns that have been expressed are being vetted and revisions to the design will result in a positive change. As the design continues to evolve and be refined, our team will be keeping the community updated and additional opportunities for input will be scheduled.

## From: <attribution being checked>

I would add that the traffic plan seems like a nightmare. The school will be significantly increasing its student body, entailing a significant increase in parent drop-off traffic on Inlet Place. It appears from the map that a lot of traffic trying to leave the drop off driveway at the east exit will conflict with and be jammed up by the one-way traffic going north on Inlet place – much of which will be trying to enter the drop off area.

- The school is not significantly increasing the student body, but rather maintaining the current enrollment and providing the accessory learning spaces (i.e. MPR, Special Ed, & Resource), per the ASD Ed Specs, that are needed to support current enrollment. The project is also increasing the classroom count from 11 to 12. The combination of adding these spaces is why the square footage of the school is increasing. The new parent drop-off and pick-up area is designed to take the current drop-off and pick-up traffic that operates on the streets of Inlet Place and 12th Avenue and to allow the traffic to all occur on the school property. This change will result in a safer environment for the students while decreasing if not eliminating all the street parking and loading/unloading.
- Traffic flow has been analyzed as part of the design process and discussed with the MOA Traffic Department. The design team has completed a traffic circulation study and met with MOA Traffic. These meetings resulted in discussions that alleviated concerns and resulted in agreement regarding the site plan design. It was expressed that MOA Traffic accepted the idea of the new design and understands the design intent operations of how the drop-off and pick-up queuing is designed to work. The traffic study can be found on the project website, in addition to other project documents.
- Based on existing traffic patterns and the number of vehicles dropping off and picking up students at Inlet View each day, it has been determined that the on-site traffic queuing should be able to handle the traffic without spilling out on to the adjacent roads. If traffic issues with the neighborhood do occur, then there are three operational contingencies that can be implemented to mitigate any issues. They are as follows:
  - Use the extra wide bypass lane (20' wide for Fire Truck Access) to create a third lane that can be used for additional queuing.
  - Use the front parking lot and direct traffic to park in order to drop-off and pick-up students.
  - Use the Bus Loop/Staff Parking lot on the West side of the site for additional drop-off and pick-up queuing.
- One other thing that was discussed with the MOA Traffic department is that conversations are going to take place with the MOA traffic engineers responsible for traffic lights in the area to see if there is any merit to increase the green light time (during school drop-off and pick-up times) for vehicles headed east on 12th and 13th Avenues and turning onto L Street, so they don't back up onto Inlet Place as vehicles are leaving the neighborhood.

Moreover, introducing a two-story building which faces north (completely ignoring the southern exposure) really violates the open/green aesthetics of the existing campus that blends in with the neighborhood and invites pedestrians from all directions and has a feel of a park. While the existing plan equally distributes the green area and invites pedestrians from all directions, the new 2-story building plan significantly increases the parking spaces, diminishes the amount of green area and redistributes it to just one side of the campus, and does not blend in with the neighborhood at all. The new plan virtually closes off any invitation to pedestrians from the south cul-de-sac.

- The gymnasium and a small portion of the Administrative Suite is the only portion of the building that is actually facing north. The main entry of the school is facing east, and the back entry of the school is facing west. This is very similar to the existing school except it is the opposite where the main entry faces west and the back entry faces east. The classroom wing is slightly tilted so the orientation of the windows face the Northeast and the Southwest, which provides great exposure to the sun and daylight through all seasons of the year.
- The new school invites pedestrians from the neighborhood similarly as the existing school with direct access across the school site from the east and west direction through the middle of the site. The only difference is that the new school will be located on the south portion of the site with the green space on the north portion of the site, which is the exact opposite of the current layout. The amount of green space of the new school layout compared to the existing school layout is almost the same. The reason the amount of green space is slightly reduced with the new school design is because the new parking area is slightly larger to accommodate all the parking on-site versus vehicles needing to park in the neighborhood streets. Unlike the existing school, the new school is also placed in the middle of the site, which is setback from the sidewalks and surrounding streets providing more of a buffer from the school building to all the surrounding residents.
- As it relates to the pedestrian access from the south cul-de-sac on M Street, the design currently provides for pedestrian access with a nice sidewalk and pathway to the back entry. We heard in the neighbors that live on M Street that if there is a pedestrian access at this location then parents will use the cul-de-sac to drop-off and pick-up students and they would prefer this to not be the case. Based on this, ASD and the Design Team are exploring options for how pedestrian access is handled from the south M Street cul-de-sac.

## From: <attribution being checked>

Can you clarify if there is still opportunity for input from adjacent neighbors in both building design and building site selection? In the September Community Council meeting it sounded like no. If not, why was there no engagement or input sought from the South Addition Community Council and adjacent property owners prior to the adoption of the two-story design and the relocation to the south end of the lot? Your proposed design with significant changes to the building site, parking lot size and placement, and two-story building design up to 37.5' above current grade (35' as stated in the previous meeting plus the 2.5' of fill identified as needed to raise the south building site above current grade) will have significant impact on adjacent neighbors. All of these concerns and others need to be addressed; and a venue provided for input from adjacent neighbors and property owners as these issues will have a negative impact to their lives and property values given the current proposed plan.

- There is still opportunity for input as the project is only at 65% completion. All the comments we continue to receive are being evaluated by ASD, the BDC, and the design team. If any comments, suggestions, or questions that come up, that haven't been thought about or considered, and makes sense to be implemented into the design process, they will be. Most likely there will not be any significant design changes (i.e., like moving the building or altering the footprint and two-story design) as the design progresses to 100% completion. Please note that the reason for this is because it has been determined through the design process, that has taken place to date, that the current design is the best solution for the school, ASD, and the community for various reasons that have been presented. Through the school and the development of the BDC (that has 3 of 10 members that live in the neighborhood) the design process has included a good representation of the various stakeholders that are affiliated with the school.
- Please do note that there is opportunity for revisions here and there as the design progresses further. For example, as we completed 65% design submittal the design team was able to reduce the max height of the new building to 30'.

Input from three PTA members on the building committee that live several blocks away, that would rather see a suboptimal two-story design, placed on the suboptimal part of the lot, with known drainage issues and high-water table, isn't sufficient. I'm sure the concerns to minimize inconvenience during construction were well intentioned, but it appears the inconvenience concern was overweighted in the decision making. We need to be thinking about how to best spend \$30 million dollars of taxpayer money so it will provide the next 60 years of students with the best designed school, with the best possible building site placement on the lot.

- No one on the BDC, at ASD, or on the design team would want to see any sub-optimal design options being moved forward. Wanting to minimize inconvenience during construction is a low priority for the Inlet View school project. Being welcoming, safe and secure, beautiful and unique, inclusive, embracing community, organized and functional, and inspiring learning while connecting to nature all had higher priorities. Project development considered many variables, and decisions were made that emphasized some variables more than others. Unfortunately, not everyone is always going to agree on design decisions for a public project. We request that we all show respect for one another and understand that things are not being ignored and they have been discussed and reviewed. Disagreement with a decision doesn't mean that what is being done is wrong, rather it might just reflect different priorities. We hope that it can be recognized that much effort and deliberate thought has gone into every decision that has been made on the project and that no decision was made blindly. What has been designed to date, and will be completed through the remaining design process, will indeed be a 50-to-60-year school that will serve the community and neighborhood well.

The lack of notification or input sought from adjacent neighbors and the fact that NO South Addition Community Council participation or input was sought prior to the building design selection and building location change was inexcusable, and the process needs to start over to include these parties in the process. If this means that we miss the 2022 ASD Bond, that is unfortunate but necessary. We shouldn't proceed with a building design that fails to be "sensitive to the scale and context" of the South Addition neighborhood, built on the most problem-prone portion of the lot, with known drainage and shading issues.

(ASD Educational Specifications: Elementary Schools, General Site Goals 4.8.1, 1st Consideration: "Sensitivity to the Neighborhood Scale and Context")

[https://www.asdk12.org/cms/lib/AK02207157/Centricity/Domain/1195/ASD-DWES\\_ElementarySchools\\_Sept2012\\_Approved.pdf](https://www.asdk12.org/cms/lib/AK02207157/Centricity/Domain/1195/ASD-DWES_ElementarySchools_Sept2012_Approved.pdf)

- The design process to date has followed ASD's guidelines and has included multiple opportunities for community input while having residents of the neighborhood sitting on the BDC. Specifically related to the ASD Educational Specifications, the general site goals of being sensitive to the neighborhood scale and context has been met with the current design. The school is setback from the neighborhood streets and placed centrally on the site. The building and site layout is open and welcoming while providing safe and secure access for vehicles and pedestrians coming to and leaving the school site. Landscaping around the entire perimeter meeting the MOA zoning code to add to the beauty of the site is included while also providing site lines into and from the school site for security purposes.

