

Waverley Elementary School – Feasibility Study

Project No.: 17261.00
Meeting #4

December 14, 2017

Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Present</u>
Jan Hollenbeck	Principal, Waverley Elementary School	jan.hollenbeck@fcps.org	Y
Kathy Prichard	Elementary School Director, FCPS	kathy.prichard@fcps.org	Y
Dawn Worrell	Construction Accountant, FCPS	dawn.worrell@fcps.org	Y
Eric Phillips	Supervisor of AAE, Accelerating Achievement & Equity, FCPS	eric.phillips@fcps.org	Y
Beth Paseirb	Supervisor of Facilities Planning, FCPS	beth.pasierb@fcps.org	Y
Holly Nelson	Facilities Planner, FCPS	holly.nelson@fcps.org	Y
Michael Blake	Principal, Marks Thomas	michaelb@marks-thomas.com	Y
Jennifer Lyon	Senior Associate, Marks Thomas	jenniferl@marks-thomas.com	Y
Ursula Fernandez del Castillo	Project Architect, Marks Thomas	ursulaf@marks-thomas.com	Y

Meeting Notes

Meeting #4 was held to discuss the initial feedback received at the Community Meeting on 12/11/17, and to continue evaluation of the educational assessment and feasibility study options for the project. Attached are the Power Point slides which provide additional context to the meeting discussion and should be viewed in accompaniment to the Meeting Notes outlined below.

Action

- I. **Community Meeting Recap – Feedback, Follow Up Items**
 1. Comments written down on poster boards and discussions from the first Community Meeting were presented to the group. Comments received were organized in the following categories:
 - Building and Arrangement
 - Environment and Site
 - Program & Ed Spec
 - Operations
 - Community
 - Learning
 2. Student thoughts / comments have been scanned and saved for future reference. Posters were provided to Jan for sharing with the Teachers & Parents at the School.
 3. Surveys filled out at Community Meeting – responses will be translated, and the Facilities & Design Team will organize the responses in some way and have them available for evaluation and how they can inform some key components for the design options of the Feasibility Study.
 4. Ideas for organization for Community Meeting #2 will be discussed after this meeting with the Media / PTA group. Community Meeting #2 is scheduled for 1/11, 6pm at Waverley ES Cafeteria, which is the same night as MLK holiday event. It was discussed and agreed upon that it would be best to leave it as is on schedule.

- II. **Educational Assessment – Revised Program Analysis, Organization of 1,000+ School & Two-School Options**
 1. Educational Assessment – team reviewed the updated version of the 725 Student Ed Spec program spreadsheet comparison chart with revisions discussed at previous meeting. Comparison chart represents a more accurate version of the existing Waverley building against the 725 student Ed Spec:

FCPS /
MT

FCPS /
MT



MT

FCPS /
MT

- Existing core Classroom space indicated represents spaces inside the Waverley ES building and not within the non-permanent Portable buildings and Rock Creek building.
 - Numbers in the “Differences” column indicate about a 43,000 GSF deficiency in the overall space required to meet the building size necessary for the 725 Student Ed Spec. Nearly all categories are lower than what the Ed Spec calls for.
 - Parks & Recs programs should be add-alternates in both the 725 and 1,019 schemes.
 - Request for International Office suite of spaces was raised. Facilities team will discuss with Design Team.
2. Discussion of organizational precedents for a 1,000+ student School:
- Team shared two-plan option examples of schools designed for 1,000+ student enrollments – a large wing double-loaded corridor option and a pod-classroom option.

Double-loaded corridor option:

- Double-loaded corridor option allows for wider Corridors which can also be used as Breakout Spaces or Collaborative Learning Areas. This arrangement is more efficient than the pod-classroom option.
- Corridor length is a huge dynamic for youngest students. It is intimidating and can add time to walking, orientation, transitional time, length & depth perception.

Pod-classroom option:

- Pod-classroom arrangements – has a spine corridor with pods feeding off spine which creates separation of classroom groups. This organization breaks down the corridor, which seems like a less intimidating arrangement with the number of classrooms.
- First thought on the pod-classroom scheme is that when there are years with larger grades which would create more separation within the classrooms in these grades – they would be in different pods. There is less flexibility when you arrange classes by grades.
- If there is a pod-classroom example for Elementary Schools that works for young students, it would be good to share and discuss with the group. MT will look into this.