## Summary Of Informal Meeting With Neighbors

Charlie Peters and Patricia Ahrens had an informal meeting with neighbors: Martin Hansen, David McCarthy, and Arthur Jensen

Discussion points were:

- Parking lot size (did discuss size is going down approx. 20 spaces)
- Building on south side instead of building at the current location. (discussed public process and that there were about nine (9) site layouts and that this one was chosen as the best suited for the site.) They will want to see these others during the meeting.
- Shade study to confirm which homes will be affected by a two-story building.
- Water issues on south side. Concerned that building on the south side will increase costs due to water mitigation.
- Concerned that building on the south side is in an area where the subbase is less known than the current location of the building, which has a high potential of change orders.
- Concerned that a decision where 1-2yrs of inconvenience are out-weighing the best school location (north side per neighbors).
- Don't like 2-stories, prefer 1-story to keep views.
- Is there information on why the north side of the site was originally chosen for the school location?
- Public process was not inclusive of neighborhood enough where most impacts will be felt.
- Think the language of the bond for design was to replace the school in its current location, not move the building to a different location on site.
- Concerned that being in the highest seismic zone, along with known water issues, and unknown soils there is a high chance for change orders. Also, there is concern that the next big quake has a higher potential to cause damage to the new building if done on the south side as a 2-story, instead of the existing 1-story building that has lasted through two large quakes and many others on the north side.
- Very concerned with the size of the parking lot and that the exit is directly across from his driveway. (Can this be modified to exit directly to 13th)
- Concerned with home value being decreased (Although they did discuss that home values typically increase with new school construction)
- Concerned that building directly across from house will not allow the sunsets that have enjoyed with family for years.
- Has a young child that will be in school in the next few years.
- Concerned with safety of own child with driveway exit directly across from their driveway.
- Concerned with current parking lot design and safety with crossing traffic three times (3x) to get to main entry, or off site.
- Concerned that view will now be a parking lot, and school instead of a field that has been viewing for over 30yrs.

## From: Deborah Hansen

I sent you a list of questions today partly compiled from neighbor comments and partly from me. We remain very concerned about the process. I am well aware that a Q and A this Saturday is not the same as a work session. We still request a work session.

Frankly, spending \$30 million of the tax payers money on a mediocre building poorly landscaped on an inferior site that makes our neighborhood worse is not in the ASD's interest nor ours. We want to avoid this outcome.

- The special community council meeting on 10/9/21 was not a work session. The intent of the meeting was to present the background and the process that has taken place already through the design development of the project. In the early stages of the design process several different work sessions were held with students, teachers, parents, and community members. There were also several work sessions held with the Building Design Committee (BDC) that is comprised of 10 members and has a very good spread of all the different stakeholder types from the community. A representative sample of the community is required to meet Urban Design Committee requirements for major site plan review, and is ASD's preferred methodology for ensuring stakeholder involvement.
- Beyond providing a project briefing, the October 9th meeting included time for facilitated questions/responses, comments via chat, as well as verbal comments and discussion. The ASD and design team remained on the call until there were no more items that attendees wanted to discuss.
- Regarding statements about the quality of design, the project goals are to create a school that is welcoming, safe and secure, beautiful and unique, inclusive, embracing community, organized and functional, and inspires learning. These are the goals that were developed for the project and have been the mission of ASD, the Design Team, and the BDC throughout the design process.

## From: <attribution being checked>

You talked a lot about the gutter and rain spout drains on the north, east and west side of the building and around the parking lots. You did not address any drainage concern for the south side which is a very big issue on M Street. The ditches are on the south side now; what specific plans do you have to address potential drain issues to the south? Most importantly, what can you do to guarantee that this project will NOT adversely affect/ increase the water table levels which would have devastating consequences for the neighborhood? If you don't take care of this during construction, and your project raises the water table, it would most certainly permanently damage the neighborhood.

- Proposed drainage improvements include a storm system for all parking and student drop-off areas. The gutters will convey surface run-off to isolated points where the flows will be collected by field inlets or catch basins. Municipal design criteria prohibit increasing discharges to the downstream system; either a detention chamber with a flow control structure, or an infiltration system with bypass piping will be required to maintain the flows generated by the 10-year 24-hour design storm.
- The school bus loop and parking area on the west side of the school will be served by a bioretention pond/rain garden with at least 1,500 sq ft of area. The bioretention facility will be located between the parking area and N Street. An 18-inch CPEP storm drain overflow pipe will be constructed from the pond and connected to the existing municipal storm drain system in N Street (approximately 180' of 18" and 12" pipe.)
- Drainage from the hard play area will be directed to either the open field to the north or into catch basins (2 total) that drain via 18" CPEP storm drain, 140' in length, to the existing municipal storm drain system that bisects the site.
- Drainage from the parking lot and student drop off loop on the east side shall be collected in a 24" CPEP storm drain system that is directed toward the existing municipal storm drain system that bisects the school site. Approximately 200' of 18" and 24" CPEP pipe, six catch basins, and an oil and grit separator will be installed to collect storm water.
- Rain leaders will be installed on the east and west sides (2 total) of the school to collect water from roof drains. These rain leaders will be directed either to the existing storm drain on the west side of the school or the municipal storm drain system on the northside of the school. Approximately 200' of 12" CPEP storm drain will be installed for the rain leaders.

What is the distance from the M Street Cul-de-sac to the school building? The building looks super close to the property lines of every house on N, M and Inlet Place.

- The most southern point of the new building is 45' away from the closest residence property line.

M Street is a small cul de sac. Is it true, you might stage equipment in the cul de sac during construction? Please explain your plans in detail and note that it would not be acceptable to have lots of large equipment at the end of the street for a long period of time.

- No construction equipment or materials will be staged in the M Street cul-de-sac that is south of the school site. All construction activity will only occur on the school site.

We anticipate increased bottleneck traffic on Inlet Place which is a one-way street south of 13th. What will the traffic flow be for the parent drop off.

- The queuing of all drop-off and pick-up traffic will be contained on the school site. The traffic exiting the school site will turn left from the site and head north on Inlet Place to either 13th or 12th Avenue. Please reference the Briefing and Question/Answer document developed for the October 9th meeting.

We are truly dismayed that you did not come to the neighborhood earlier to discuss various options when there was an opportunity for input from the neighbors closest to the school. We are the community..... without any input or knowledge of this project until now and it appears 99% of your plans are final.

Parents and school aged families participate in the school from K thru 6th grade. We the home owners commit for many many more years and we invest hundreds of thousands of dollars into our properties to make this a very nice neighborhood... one of the nicest, most established in all of Anchorage. I have been here 30 years and had four children at Inlet View school, I know we need to have a new school but I cannot believe you totally ignored and by passed the neighborhood during early planning. You developed plans without any input from the neighbors closest to the school grounds... (just three neighborhood families and NONE within sight of the school).

- The design process to date has followed ASD's guidelines and has included multiple opportunities for community input while also having residents of the neighborhood sitting on the BDC. Through the school and the development of the BDC (that has 3 of 10 members that live in the neighborhood) the design process has included a good representation of the various stakeholders that are affiliated with the school.

I hope you will listen to the neighborhood and consider ALL of our concerns. You will need our vote and support for the bond package to pass. We look forward to hearing from you this Saturday.

## From: Lois Epstein

Why is the school being built for 289 students when the projections shown have a maximum of 250 students? Aren't the numbers of students in Anchorage public schools declining?

- The numbers are declining in some areas of Anchorage and rising in others. The projections for Inlet View Elementary School show an increase. The number of 289 students comes from the Districtwide Educational Specification Facility Utilization Standards. The current school has 11 regular teaching classrooms and the new school is planned to have 12 regular teaching classrooms. When designing a new school and investing tax payer dollars, there is a balance that needs to be found between providing a school that has no room for growth or one that does have a little room for growth.

Please explain how the parking lot size relates to the number of students in this urban elementary school.

- The MOA zoning code requires 1 parking space for every 6 students based on the State of Alaska Department of Early Education and Development (DEED) maximum capacity count. The final maximum capacity count is to be finalized still, but once this number is finalized, the parking count on the new school site will be reduced to the minimum requirement per the MOA zoning code. We are anticipating right now a reduction of approx. 20 spaces.

Will a federal wetlands permit be needed to rebuild the school? Those can take years to obtain. Also, as an engineer, I'm worried about the bioretention pond overflowing onto N St.

- A wetlands permit is not required as the site is not considered a wetland. The bioretention that is being proposed for the project is being designed to accommodate all the water on-site that would be generated by what is called a 10-year 24-hour design storm.

Why were neighbors without children in the school not consulted to date? We use the schoolyard when school is not in session for other purposes such as walking dogs and as a shortcut, and we are familiar with safety and other relevant concerns.

- This was not intentional. Since the schools main purpose is to serve as an educational facility for kids, when the Principal selected the members for the BDC from the different stakeholder groups, the neighbors she knew that lived in the neighborhood happen to be parents of students. The intent to select BDC members from the different stakeholder groups within the community that surround the school was met.
- It is understood that the community uses the school site for various purposes as described. For example this is why a pedestrian pathway across the middle of the school site is still a part of the school design.

Will the school have solar panels on its roof? If not, why not?

- A 2020 solar energy feasibility study concluded that solar is not economically feasible for ASD. This study has been included on the project website.

Last, the view entering the entire neighborhood as vehicles, bicyclists, and walkers travel down 13th from the direction of New Sagaya is of the sled hill. In the proposed plan, the first view of the neighborhood would be of a massive parking lot. This is a terrible degradation of the view. Can that part of the design be changed?

- The view to travelers coming down 13th towards the school site will be of the front entrance of the school which is designed to be very welcoming.

Thank you for ensuring these questions are discussed at the Saturday meeting.

## From: <attribution being checked>

Leading up to the 2020 bond that funded the design of the replacement of school, and the demolition of the existing school, it had been stated that the plan, at that time, was to temporarily utilize a different school (Central Middle School if I remember correctly) for a school year to facilitate the demolition of the existing school and construction of the replacement. When did this plan change?

- This changed in the Fall of 2018 when PAIDEIA was relocated in to Central Middle School.

The 2020 ASD bond text, relating to Inlet View reads: "Design funding to replace Inlet View Elementary School including the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new school on the existing site."

Now, it is being stated that the intent is to build the replacement school on the south half of the lot, while the old school remains on the north half of the lot and continues to be used while the replacement is being built.

I believe it to be deceptive and legally questionable to pay for and pursue a design of the replacement school that is quite literally on the opposite end of the school's lot, contrary to the intent and desire of the voters that approved the bond.

- The terminology for "site" references the platted site (whole property) rather than a particular building footprint.

The minimal time allocated to public input and Q&A during the 9/23/2021 community council meeting was inadequate and failed to address most concerns and issues brought up. Also, the Zoom link on the postcard that was mailed to homeowners near the school soliciting input, had a link that failed to work. I would like to see a well-advertised, in-person meeting, with all relevant project parties involved and in attendance, along with a virtual option, with a functional link before this project precedes further. This upcoming meeting on 10/9 at 10:00am should be looked at and approached with the objective of gathering and utilizing neighborhood input in the design and site placement, and not simply a venue to tell the attendees how you are going to proceed with your current plan, as the 20 or so minutes that were dedicated to this topic at the community council meeting seemed to be approached.

- Beyond providing a project briefing, the October 9th meeting included ample time for facilitated questions/responses, comments via chat, as well as verbal comments and discussion. The ASD and design team remained on the call until there were no more items that attendees wanted to discuss.

While I understand the desire to minimize the impact to students and families during the school replacement, it's clear that the ideal location of the school is on the NORTH end of the lot for many reasons, that's why the original school was built on that end of the lot.

- Based on the design process and input and discussions that have taken place, the current decision is to build the school on the south of the property. The Briefing document prepared for the October 9th Special Meeting provides information on this decision.

Can you please address what has changed between the original school construction and site selection, and now that makes the south end of the lot the preferred building site, other than the reduction of inconvenience during construction?

- Many factors have changed from the original school construction site layout versus the new school site layout design. The critical items that have changed and are being addressed with the new school design are adequate parking, drop-off and pick-up queuing area, safe and secure pedestrian access, welcoming main entry, safety and security (secure vestibule), the need for a multi-purpose room (MPR), and the need to bring in three classrooms from relocatables. All of these needs can not be efficiently added on to the existing school the way it is designed and located on the site.

Can you please address the need for a 2-story design, other than the inadequate foundation footprint area on the south half of the lot, because the original school still exists during the new school's construction?

- The 2-story design allows more square footage to be constructed with a smaller foundation footprint, which in turn is more cost effective. There are long term benefits of a two-story building versus a one-story building. These benefits include, but are not limited to, better energy efficiency with heating & cooling the building, less roof square footage to maintain and replace when needed, and better access to building infrastructure by having less underground.

We should be making solid, sound, plans and decisions with the next three generations (60 years) of students in mind, and not let one year of inconvenience dictate or drive the decision to place the new school in a suboptimal location, with an unnecessary and undesirable 2-story design.

- The Briefing document prepared for the October 9th Special Meeting provides information on this decision.

I have the following concerns with the plan as proposed and would like all of them addressed either prior to, or during the upcoming meeting on this topic:

## Shading

The south end of the lot is the most shaded, with large 30-40' trees on the property line that will result in significant shading of the new building and classrooms, especially during the winter months (school year).

- The majority of the existing trees along the south end of the lot are deciduous trees, making them less of an issue regarding shadows in the winter.

Significant shading will also be an issue for the proposed playground, as it is to the north (shaded side) of the proposed 35' replacement school. According to my calculations at winter solstice, a 35' object will cast a shadow length of 363' at midday's sun peak of 5.5 degrees. This will result in most of the playground being shaded for most of the school year.

- This is a concern that we have looked at extensively and we have placed the playground where it will not be impacted significantly by shadows. Also, as we have been progressing the design further, we have been able to reduce the max height of the new building to 30'.

Can you depict on your plans the sun angle of 5.5 degrees to get an idea of the shadows cast both over the playground and also the school itself with the 30-40' trees at the south property line?

- The shade studies that were presented at the SACC Special Meeting are posted to the project website for reference ([www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)). In addition to the shadow studies presented, we have provided a video animation of the shadows on and around the school site throughout the year and all the different seasons.

Looking at satellite pictures of all other Anchorage elementary schools, I can see no other schools built near their southern property line. In fact, most Anchorage schools appear to be positioned on their lots to prioritize unobstructed southern exposure with either a parking lot, field, playground or other open area to the south of the school.

- There are a number of ASD Elementary Schools that have been designed and constructed with play fields and playgrounds located to their north, northwest, and northeast sides of the school. A few examples are Nunaka Valley (playground to the north/northeast), Rogers Park (north/northeast), Taku (north), Lake Hood (north/northeast), Klatt (north), Ocean View (north), Trailside (north), Mountainview (northwest and northeast), Government Hill (west and east northeast of school), Williwaw (west and northwest), Baxter (northeast), Scenic Park (northeast), Sand Lake (b-ball and pavement games north), William Bowman (northeast), and O'Malley (west). Some of these schools do have roads to their south, and they vary in the location of their interior spaces and their overall building alignment for southern exposure.

## Parking Lots

In the proposed design, there are two parking lots with a total of 85 parking spots, the current school has approximately 33 parking spots counting the gravel lot next to the playground, this is a 257% increase in parking spaces.

I understand there are code requirements for parking spaces. Are the proposed 85 parking spaces at the minimum for the code given the number of students/staff?

- The MOA zoning code requires 1 parking space for every 6 students based on the State of Alaska Department of Early Education and Development (DEED) maximum capacity count. The final maximum capacity count is to be finalized still, but once this number is finalized, the parking count on the new school site will be reduced to the minimum requirement per the MOA zoning code. We are anticipating right now a reduction of approx. 20 spaces.



Is there a possibility for a code deviation/variation for this project reducing the parking spots?

- Yes, based on conversations with the MOA Director, deviating from the code requirements is an option and will be discussed further.

Did the work group consisting of staff members making recommendations to date, suggest or request a 257% increase in parking spots, or think this significant increase is needed?

- The large increase was not a specific suggestion, but it was noted that more parking for the school is needed.

The large parking lot has three pedestrian crossing points within the parking lot that pedestrians must cross to reach the main entrance after utilizing the crosswalk to cross Inlet Place. This is poorly thought out and an unnecessary hazard for children and parents. Why do you have any pedestrian crossing points in a parking lot? Why isn't the main entrance accessible via sidewalk after the crosswalk, like you have on the other side of the school?

- A pedestrian can certainly access the main entrance of the school via sidewalk just like the existing school, however, the shortest access point is through the parking lot so for safety purposes crosswalks are included. This is a perfectly safe option that ASD has included on other school designs.

## Two-Story Design

The replacement school is proposed to be a 2-story, one-wing design. The advantages with a 2-story design are few, primarily being a reduced footprint with the foundation. The minimal footprint would not be an issue or necessary if the old school was torn down and a replacement single-story, two-wing design was built on the North end of the lot.

- With the increase in square footage to the school, even on the north side of the lot, a 2-story design would be necessary to be accommodated comfortably within site boundaries.

I have concerns with letting the desire to retain the old school during construction drive the construction of an unnecessary, suboptimal 2-story design.

- Please reference the Briefing and Question/Answer document developed for the October 9th meeting.

There are many disadvantages with a 2-story design. There would be daily challenges for those that are disabled, increased fire evacuation and response times and chokepoints associated with the stairwells that could prove to be a significant disadvantage in the event of an active shooter situation, both of the latter could have deadly consequences.

- Accessibility is not an issue with the code required stair access points and the elevator. There are other elementary schools within ASD that are 2-story concepts that are very successful school designs.

I see in the plans only one elevator, how will disabled students and staff access the second story in the event of a mechanical issue or needed maintenance on the only elevator?

- These are covered by code required egress pathways. Also, there are school safety plans and periodic drills to enforce these safety requirements. There are also no spaces on the second level that are unique and not already provided on the first level in the event that access via elevator is down.

The Inlet View lot is located in the "Red Seismic Zone", some of the highest likelihood ground in Anchorage to sustain building damage during a large earthquake event. The proposed 2-story design would be at greater risk in a large earthquake event for both building damage and occupant injury or death, compared to a single-story design.

- The site is in a Seismic Hazard Zone 5; however, the Inlet View Elementary school site is located within what appears to be an old landslide that is flat. Once a slide occurs where the toe of the slope is farther from the top than it was before the slide, the soil mass is inherently stronger than before. If the soil slope is flatter than about 15H:1V and the slope height are not increased, it is believed to be little risk of further sliding. It is known that the slide body of the site is currently quite flat (about 20H:1V) and that given the typical strength parameters of expected soils at the site, the stability of the site during the code design seismic event is quite high. With all this in mind, there is no greater risk with a 2-story design.

## Neighborhood Impact

The relocation of the school to the south end of the lot and the increase in height up to 35 feet as suggested will have a significant impact to the neighborhood. Current zoning building height maximum for the R2M residential lots surrounding the school lot is 30 feet.

- The school site is a PLI (Public Lands and Institution) zone, which allows up to 50' tall structures. However, the height of the new building with the gymnasium being the tallest portion of the building will be 30', which aligns with the residential zoning district maximum height.

Inlet Place would lose several street parking spots to accommodate the new large parking lot entrance and exit.

- The loss of street parking spots on Inlet place to accommodate the new design would be limited to just a couple of parking spaces where the new driveways are located. This is approx. 1 space per driveway.

Many houses along Inlet Place have been designed with living room and large window placement to face the unobstructed open area on the south end of the school lot. The construction of a 35-foot replacement school on the south end of the lot would be detrimental to their property value.