MT

- The limitations on flexibility with the pod-classroom scheme are understandable, but variables of this scheme could be good – perception of the smaller school “house”, “homes” is a good factor.
- It is important to have the Community / Family feel within the Classroom areas – the large corridor option doesn’t achieve that as much as the pod-classroom option does.
- Is there a way to engineer flexibility in the pod-classroom option – by using some of the same sized Administrative spaces that could be changed into an additional Classroom space in the future?
- Design Team should figure out the massing of the design options as part of the Feasibility Study, but it may be nice to see examples of a pod-classroom scheme for Elementary Schools.

MT

Two-school organizational options – operational differences / general comments:

- Grades could be organized into Lower & Upper school categories.



- There would be many considerations to evaluate to arrange the spaces so that operationally they serve all students. There will be additional challenges imposed onto the students with such a large school and especially if it is separated into two school zones within one building. There likely would be a bigger impact and need for Teachers and Administrators to respond.
- A co-principal situation works best when both are aligned philosophically in their teaching methodologies.
- School district is committed to providing services for the Title 1 program (for 400 student enrollments at those age levels). Ability to do this would be more difficult with a 1,000+ student school.
- A delineation between primary and intermediate grade spaces / areas would be challenging – families will want to come together for events.
- One positive of a Pre-K-5 grouping is the mentoring opportunities for students. Older students pair with younger students and can work on skills, collaboration and socialization skills. Their “buddies” are in the same building as their peers – seeing the older students in the halls is very positive.
- A two-school option would also possibly separate grades more. Bringing varying grades together for assemblies and activities would be difficult – grades 2 & 5 at the same time, for example. Arrival / dismissal, fire drills, alternate locations for activities would have to be figured out for a two-school option.
- Consideration for a 1,000+ student school is due to the density of homes, families and students in the area serving the school. There is a need for more seats in neighboring school zones but there is no land to provide to expand those schools.
- If a single large building for 1,000+ students is proposed, all spaces would be provided in just one building as opposed to two buildings on the site. Specialized programs and services are difficult and inefficient to separate into two buildings to serve the same students.
- The School Board asked this project to look at providing a larger school. When design options for both sizes of schools are presented to the Board, they will likely have questions on the larger school’s functionality. All the possible issues are out of the prevue of this group, but the Educational team members should be prepared to discuss pros/cons with the Board in conjunction with the larger school design options developed as part of the Feasibility Study.
- The School Board also asked if two buildings could fit onto the site – both at grades Pre-K-5. The Feasibility Study project was not asked to evaluate this as an option, but we should comment on whether two would fit on the site physically. Multi-story buildings would accomplish this for the larger school enrollment option. Design Team will illustrate these options on a site plan to evaluate feasibility.