- Having a new school in a neighborhood has historically increased property values.

The huge proposed 65 spot parking lot with its exit on Inlet Place, which is a one-way road in that area, would serve to congest not only 13th and Inlet Place, but also

13th and L St. during drop-off and pick-up. This would negatively affect emergency response vehicles that needed to utilize any of these roads or intersections during drop-off or pick-up time. If built as proposed, this parking lot design will surely serve to increase the wrong-way traffic on Inlet Place, which is already problematic.

- Traffic flow discussions and studies have taken place to prove there will not be a negative impact to the neighborhood traffic.

Please provide the Anchorage Municipality Traffic Engineering Department analysis/study of the proposed large parking lot, with its entrances and exits in very close proximity to the 13th and Inlet Place and 13th and L Street intersections.

- The traffic study that has been completed during the design process has been posted to the project website for reference ([www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)).

## Water Drainage

The south end of the school is the lowest part of the lot and stays very wet after heavy rain and spring snow melt. I see there is a monitoring well placed on the south end of the lot where the proposed school would be located. What are the results? Where have you determined the water table to be in this location? Will you collect water table data and postpone the final decision on site selection until the spring snow melt season, when the water table is the highest?

- The water table on the site exist between 5' to 10' below grade depending on the exact location and the time of year. The water table level is fairly consistent across the school site, so there isn't an ideal location on the school site to avoid the high-water table.

There was a sub-surface water drainage system installed on the south end of the school lot 10-15 years ago. This was done in part to reduce the basement flooding of the neighbors adjacent to the south. Will this system be removed as part of the foundation construction? Will any other system be installed or mitigation measures implemented to ensure the loss of water absorbing greenspace and drainage system doesn't negatively impact the neighbors to the south with flooding?

- Any existing drainage mitigation systems will be left in place. All the new drainage mitigation work associated with the project will further improve the drainage situation for surrounding neighbors.

How much more will constructing on the suboptimal lower and wet end of the lot cost, versus the higher and dryer north end, taking into consideration the potential need for an engineered water table lowering system associated with the subsurface portion of the building's foundation and the surrounding ground?

- There are no noticeable cost increases with building on the south side of the site. We are currently designed to meet the construction budget of \$21.875M. Costs and schedule would be anticipated to increase if a north site configuration were developed due to non-construction related items including relocatables, up front demolition of a portion of the existing building and build back of a temporary exterior wall for the existing building.

## Playground/Exercise Area During Construction

If the plan as proposed is used, where will the children play during recess, outdoor gym days and field days, as the current playground, open field and sledding hill are all located on the south half of the lot where the new school will be under construction?

- The current playground and playfield area on the east side of the site will be left in place during construction. The large field area to the south and the sledding hill are the areas that will no longer exist or be accessible during construction.

## From: <attribution being checked>

We need to know the length of the shadow cast by your two-story building at solstice.

Please send us the traffic study. We would like to know exactly where 13th intersects the parking lot.

- Both the shadow study and the traffic study that has been completed during the design process has been posted to the project website for reference ([www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)).

## From: <attribution being checked>

Charlie, I appreciate your measured and professional response to questions presented at the SACC the other night. Many of us feel that some of our neighbors were rude but let's move on:)

Thanks for arranging the meeting. I am former staff, had 1 student attend Inlet View (K-6th) and live in the neighborhood. We are thrilled there will be a new school and know 2 of the 3 neighbors that were on the committee.

It does seem like the parking is more than needed. I see what they say the capacity can be and perhaps you are locked into code with that calculation.

- The parking spaces shown in the site plans that have been presented to date are overparked. This has been intentional to make sure that adequate parking per the MOA zoning code is covered in the design. Then we would come back and reduce parking counts as allowed. The reason for this is that the MOA zoning code requires 1 parking space for every 6 students based on the State of Alaska Department of Early Education and Development (DEED) maximum capacity count. The final maximum capacity count is to be finalized still, but once this number is finalized, the parking count on the new school site will be reduced to the minimum requirement per the MOA zoning code. We are anticipating right now a reduction of approx. 20 spaces.

However, I have never known IV to get even close to 300 students and twice it has been in danger of being closed. Can you get a history of the student population at IV?

- Please refer to the ASD Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan that is updated every year. In this document you will find a membership summary that provides districtwide projections by grade level for every school in the district.

### From: <attribution being checked>

Thanks for keeping me in the loop. I certainly hope the project gets approved on the bond and look forward to seeing it come to fruition. I'm also interested in seeing plans as they develop.

One recreational component I'd wondered about is whether there's been any discussion of incorporating in the planning a perimeter soft surface bike trail for kids to ride on. Lots of kids in the neighborhood like to bike and I've noticed the new single-track trails in Chester Creek valley get a lot of use. As a parent of young kids, personally I'd love to see a bike trail like that incorporated in design, perhaps leaving funding of its construction to parents like me since I doubt the district would see that as a particularly important part of the project. I also support keeping (relocating) the sled hill, which as I understand from Principal Ahrens is part of the plan already.

- There has not been any discussion on incorporating in the planning a perimeter soft surface bike trail for kids to ride on. There were other recreational ideas discussed during the early planning sessions. It was determined though that ASD school sites are not intended for recreational purposes outside of the standard play equipment and play fields that are specified to be included at ASD schools.

### From: <attribution being checked>

A couple of weeks or so ago we spoke on the phone about the new school going up next to my house. Last night I tried to take part in the community meeting by way of Zoom. However, I messed up in doing the Zoom protocols correctly, so it was not until about a half hour after the meeting started that I could even get through the initial Zoom steps, but the Zoom box indicated the meeting was in progress and I was unable to join in.

I hope the meeting went all right, but I just want to reiterate my primary concerns at this time. First, in light of the past problems of the school yard's spring snow melt run-off flooding into my backyard and down into my crawlspace I hope that the new school yard has a good gradient and proper and drainage to avoid these issues. Second, from the preliminary drawing that I saw of the employee parking lot driveway on "N" Street it looks like the southern end of it runs just about up to my property line; so I would wonder whether any wintertime snow berm by that driveway would impact my own driveway. Third, I know in any large construction project that there is going to noise, so I'll just hope that it is kept to reasonable hours.

I really appreciate your assistance, and if there are any future Zoom community meetings on the new school, I'll try to download the meeting correctly the next time.

- Thank you for your input. Regarding drainage, please reference the Briefing and Question/Answer document developed for the October 9th meeting. As for the construction project and any noise generated from the work, please be assured that the construction activity will meet MOA Noise Ordinance requirements.

# QUESTIONS & ANSWERS FROM THE OCT. 9TH, 2021 SPECIAL MEETING

This section provides answers to specific questions that were posted by participants during the October 9th Special Meeting that was hosted on by the South Addition Community Council.

These questions were answered at the time, with that video being available on the project website. The answers provided here have been prepared after the meeting in order to document them in written form. These answers are not a transcription of answers provided in the meeting video.

In addition to the content of the meeting being available, a project overview and generic question and answer document was prepared prior to that meeting. We encourage people to review the briefing and question/answer document which is available at the following website, in addition to other project documents.

The project website is: [www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)

**If you do not find an answer to your questions within project documents, please submit your question(s) to [peters\\_charlie@asdk12.org](mailto:peters_charlie@asdk12.org).**

## 1. Project History Related Questions

- a. The 2020 school bond specifies using the existing site. Is it legal to move the site since it was specified in the original bond?
  - The language on the bond included the below (note that information related to students is now out of date, and that Inlet View is not the oldest school in the ASD):
    - The 2020 Bond will provide \$3.34 million for the new school design on the existing site.
    - The current Inlet View building was built in 1957 and is the oldest school in ASD.
    - The new design will accommodate up to 300 students, the average number of elementary age students living within Inlet View's boundaries.
    - Inlet View houses just over 250 students, with an official capacity of 168.
    - The new design will include a fire suppression system, a safety feature the current school does not have due to its age.
  - The terminology for 'site' references the platted site (whole property) rather than a particular footprint.
- b. Can you please address what has changed from 1957 that determined the north end to be the best site to build? Is the only reason for building on the south end due to the inconvenience factor? Your geotechnical study that was done was presuming building on the north end. When will you seek geotechnical analysis of your proposed south site?
  - What has changed since 1957 and makes the south end of the site a better location for the school is that it provides the opportunity for a safer and more secure facility, improved drop-off and pick-up, additional parking, and provides a better location for the school to be welcoming and inviting.
  - A Geotech analysis was completed on all areas of the site including the south end. The findings show that the soil conditions are fairly uniform across the site and that groundwater occurs at depths ranging from approximately 5 to 10 feet below the existing ground surface across the entire project site. Groundwater levels will likely vary some seasonally (depending upon annual precipitation and snowmelt runoff).

## 2. Student Data Related Questions

- a. How many children are being bused to IVES now, and how many are projected to be bused in the future? Where are they being bused from?
  - Before the COVID Pandemic, approximately 35-40 students attended before and after school programs at the school and the bus ridership was 65 students. As of today, bus ridership has been reduced to 35-40 students a day. The students that are bused are coming from the local area. There is no after-school program this year.
- b. What is the demographic information are you using for sizing the school given how close together the South Addition elementary schools are?
  - Please reference 2040 Land Use Planning Action #5-4, per ASD's 6-year CIP, July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2027.

### 3. Building and Siting Related Questions

- a. What is the tallest height of the new building?
- The final height will be determined as the design progresses, but at the current 65% design level, the tallest height of the building is at the gym and is expected to be 30' tall. Please note that in the special SACC meeting it was discussed that approx. 2' of fill will be brought into the site and that was then carried over to think that the building will have a taller effective height due to additional fill material below the building. This is actually not the case and over excavation will be done on the site to remove peat and then 2' of fill brought in. The finish floor elevation will be relative to the surrounding areas so 30' tall is the effective height.
- b. Does 35' include mechanical systems on the roof?
- No large mechanical equipment will be installed on the roof. There will still be exhaust and relief fans installed on the roof.
- c. The existing school is a low-profile one-story building that fits the scale of the adjacent houses. Even the two-story gym is only about 20 feet high. The proposed school is a taller building that alters the scale of the neighborhood. How will the proposed design reduce scale impacts?
- The proposed design reduces scale impacts by being located in the center of the site and not directly adjacent to the surrounding streets. This added buffer helps to reduce the scale and allows for the site area needed for the drop-off and pick-up queuing areas and added parking.
- d. The school as it sits now does not have a back side. The existing service area off of West 12th Avenue is inconspicuous and somewhat hidden from the neighbors. How will the new school offer sufficient space for screening and present a less desirable face to N Street neighbors?
- Title 21 requires promoting site designs that enhance surrounding community character and encourage transportation development patterns that promote public health and safety. The building design committee, ASD CP&C and design team believes this is accomplished with the current design.
- e. Will a snowmelt system be installed?
- No, snowmelt systems are not part of ASD design standards nor required by code.
- f. Where is there room for relocatable? I believe that the Planning Commission still requires this.
- MOA Planning does not require this, but the ASD Districtwide Elementary Ed Specs call for location for future relocatables be included in plans. This current design layout has space to accommodate this requirement and will be identified as the plans progress.
- g. Inlet View Elementary will be one of the very few Elementary School without a southern exposure if ASD moves the school location. What is the justification with the break with precedent?
- There are classrooms with southern exposure included as part of the design. As to other Anchorage schools, there are a significant number where the school is located at the south of the site, with playgrounds to the west, northwest, north, northeast, or east of the school. A non-comprehensive list includes: Nunaka Valley (playground is north/northeast), Rogers Park (playground is north/northeast), Lake Hood (playground is north/northeast), Klatt (playground is north), Ocean view (playground is north), Trailside (playground is north) with these schools having playgrounds more to the east or west Mountainview, Government Hill, Williwaw, Baxter, Scenic Park, Sand Lake, William Bowman, and O'Malley. The relationship to southern exposure for these schools also depends on whether there is a road to the south or not, where their parking areas are, and the layout of the school as it relates to interior spaces and access to sunshine during the day.
- h. If it is more expensive to build a new school rather than remodel, why is ASD choosing to put the school in an inferior location for a 60-year school?
- The south location on the school site has been selected intentionally, with sound reasoning that includes the school being centralized on the site and not directly adjacent to surrounding streets, providing adequate drop-off and pick-up queuing for modern school function, the addition of needed parking, the entire existing school can remain intact during construction so no relo's are needed, the site grading is more level on the south side of the lot, improved skating rink and playground access from the gym and MPR, placement of classroom windows is improved so the views are of the neighborhood and not the playground while also maximizing daylight during school hours, and pedestrian access to the school from the surrounding neighborhood streets is significantly improved.
  - Please note that replacing the school versus remodeling the existing school is based on the life of the building and the return on investment. Depending on the type of remodel, either 10-20 year or 20-30 year extensions are added to the life of the building.
- i. Can you make this building fit the building site and respond to the neighborhood, to the environment and to make an exceptional community facility?
- The building design committee, ASD, CP&C, and design team believe this is being accomplished by the current design
- j. Is two-stories a safer design versus a one-story grade school? Has there been any research and studies provided?
- There are no significant safety differences between a one-story and a two-story elementary school.
- k. The shadow study only addresses school operating hours and not adjacent property owners throughout 24-hour period. Where is the shadow study based on single story versus two story? Where is the shadow that effects the inlet place properties? How was that considered during the building design committee?
- The shadow study is available on the website. The assessment of single story versus two story was based on numerous factors. A shadow study was used to develop the design, including to see how it would affect properties across the roads. The orientation of the building and the design of the building has been developed to maximize the amount of daylight into the building with standard windows and clerestory windows at different times of the day when the different spaces of the school are used. For example, the entrance to the east will allow good sun exposure as the sun is rising and the placement of the drop-off/pick-up area is far enough away from the building that in the afternoons this area of

the site will not be in shadow caused by the building. Another example are the clerestory windows to the east, south, and west that will flood the main core of the building (where the two-story lobby and multi-purpose room space are located) with daylight.

- i. How can we get the school district to approve solar on the roof even though it's not part of the Muni's plan for new schools? What about adding solar panels on the roof?
  - The District contracted EES Consulting in 2020 to assess solar feasibility at schools. The results showed they were not economically feasible. This report is available on the project website.
- m. Please address how disabled students and staff will access the second story when the one elevator as proposed is out of service due to maintenance
  - Alternate egress requirements are required by code and will be included in the design.
- n. Please state again why the two stories instead of one.
  - The reason it has been decided to go with a two-story option is because of costs and trying to maximize tax payer dollars. A two-story concept allows the school to have less of a footprint on the site while achieving higher square footage which in turn saves costs. Knowing that a two-story school has a different look, we have purposely placed the school in the center of the lot so it is not so close to the property lines. This setback provides the clear space between the neighborhood and the school so the scale isn't as dramatic. This also ensures that no shadows will be cast by the building that will impact any neighbors or site features. Another item to note is that the gym of the existing school has a two-story height, so in that sense there isn't a difference there.

## 4. Security Related Questions

- a. The current school has "eyes-on-the-school" on all sides. The proposed school cuts off views into the play area from the south reducing the number of "eyes-on-the-school" which could result in higher vandalism. Has ASD explored this?
  - Yes. Visibility to the street on three sides provides for an open playground. Note that the project is expected to seek Alternative Equivalent Compliance to reduce the amount of MOA required shrubs to increase visibility as compared to what code requires.
  - The design is guided by Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) guidance.

## 5. Drainage Related Questions

- a. Where will snow storage be located?
  - Pending parking lot refinements, snow storage will be located as close to the expected 'snow plow movements. These areas will be designed to address meltwater.

- b. For areas flooded for winter ice skating, how will the spring melt be addressed?
  - Thank you for noting this specific condition. This will be taken into account for site drainage needs.
- c. The southern end of the plot is very wet. When we installed our fence on the north side of our property, we hit ground water at 3.5 to 4 feet. If ASD is concerned with costs that justify a two-story building in an earthquake zone, how much will it cost to build a building on the south end of the lot?
  - It is understood that the south end of the lot is very wet. Based on the Geotech analysis our team has completed, we understand that the entire site has a high water table with ground water between 5 to 10' throughout the entire site.
  - There are no noticeable cost increases with building on the south side of the site. We are currently designed to meet the construction budget of \$21.875M. Costs and schedule would be anticipated to increase if a north site configuration were developed due to non-construction related items including relocatables, up front demolition of a portion of the existing building and build back of a temporary exterior wall for the existing building.
- d. Can you provide us with that cost analysis on fill versus relocatable farm? If you run into poor material at that site what potential additional concerns and cost have been discussed?
  - A Geotech analysis was completed on all areas of the site including the south end. This information has been posted to the project website. The findings show that the soil conditions are fairly uniform across the site and that we shouldn't come across any poor material in one area over another.
- e. Where is the bore hole located?
  - There are several bore hole locations on both the north and south ends of the site. Please see the Geotech report that has been posted to the project website.
- f. Have you estimated the cost of 2.5' of fill on the south end of the lot plus the engineered drainage/dewatering system vs relocatables?
  - Yes, this has been estimated and determined that the costs are less expensive than bringing in relocatable classrooms to house displaced students during construction. Relocatable classrooms are less desirable due in part to air quality, costs to move on/off site, energy loss, dissociation with students and staff in the main building, and lower safety and security.

## 6. Site Design Related Questions

- a. Lighting of the school will change with the new site plan. How will new lights affect the adjacent neighbors?
  - Site lighting (specifically for parking) will need to meet MOA requirements. This includes limiting 'light trespass' off the site to neighboring properties and general light pollution.
- b. The current school has gardening spaces that have been heavily used in the past, not so much now. Will the proposed design allow a good, highly visible place to grow sun loving plants?
  - Yes. In discussion with staff the intent was to maintain a location on the site that could be used for this again in the future.

- c. There appears to be a significant loss of permeable ground from the existing building to the proposed building. How much permeable surface will be lost? How will the loss be mitigated?
- The existing site has approximately 110,500 sq.ft. of greenspace south of the school, and approximately 58,500 north of the school, for a total of 169,000 sq.ft. Greenspace includes area that is soil, grass, or vegetation. The proposed site will have approximately 68,500 of greenspace south of the school and approximately 86,000 sq.ft. north of the school for a total of 154,500 sq.ft. This means that the new school site will have approximately 14,500 sq.ft. less greenspace than previous. Note that this difference will likely become smaller as refinements are made to reduce parking.
  - Note that the actual building footprint will be smaller than the existing building, with 10,000 SF of additional interior space.
- d. Will there be any fencing around the school property? What type if so?
- Yes, fencing around the entire perimeter of the school site will be installed. The specific type of fencing is to be determined, but ASD design standards call for chain link.
- e. What is the distance between the building and the cul-de-sac?
- The most southern point of the new building is 45' away from the closest residence property line.
- f. What are the negatives of building the school in the same site?
- The terminology for 'site' references the platted site (whole property) rather than a particular footprint. Assuming that this question relates to building footprint, a few of the negatives that were discussed for building the school on north side are; gym placement either doesn't have direct access to playground, or takes up a good portion of southern exposure that would be better for classrooms, N street remains as the main access, vehicular access and drop-off remain challenged, and the need for relocatables. A significant negative is the need to provide student and classroom space. Relocatable classrooms are less desirable due in part to air quality, costs to move on/off site, energy loss, dissociation with students and staff in the main building, and lower safety and security.
- g. You mentioned that putting in fill was more cost effective than putting in relos. How much difference are we talking about?
- The ballpark figure is approx. \$500,000 less for the fill than the relocatable classroom farm.
- h. What is the reason to have separate Kinder drop off? I wonder what % of K students have a sibling at the school.
- There is no specific reason to have kinder drop off separated. It is a product of the design that will encourage parents to drive past the main entry during drop-off and pick-up times to maximize the length of the traffic queuing lane.
- i. how much snow melt system will be included in the cost estimate
- There is no snow melt system included in the project.