FCPS

MT

III. Feasibility Study Options – 725 Student Renovation/ Addition Options

1. Site Design Requirements:



- Building on the west portion of the site (back triangular shaped area) – it is a possibility and is shown in one of the options, but there isn't a good way to accomplish it without touching either one of the two buildings.
 - An outdoor play field, two hard surface play areas and two play areas with equipment are being planned for in the design options.
 - MSDE Guidelines – call for play fields, play areas (hard surface and ones with equipment) – sizes are still TBD.
 - Parking count showing about 100 spaces in the design options – currently Waverley has close to 100 spaces, and they struggle with having enough spaces available. Parking count used at Butterfly Ridge should be sufficient – although they are in the City.
 - Per the City code – we can flag what we deem as what is a “Classroom” and that could increase the parking count number we can plan for (2.5 per Classroom max.) which would help us.
 - With a 725-student school, there would still be enough space on site to add more parking.
2. Option 1 – reuse Gym/Cafeteria portion and central classroom bar with reconfiguration for new interior layouts; provide new Gym, and new 2-story Classroom wing additions.
- Gym is close to the Cafeteria space, which is preferable.
 - Entrance is repositioned on the south elevation down from where it currently sits.
 - SWM will be provided on the north side of the site in one large area.
 - Approx. 9,500sf of demo, 44,500sf of reconfigured/renovated space, 54,000sf new construction.
 - Phasing strategy – demolish first wing, relocate to Rock Creek, swing back to renovated Classroom area / new addition; work on Cafeteria / Gym space while relocating to swing space or a dining Portable.
 - Est. 2 years of constr. w/ disruption to existing driveways.
 - 12-room Portables – it could be tight but possible.
 - Look at Rock Creek closer as how it could be used.
 - Question posed to Jan: would the school rather do 1 year of uncomfortable or 2 years of an occupied renovation?
Response: It would make more sense to stay put in Waverley building and build over Rock Creek on that side of the property...but that may not be an option. Less disruption to instruction & learning.
 - Design Team to look at Waverley reno/add and Rock Creek reno/add – look at construction staging, phasing, cost, etc.
 - Location of Gym – sticking out too much, but don't “design” as part of this exercise.
 - Scheme doesn't look like it would serve the purpose we discussed – tough visual – looks like 5 Support Service areas with some that look smaller than a regular Classroom – they would need to know what would go in those program spaces.
 - This option used the Butterfly Ridge Ed Spec that had the additional Title 1 Support Services spaces.
 - In continued development of this option it may be helpful to see what spaces want to be paired next to those classroom spaces – Design Team should look at the Butterfly Ridge plan for these adjacencies. Holly will provide current plan.

MT

FCPS

MT

MT /
FCPS



- MT
- We will be looking at varying MEP systems and options depending on design options, sizes of renovation vs. addition areas – will be evaluated with each scheme.
 - Classroom area to remain – large center corridor area could be revitalized into some of the 21st Century initiatives that have been talked about.
 - Showing two entries – Community & School. Separate entry is important. Security aspect of it would be important to figure out.
- FCPS
- Possibly bring Dir. of Security to future meeting to discuss thoughts on options for the entry. We may want to enter in to one spot, then divide out when in a secure vestibule.
- HN
- Holly to send us Butterfly Ridge floor plan and space analysis from CD's. Computer Labs are going away and being converted to other learning spaces...maker space or flex learning / student support.
3. Option 2 – demolish both ends of building, reuse central Classroom space and reconfigure for new interior layout; building new 2-story Classroom wing and new Cafeteria / Gym.
- Approx. 32,500sf of demo, 21,500sf of reconfigured/renovated space, 76,500sf new construction.
- MT
- Hard surface play court should be located by the Gym. Play equipment courts should be located by the Classrooms – one could be put on the south end of the reconfigured wing.
 - This option represents a likely 2-year construction, which would be the most disruptive option. This plan will require the most orchestration to deal with shuffling spaces & people around.
 - Plan will have to use Rock Creek for swing Classroom spaces or more Portables will have to be placed on site. In the second year, the existing Cafeteria & Gym block of the building would be demolished.
 - Logistics would need to be determined for the student access to play fields.
 - The service drive could be relocated to the front of the building with relocation of the two types of play areas.
 - This option possibly does not have the best arrangement of Classrooms – some similar grade Classrooms are split up between floors.
- MT
- The Computer Lab & Media could be flipped, and two Music Rooms could be needed.
 - The Gym is located far from the Classrooms.
4. General Comments – 725 Student Renovation / Addition Options
- Both options are trying to not touch the Rock Creek building so the plans become linear in layout. The goal of both options is to preserve the Rock Creek building for use as swing space during construction.
- MT
- Due to site limitations, the Gym is far from the Classrooms in both options. Design Team will note this in our Report.
 - Relocate students to Rock Creek and Portables, then ultimately demolish the Rock Creek building.
 - Option for using both buildings for the 1,019-enrollment scheme is not out of the question yet.
- MT
- Exploration into renovating the Rock Creek building has not yet been explored. These schemes do look at using a portion of both buildings in some manner. Design Team should evaluate (not design per se) reuse of Rock Creek. It is about the same square footage – issues and challenges with this building could be identified. It is a different part of the site with possibly different constraints.