## 7. Vehicle Circulation Related Questions

- a. Has a traffic impact analysis been completed? How will local traffic patterns be affected? The much larger parking lots will dominate the design from N street and Inlet Place. Currently much more pleasant views dominate the street views.
- Yes, a traffic analysis has been completed and discussions on traffic flow have taken place with the MOA Traffic Department. The site design has sufficient capacity to handle all vehicle queuing on-site so it doesn't overflow into the neighborhood street.
- b. Can we hear what measures will be in place to restrict cars through the teacher & bus loop on N street?
- Signage will be used to notify vehicles of accessibility. Initial and annual school training of parents will be needed at the beginning of the school year to use appropriate lanes for the new site layout. This need to have parents follow recommended processes is common to the functioning of most schools.
- c. Will you let us know once you have a solid answer from traffic regarding the stop light at 13th ave? Reason is because for YEARS the community has tried to at minimum put in a yellow flashing left lane. Traffic refuses and they refuse to change the length of the lights due to the traffic departing downtown. So unless that can be changed our neighborhood is looking for additional traffic issues that often lead to almost head on accidents.
- Understood and will do. We have asked MOA Traffic to look into this and to provide a response.
- d. How will you address the traffic jam that will be created by the drop off exit traffic and the one-way traffic exiting the subdivision on Inlet place north all trying to cross the intersection at 13th and L
- In general, the intent is to minimize negative off-site impacts by increasing on-site drop off and queuing, and coordinate with MOA traffic to see what opportunities there are for positive benefit.

## 8. Parking Related Questions

- a. People parking their cars in the large parking lot will have to walk between other cars to get to the front door. Can we have a safer design given our long dark hours during the school year?
- An updated site graphic shows a refined access from the front door into the parking area. The intent is that people would walk toward that access in order to have one crossing area, rather than filter through cars toward the building. Landscape will also be used to try to reinforce this pedestrian flow.
- b. The 65 parking spaces implies a school population of 390 children. There are about 214 children enrolled now. Is the school district thinking of changing the school boundaries?
- The parking lot is being refined to reduce the number of parking spaces. Project development is based only on existing boundaries and requirements.
  - Note that at the School Board October 19th work session, the Superintendent indicated that ASD boundaries are being looked at in general and changes would be presented to the Board in Spring.

- c. The school bond to fund this design specified 300 students. Title 21 specifies 1 off street parking spot per 6 children. This works out to about 37 spots which is about the existing size of the parking lot. Why is ASD expanding the parking lot in a pedestrian neighborhood? Does ASD anticipate more students being driven to school?
- The 1 parking space for every 6 students calculation is required to use the State of Alaska Department of Early Education and Development (DEED) maximum capacity count. The final maximum capacity count is to be finalized still, but once this number is finalized, the parking count on the new school site will be reduced to the minimum requirement per the MOA zoning code. We are anticipating right now a reduction of approx. 20 spaces.
  - In addition, the existing lot is undersized and has no separation of bus and parent traffic for safety per ASD Standards.
- d. The interruption of the parking spaces by multiple narrow peninsulas of landscaping is not desirable. They will make snow removal harder, they are not big enough to sustain large trees and the narrowness means a loss of several feet on either side of the area further reducing its viability as a place to plant trees.
- Parking lot interior landscaping is required by code, and includes minimum dimensional standards. The sizing and placement of interior islands will be revised, including sizing them appropriate to the landscaping that they will contain. An important component of this is also depth of planting soil.
- e. The parking lot will be very difficult for snow removal. The semi-circular design is not conducive to plowing. Can you redesign the parking lot so that it will reduce snow removal time?
- Pending parking lot revisions, improvements for maintenance will be included. ASD Maintenance snow removal leads will review design
- f. Can the proposed design be altered to be more neighbor friendly? Specifically, the front parking lot is large and unsightly as currently designed. Double loading all aisles is more efficient and may allow more space for landscaping.
- Double-loading is more efficient. The design team is working on revisions to the parking lot based on the anticipation that the required parking will be less than what we have been currently planning for. Reduced parking will allow the design to better meet other needs.
- g. The parking lot has insufficient space for substantial tree plantings. Trees and landscaping will be stressed and not grow to their full potential with the limited planting areas. Can you redesign the parking lot to make it more neighborhood friendly and comply with Title 21 parameters which allow for grouping of plantings?
- Expecting parking reductions will include design refinements for landscape health.

- h. How about moving all visitor parking (and reducing the number) to another location???

- If this question is referring to an off-site visitor parking area, this is not an option because ASD doesn't own a nearby property. If there was a property nearby that could accommodate the required amount of parking, there would need to be a shared parking agreement that would be recorded on the property deed and this is difficult to achieve.

## 9. Playground Related Questions

- a. Inlet View's playground equipment was designed through a student process which led to the current selected equipment. Will students be a part of the new play equipment selection?
- That is our desire. COVID-19 protocol has severely impacted normal/optimal interactions. We are trying to figure out a different strategy to achieve this intent.
- b. (Question is based on a 2011 concept for site improvements). Do you know if construction dasher-boards, fences and lighting are included in the project? If so, where are proposed vehicle access gates arranged?
- All new dashers, asphalt, drainage, lighting is anticipated for the rink.
- c. (Question is based on a 2011 concept for site improvements). Has any consideration of developing a skater-access/staging area at a near point to the rink (inside the building) been made?
- This has not been discussed. We will bring this up with the school staff and the BDC.
- d. Is there a plan to have water service for rink maintenance (flooding connection/1.5" fire hose nipple) near to the rink?
- This is an excellent suggestion for us to review and evaluate, whether out on site or building-attached as assessed by line freezing.
- e. The Inlet View playground was quite unique with its twin tennis courts (when they were young). Any chance these or maybe pickleball courts could be incorporated?
- Tennis courts are not included in the new design. There is a multi-purpose court.
- f. The existing open large playfield provides abundant opportunities for the community to run dogs, have pickup games. It is a very unique feature in the neighborhood and even more unique in that it is located in a downtown area. The current plans offer pavement and destroy this unique feature. Will the new design incorporate these users by continuing to provide a sunny open playground?
- Significant open greenspace is provided to the north.
- g. Can the sledding hill be designed to remove the dead zone? Rotating the hill on a diagonal, using existing topography and giving the corner to landscaping are some suggestions.
- Yes. The location and design for the sledding hill has not been refined yet. The main concern is typically the backside of the sledding hill where it is adjacent or directed toward property lines where there is fencing.



- h. Will the landscape consider combining basketball with hockey to increase the field area and reduce impermeable surfaces?
- Yes. This can certainly be considered.
- i. The primary playground seems very close to the M Street cul-de-sac. Is there any concern of a child slipping around the back of the school and onto the street without being noticed?
- There are no concerns for this happening because the site perimeter will be fenced and there are also security measures in place when kids are outside playing.

## 10. Landscape Related Questions

- a. Why is there no planting in front of the school building?
- Landscape design to date has been conceptual. Foundation planting and entry planting have been added for the 65% design.
- b. Title 21 section 7 emphasizes the importance of preserving mature plant material. On the north side of the property are many beautiful trees. There are mature trees on the site particularly at the northwest corner. Will these trees be saved? They currently provide habitat for many local songbirds. Can the school design be more bird friendly?
- Trees internal to the site will be removed due to construction needs. Note that some of these trees are invasive (Canada Red). The most significant trees on the site are spruce trees on the perimeter. These will be assessed for how much they will be impacted by site design. Spruce trees along the northern perimeter of a school site with houses across the road are normally not ideal due to future shading, and blocking views into the school site. If they are removed, they would likely be replaced with deciduous trees, with evergreen used in key locations for aesthetics or controlling views.
- c. What provisions are made for maintaining the tree perimeter? What kind of trees will be planted. We are puzzled by the shrubs since the school district removed shrubs and low tree limbs from the perimeter a few years ago to improve visibility. Will ASD ask for an exemption to Title 21 for this?
- MOA code requires perimeter shrubs in order for a project to be permitted. The only way to reduce shrubs to date has been seeking a variance (very difficult to get) or recently being able to pursue Alternative Equivalent Compliance. A current idea to achieve this is to develop the perimeter as an 'arboretum', using a wide variety of tree species, and to seek shrub reductions by achieving their intent through other means. The ASD strongly wants their sites to reflect Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design intent, but is limited by code requirements that do not account for different needs for sites.
- d. Why are you getting rid of the habitat forest on the northwest corner?
- All trees will be evaluated based on the level of disturbance they will experience during the project, how they will relate to the needs of the new site design, as well as their expected longevity based on age and quality. At the moment, the existing trees on the northwest corner of the site appear to be in a good location for retaining them.