- School district would not do a mid-year opening of a new school – timing of design & construction would have to be set to accomplish a Fall (August) opening.

IV. **Feasibility Study Options – 725 Student Replacement Options**

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| MT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Option 1 – replacement school (non-prototype), 725 students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not impact Waverley building footprint. - New ground floor is approx. 66,000sf, second floor is approx. 31,500sf. - Site building about 50' away from existing building for buffer from construction activities. |
| MT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eliminate the loop driveway & parking for the construction work. Design Team will develop diagrams for construction staging. - Art Classrooms should be spread out around the building – not preferred to show both on second floor. Computer Lab will possibly be removed due to Rock Creek final designs (see above). |
| MT / FCPS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Option 2 – replacement school (non-prototype). 725 students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not impact Waverley building footprint. - New ground floor is approx. 64,000sf, second floor is approx. 33,500sf. - Consider Shaffer Drive to become the more prominent arrival street to the school site. This option particularly connects more to that direction visually. - This option would also keep the central loop that serves Waverley now in tack during construction. |
| MT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New parking could be reconfigured so that it isn't the first thing seen when one enters the site. Areas between parking and driveway can also be planned to have bio-retention areas and landscaping to provide a more welcoming appearance. |
| MT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option could put the last few Classrooms on wings on the double-loaded corridor side to shorten the wings up. There is a possibility to connect the ends. Plans should show this option as more compact and efficient. - Comparably, the first new building option seems more efficient – shorter corridor distances. - There seems to be the potential for more wasted space in this option, due to the odd angle which responds to the site. The center area could have a feature stairway or a shared collaboration space, a pre-function space for the Gym, or more Media space. - This concept may yield a larger school (1,019) could be fit in this location / orientation strategy. - Security methods in this option may not be as preferable as in Option 1. |
| MT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. General Comments – 725 Replacement Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Due to site configuration, shape, and access points, it is important thing to show is there are a few options that the site can accommodate with a new building, whether in a 725 or 1,019 enrollment option. - What can't be changed are the boundaries of the site. Per our meeting with the Planning Department, they recommended not building too much outside of the building footprints that are in place now. Option 2 could have a more Pod style approach. - Both options would be more of a 1.5-year process – 1 of real site disruption, and half a year of lingering site work and demo at the beginning of the project. |



V. Comments / Questions

- MT 1. Pedestrian friendly nature of the school community should be maintained in all design options. After the redistricting occurs, most of the walkers to the school would be coming from the top two triangular ends of the site.
- MT 2. In general, to describe overall site development, show one option closer to the driveway, show one closer to the back of the site – to show the differing site options available. The building itself doesn't matter, but rather to show the two site impacts / construction disturbances, etc. Building closer to the drive would be more pedestrian friendly appearing.
- MT 3. Look at one option where the Rock Creek building gets utilized.
4. It is the opinion that Option 1 in the Renovation/Addition possibility with the reuse of the Kitchen/Cafeteria/first Classroom wing is the best. This will be the baseline to compare to with renovation/addition option to the Rock Creek building.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for **January 4, 2018 from 1:30-3:30pm** at the FCPS Central Office Board Room. Meeting topics to include initial design options for all the 1,019 enrollment options – renovation/addition, new construction and a combined building.

The above is our interpretation of discussions held on this date. Anyone wishing to add to or otherwise correct these notes must notify our office in writing within seven (7) days of receipt.

Respectfully submitted,



Jennifer Lyon, AIA, NCARB
Project Manager

Cc: All Attendees

Additional FCPS Staff & Admin:

Mary Jo Richmond, Ana Mejia, Randy Connaster, Brian Staiger, Glenn Fogle, Richard Gue, Rick McTighe, John Veronie, Sandra Fox, Tonya Street, Gloria Mikolajczyk

Design Team Consultants:

Shawn Benjaminson – Adtek Engineers; Patty Nyikos – Nyikos Associates; Jeff Teagarden & Rose Rodriguez – Adtek Engineers; Farshad Kassiri, Abbas Lohrasbi, Kevin Matthai, Chris Sachs, Ryan Masters – Kibart M/E/P Engineers; Bill Richardson & Scott Boyd – Educational Systems Planning