## 11. Pedestrian Circulation Related Questions

- a. For the last 50 plus years, there has been a paved extension of 13th through the schoolyard which is used by residents west of Inlet View School bicyclists, walkers to access the L street bus stop, and New Sagaya. Will that design continue that?
- Yes, the new school design includes a route extending through the site in the west/east direction.

## 12. Design Process Related Questions

- a. When Denali Elementary School was being replaced the design process involved the students, teachers, parents and community in many meetings including a design Charente with users and neighbors. Will we have a work session that incorporates our ideas, not simply an opportunity to ask questions but work on optimal design and location for all users?
- The design process for this project has already conducted many design charrettes and meetings with students, teachers, parents, and community members. Additional meetings with the BDC will take place as the design progresses. We will also provide updates at the SACC monthly meetings.
- b. Chugach Optional design for the rebuild responded to neighbor concerns regarding blocking views. How are you incorporating our neighborhood objections to the design?
- Emails, phone calls, discussions to date, and meetings like the SACC special meeting are certainly influencing the project.
- c. What is the background of ASD decision to not go through a planning process similar to Denali and Chugach Optional processes? A planning process would advise this project as to designing it for proper location and not for the convenience of avoiding one year of displacement of students.
- This project did go through the ASD planning process similar to Denali and Chugach Optional.
- d. Based on the incredible community response will the ASD offer another Building Design Group with a better representation of community members adjacent to the project site? How many Community members adjacent to the school where on the build design group? How many property owners adjacent to the project notified and given an opportunity to be part of the building design?
- ASD is considering adding another member from the neighborhood to the BDC, but this has yet to be determined. Currently there are 3 out of 10 members on the BDC that are parents and live in the neighborhood near the school site.
- e. Did the community design committee include any parents/ families that had property next to the school or direct sight of the school building?
- Yes, the BDC includes 3 out of 10 members on the BDC that are parents and live in the neighborhood near the school site. 1 of these 3 members lives on 11th Avenue with view of the school from their backyard.

- f. Who is this being built for? I am hearing “population growth is expected” but we have a declining population in AK and the numbers provided in the presentation of current and expected enrollment do not show increased students
- Reference 2040 Land Use Planning Action #5-4, per ASD’s 6-year CIP, July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2027.
- g. I am an adjacent property owner and future parent of a student that will attend the new school. You admit that you failed to include people like me in initial notification and input. How will you correct this omission and allow for my input and my neighbors input in design and site selection?
- Yes, it was admitted that in hindsight the invites to the visioning and planning workshops that were held in the early stages of the design process should have been sent to the SACC for distribution to the council’s mailing list. These workshops were still advertised through the school and held with input from other south addition property owners so there was representation of your stakeholder group. Again, we apologize that you didn’t get an invite. Since input was collected from the neighborhood community there isn’t anything to correct with the process.
- h. 10% seems like a small neighborhood constituency for a building design committee. How was this percentage arrived at?
- The percentage of neighbors included on the BDC is 30%, which is a high percentage when considering that the neighbors are not the users of the school.
- i. Is it too late to go to the Denali model for design?
- A similar planning process to what was done with Denali Montessori School was utilized for this project.

### 13. General Questions

- a. Who is the contractor?
- The general contractor that has been selected to be the GC/CM for the project is Cornerstone General Contractors.
- b. Can you define “IB” school?
- The International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP) for children aged 3-12 nurtures and develops young students as caring, active participants in a lifelong journey of learning. The PYP offers an inquiry-based, transdisciplinary curriculum framework that builds conceptual understanding. It is a student-centered approach to education for children aged 3-12. It reflects the best of educational research, thought leadership and experience derived from IB World Schools. The PYP curriculum framework begins with the premise that students are agents of their own learning and partners in the learning process. It prioritizes people and their relationships to build a strong learning community. PYP students use their initiative to take responsibility and ownership of their learning. By learning through inquiry and reflecting on their own learning, PYP students develop knowledge, conceptual understandings, skills and the attributes of the IB Learner profile to make a difference in their own lives, their communities, and beyond.

- c. Please explain who the visitors to an elementary school would be and if they will all be there at once.
- Visitors to the school will be primarily parents and volunteers. These individuals will come and go throughout the school day. There are also school events that bring significant numbers of parents and volunteers at one time such as open houses and back to school events.
- d. Will you need a federal wetlands permit for the new site location? That can take years to obtain.
- A wetlands permit is not required because there are no wetlands on the site.
- e. When will you have the geo tech findings and costs? When will they be available?
- All of the Geotech findings are complete. Cost Estimates have been developed with each design submittal at 15%, 35%, and 65%. The Geotech reports can be found on the project website for reference.
- f. Where will we find the answers to the issues raised today?
- Documents like this one are being prepared and made available online.
- g. 289 students seems arbitrary. How does this reflect the projected population growth for the neighborhood?
- This number is not arbitrary and comes from the Districtwide Educational Specification Facility Utilization Standards based on the number of classrooms and the ideal number of kids that should be in each classroom by grade type. This number is slightly higher than the projected enrollment growth for the school based on cumulative totals when you add up the ideal number of kids per classroom, however, this is based on the need for 12 regular teaching classrooms in the school. The existing school has 11 regular teaching classrooms. The reason for the classroom count increase is to meet the utilization standards for the projected growth.
- h. Is it true that 33% of students are on zone variances?
- A large percentage of the kids attending IVES do come from outside the neighborhood, but this does not mean they are zone exemption students.
- i. What the growth projections are for the area and how other local school populations will change?
- Reference 2040 Land Use Planning Action #5-4, per ASD’s 6-year CIP, July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2027
- j. What is ASD doing to encourage walking to school?
- Clear, safe walkways to the building entrance and additional bike racks to be installed.

# COMMENTS VIA CHAT FROM THE OCT. 9TH, 2021 SPECIAL MEETING

These are comments that were posted to chat during the October 9th Special Meeting, with that video being available on the project website. These comments are provided here for record, without addressing them. Information relevant to these comments is provided within the other sections of this document.

We encourage people to review the briefing and question/answer document which is available at the following website, in addition to other project documents.

The project website is: [www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)

**If project documents do not have comments you have provided, and you wish them to be seen, please submit them to [peters\\_charlie@asdk12.org](mailto:peters_charlie@asdk12.org) and also indicate whether you wish to be identified by name or anonymously.**

**If you do not find an answer to your questions within project documents, please submit your question(s) to [peters\\_charlie@asdk12.org](mailto:peters_charlie@asdk12.org).**

## Aurora

- The current location to the north does NOT shade the playground.

## David McCarthy

- David McCarthy would like to be on the building design committee.
- I am an adjacent property owner directly affected by the egress on the parking lot and current design and shadowing. Your broad statement that all these things were discussed and debated is overly broad and vague. Based on all of these recent concerns and lack of proper notice though the south addition community council I would suggest additional meetings be established to address these concerns and potential cost overruns. When can we plan on an additional follow up meeting and potential changes based on the information provide today and through questions submitted?

## Katie and Mile Reilly

- The current school allows for multiple exit options

## Ken Gutsch and Rebecca Rogers

- Keeping the north site would cost an extra million dollars?? that's the value of just two homes in this neighborhood. Given the scope of this project

## Kim Stone

- First concern: this building is incongruent with the neighborhood. This residential neighborhood consists of one- and two-story homes containing one and two families. I do not believe the character of the neighborhood has changed much since 195 This structure is as inconsistent with the neighborhood now as it would have been when it was originally built. It seems like few Anchorage elementary schools are this height size
- Correct! I believe everyone on this forum wants a successful new school.

## Lois Epstein

- The Building Design Committee also does not include anyone from the neighborhood who does not have children and use the site when school is not in session (dog walking)
- The Community Council agenda is usually too packed to have a substantive discussion like today.
- There's usually the opportunity to apply for a variance to the parking numbers. That seems sensible and warranted for this urban elementary school.

## Martin Hansen

- I had an architect prepare a shadow study. It shows considerably more shadowing on the multi-purpose field. A building on the north end of the school ground does not shadow any of the play areas.
- I have lived next to the school on Inlet Place for thirty-five years. I would like to be on the building design committee.
- Please consider the Inlet View School's immediate neighbors to be the residents and property owners on Inlet Place between 15th Ave and 12th Ave
- We voted for a School Bond to design a school on the same site as the existing school. We understood from the bond language that the new school would have been on the same place at the north end of the property.
- The existing school building survived the 1964 Good Friday Earthquake and the November 20, 2018 earthquake.
- Thank you for putting this meeting together and to all participants. We all want the best possible school for the students.

## Mitch Cullom

- You state that shadow impact is inevitable. That is only true with the building site on the south end of the lot. Also, your shadow model fails to depict the 35' trees on the south end of the property line.

## Mitch Laird

- I would also like to see an extended shadow study

## Petra Wilm

- Many parents and all the teachers have expressed dismay about relocation during construction. It's been a hot topic during the February school tours. Anecdotally I know several families that do not want to start their kids at a school that will relocate them during their primary years.

## Rachael McKinney

- You stated that this design was about the children who attend and use the school. Basing a design based on cost doesn't convey to me that this is really about the children

## Sharon Meacham

- [during school construction] Chugach sent their students to Kennedy on JBER

## Kelly Smith

- The BDC also has a member that lives on M Court.

## Steve

- 2 years of student disruption versus 50 years of a poor building location should be discussed a little more. I was told Denali elementary changed its plans for the building after community input and workshop
- Great idea on the solar panels
- Mechanical rooms are sometimes located on the roofs
- The table notes current enrollment as 215 in one place and 238 in the chart. It doesn't note what the growth projections are for the area and how other local school populations will change
- The parking lot has curves and will be hard for snow removal and cost more and take more time to remove
- This parking lot might work in California
- Yes thank you for doing this

## Patricia Ahrens

- I'll be happy to share more in depth what International Baccalaureate (IB) means. Please feel free to come call and we can schedule a time for you to see the wonderful things our students are doing.

## Carl Jacobs

- ASD School Board: Email all board members: [schoolboard@asdk12.org](mailto:schoolboard@asdk12.org)

## Clyde Carey

- Thank you for the discussion.

## Fran

- Thank you for this forum.

## Jeff Manfull

- Well done

## John Thurber

- Thank you Paul Baril for a very informative presentation

## Lynn Hallquist

- Thank you for spending time with us this morning
- Thank you Patricia! Access and Opportunity to high quality instruction is a primary goal for all

## Margo Bellamy

- ASD schools. Inlet View's IB Program is Amazing!

## Pat Higgins

- Thanks you for this opportunity. It was very informative.

## Rachael McKinney

- Thank you for holding this meeting and allowing the public to address our concerns.

# COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER SPECIAL MEETING

These comments were received via email after the October 9th SACC Special Meeting.

The received comments are provided within this section to act as a record, and are provided with answers. We encourage people to review the briefing and question/answer document which is available at the following website, in addition to other project documents.

The project website is: [www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)

**If project documents do not have comments you have provided, and you wish them to be seen, please submit them to [peters\\_charlie@asdk12.org](mailto:peters_charlie@asdk12.org) and also indicate whether you wish to be identified by name or anonymously.**

**If you do not find an answer to your questions within project documents, please submit your question(s) to [peters\\_charlie@asdk12.org](mailto:peters_charlie@asdk12.org).**

## From: Anonymous

Most concerning to me is the crosswalk from 13th extending through the parking lot and drop-off loop (orange on the photo), meaning that kids walking to school from the east side of L street would need to cross an active parking lot twice a day. Could the lot and drop off loop be moved to the northern half of Inlet place, perhaps utilizing 12th st in order to preserve the safe walking corridor that kids currently have? Many schools in ASD are not safely walkable. That Inlet View IS is a treasure to our community.

- We have looked at various options and aligning the main entry with the crosswalk from 13th Ave. across Inlet Place is a preferred solution, while at the same time, having the drop-off and pick-up with associated parking in front of the main entry is also a preferred solution. Combining these two things together resulted in what the design is today. We have discussed the concern of kids walking through an active parking lot and based on examples of several different school operations with this same setup and the safety a crosswalk with a crossing guard brings, ASD has approved this design.

Second, the shaded playground on the north side of the building will get icy. But hockey rinks are supposed to be icy, right? Could the playground and hockey rink switch? As a teacher myself who has occasionally had classrooms that face the playground, I've always thought a little more distance between the building and the playground is helpful, anyway. Recess is loud!

- The design team is looking at the possibility of rearranging the playground components to address various concerns. Please do note that the current design and placement of the playground is intentionally set back so at its closest point it is 46'-9" away from the north side of the building.

I understand there are municipal, budgetary, and schedule-related reasons for the proposed design, but I hope a few small changes are still possible in order to make the site safer for young kids.

- Changes and revisions to improve the design are still possible as we are only at the 65% design level, so we have 35% design to go until the design is 100% complete. As the project progresses, ASD, the BDC, and the design team are all working to refine the design based on comments received.

## From: Lois Epstein

Mr. Peters - Hello. At this past Saturday's community meeting, we were told that the costs of relocating students for a rebuild on the current school building site was approximately \$1 million and the cost of needed fill for the proposed rebuild site was approximately half that. What is the cost of the water management improvements needed for the proposed building site? That cost should be included when comparing rebuild siting options for an apples to apples comparison. The community has not heard from the ASD contractors what that cost will be.

Can you please get back to me about that? Thank you.

- Based on historical data, to bring in all the relocatable classrooms needed to house students on-site during construction so the existing school could be demolished with a new school constructed, would be approx. \$1M. A cost study

was generated by the design team to determine what the cost would be for needed fill on the south side of the site to place the new school at this location, and this cost was approx. \$500K. The water management improvements discussed for the south side of the site would be needed regardless of if the school is located on the south or on the north side of the site. This is because the permit requirements for the project is to maintain all water drainage on-site, so the cost for the water management improvements was not included in the comparison of costs.

## From: David McCarthy

Where are the shade studies that show the impact on surrounding residence that where discussed?

- The shade studies that were presented at the SACC Special Meeting are posted to the project website for reference ([www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)). In addition to the shadow studies presented, we have provided a video animation of the shadows on and around the school site throughout the year and all the different seasons.

Where can I access digital copies of the 8 addition design concepts that where provided during the meeting?

- The digital copies of the 8 additional site layout concepts that were presented at the SACC Special Meeting are posted to the project website for reference ([www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)).

Do you have recordings or meeting notes from the Building design committee that we can access?

- Yes, agendas and meeting minutes of all the Building Design Committee (BDC) meetings are posted to the project website for reference ([www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)).

What is the update on adding new members to the Building Design Committee?

- Discussion at the special meeting was for the addition of one new BDC member. This is being discussed with the BDC. Once determined, if a new person will be brought on to the BDC this will be discussed with the SACC to determine who this person should be.

What options are there to change the current proposed design?

- We are listening to all comments, suggestions, and questions and evaluating them against existing planning and design process and decisions and evaluating them with project-specific priorities. Decisions to date have been based on thorough assessment and project-specific prioritizations. At the 65% level of design, while it is unlikely that aspects such as building location and its general design will see significant changes, there are many project components that are still being developed and subject to change.

Why should we rush the project with all of these concerns so we can meet the current bond deadline?

- The project is currently following a typical timeline for design, construction documentation, and Municipality of Anchorage permitting and review processes.

Delaying the bond proposal is the best course of action until all of concerns and design issues are meet.

Housing information on a website does not address the current design, impact studies needed and cost issues with the current proposal. The school board finance committee is meeting on the bond proposal. If the design issues are not addressed immediately the only option left would be to delay the bond.

I feel that pursuing this project and bond in its current state just to avoid construction delays would be a sign of negligence based on all of the recent concerns and issues. This is a 50-60 year project and delaying it two years would allow for the time needed to correct all of these deficiencies and involve more community buy-in.

## From: Anonymous

### Drainage

M St has a long history of water problems. Our basements have flooded frequently which has led many of us to install french drains or sump pumps or a combination of both. Even with these measures, we still have flooding issues - depending on the weather.

You and your team indicated that you have studied these issues thoroughly and are planning a mitigation plan that possibly makes it better. I am requesting the sections of your study that addresses the needs of M St specifically be sent to me.

- Proposed drainage improvements include a storm system for all parking and student drop-off areas. The gutters will convey surface run-off to isolated points where the flows will be collected by field inlets or catch basins. Municipal design criteria prohibit increasing discharges to the downstream system; either a detention chamber with a flow control structure, or an infiltration system with bypass piping will be required to maintain the flows generated by the 10-year 24-hour design storm.
- The school bus loop and parking area on the west side of the school will be served by a bioretention pond/rain garden with at least 1,500 sq ft of area. The bioretention facility will be located between the parking area and N Street. An 18-inch CPEP storm drain overflow pipe will be constructed from the pond and connected to the existing municipal storm drain system in N Street (approximately 180' of 18" and 12" pipe.)
- Drainage from the hard play area will be directed to either the open field to the north or into catch basins (2 total) that drain via 18" CPEP storm drain, 140' in length, to the existing municipal storm drain system that bisects the site.
- Drainage from the parking lot and student drop off loop on the east side shall be collected in a 24" CPEP storm drain system that is directed toward the existing municipal storm drain system that bisects the school site. Approximately 200' of 18" and 24" CPEP pipe, six catch basins, and an oil and grit separator will be installed to collect storm water.
- Rain leaders will be installed on the east and west sides (2 total) of the school to collect water from roof drains. These rain leaders will be directed either to the existing storm drain on the west side of the school or the municipal storm drain system on the northside of the school. Approximately 200' of 12" CPEP storm drain will be installed for the rain leaders.

## Drop-off and Pick-up

I raised the concern that some parents will choose to use the M St cul-de-sac to drop off or pick up their children instead of using the designated areas. That type of traffic will present serious difficulties for the M St residents; the street is too small for that type of usage.

Please ensure that the suggestions made regarding ways to close the M St cul-de-sac access will, in fact, be implemented.

- The Design Team is working with ASD and exploring options for fencing to be installed around the M Street Cul-de-sac without any access gates to prevent parents from dropping off and picking up students at this location.

## Visual barrier

A two story building located close to the M St cul-de-sac presents a daunting visual barrier to M St residents. A one-story classroom section is definitely preferable to your current proposal.

Please review possibilities for a fiscally responsible one-story redesign.

- As presented in the special community council meeting on 10/9/21, several options have already been explored that involved where the new school building should be located on the site and also, whether a one-story or two-story design would be best for the school. Through the project's design review process all the pros and cons were assessed and the location on the site and the two-story option were determined to be the preferred option.

## Orientation

Was there a plan for fronting the building on N St with the main entrance around the current hockey rink? If so, I'd like to see those plans. If not, I think it should be considered.

- Yes, site layout options took this into consideration. All the different site layouts that were looked at have been posted to the project website for reference ([www.InletViewReplacement.com](http://www.InletViewReplacement.com)).