

Waverley Elementary School – Feasibility Study

Project No.: 17261.00
Meeting #6

January 18, 2018

Attendees

Name	Company	Email	Present
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
Randy Connaster	Maint. Project Manager IV, Maintenance & Operations, FCPS	randall.connatser@fcps.org	Y
Eric Phillips	Supervisor of AAE, Accelerating Achievement & Equity, FCPS	eric.phillips@fcps.org	Y
Ana Mejia	Community Liason at Waverley ES	ana.mejia@fcps.org	Y
Mary Jo Richmond	Supervisor of Media Services, FCPS	maryjo.richmond@fcps.org	Y
Brian Staiger	Senior PM, FCPS Construction	brian.staiger@fcps.org	Y
Gloria Mikolajczyk	School Facilities Architect Supervisor, MSDE	Gloria.Mikolajczyk@maryland.gov	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 #6 was held to discuss comments and feedback received at the 1/11/18 Community Meeting #2, review miscellaneous follow up items, updated 1,019 schemes, as well as construction phasing and swing space strategies. 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. **Project Overview**
 1. Schedule – past midway point of study process. Held 50% Community Meeting last week. In the refine concepts phase of the study; prep for Final Report.
- II. **1/11/18 Community Meeting**
 1. **Recap of Community Meeting:**
 - Overview of redistricting process, how new Butterfly Ridge will impact Waverley student enrollment.
 - Brief overview of some of the study options. Walked through terms for each option for clarity.
 - Shared options with Community – Replacement (725, 1019), Reno/Addition to Waverley (725, 1019), Reno/Addition to Rock Creek (725), Combine Building w/ Reno/Addition (1019). Large posters pinned up in the Cafeteria with Feasibility Study Team members manning stations and discussing options and answering questions and comments.
 2. **Review of Community feedback, overall response:**
 - Posters were left at the school so attendees to the PTA Meeting the following day could view and discuss. Ana will collect posters.
 - Feedback topics:
 - Building Layout
 - Implications of 2 story building – difficult for teachers to maneuver with mobile carts

FCPS



- Compact floor plan provides for better access for Special Ed teaching.
- Bigger area may need more surveillance.
- Smaller ground floor footprint will not make building feel like a High School.
- Larger building could lead to too many students in the future.
- Adequate Community Use space.
- Adult restrooms in all parts of the school.
- Site Plan
 - Location of building in proximity to surrounding houses – adequate distance away for safety, sound.
 - Parking close to street rather than far into site.
 - Building at back of site would be more of a distance for walkers from East.
 - Outdoor congregation space – play and evacuation areas.
 - Green space vs. hardscape surfaces.
 - Play field at back of site away from entrance drive.
- Process Comments / Questions
 - Redistricting – fears of being relocated.
 - Length of Construction – the shorter the better.
 - Costs – cheaper to build new?
 - When do Rock Creek students get relocated, where are they going?
- Question Responses – from 49 people
 - Larger school preferred.
 - Replacement school preferred.
 - Not worthwhile to reuse existing buildings – construction time could be longer.
 - Locate building back towards homes.
 - Parking near the street is preferred.
 - Parking near the street is preferred.
- Final Community Meeting – will share recommendation of option. Meeting is more of a public information meeting to inform community of what this groups recommendation to the board will be. Info on where /when opportunity to voice opinions will be given at the meeting. Folks can comment to the board on the recommendation after the study is completed.

III. Feasibility Study Options

1. Miscellaneous Follow Up Items:

- Classroom test fit study – Rock Creek building & classrooms for possible swing space or if renovation option:
 - Top option example is for use as swing space. If RC vacates at the end of year 0, and we need to move Waverley into swing space into summer of year 0, will there be time to do renovations to swing space in the time? What time is involved in this option? Clean, paint, take out central partition or fold it back. Concern of clean up would take more than month based on what will be left behind by RC. Building is from 1974, accumulation of stuff over 40 years. Be realistic on time needed for turnover. Need to know more about what needs to be done to be able to use space as swing space? Marks Thomas noted that purpose of diagram was to see if space could function as a classroom space for temporary use. If it is not functional as a classroom, it would likely would be a non-starter.

MT /
FCPS



MT

- How many classrooms would we get out of RC? 14. Would still need some portables. Advantage would be to limit the number of new portables brought to site.
 - On paper, swing space would function. With only 14 classrooms inside would still mean more portables would be necessary. Cost should be included in Study. It's do-able, yes, but time, possible cost, and portables would still be necessary.
 - Some students would be on north side of site, some on south side of site – students on two parts of site would be difficult and not ideal.
 - As a comparable example, moving Frederick High – was a long process. Started before school year ended – purging and packing. With a High School, there are different items, but still was an older building. The process of relocating and moving is all temporary for a better result. If it was all planned out, teachers felt supported in the process.
 - Has it been explored to use Hillcrest portables or even use those at another site? Moving students to clear out entire site. There are 17 portables at Waverley already. Hillcrest portables support 500 students. More portables would have to be added to Hillcrest if using that as a swing site. Not a convenient thing to do, but it has benefits to having the open site.
 - On start date of construction – have anticipated enrollment to make proper analysis. On our options, identify how many classrooms would be needed for each option. Total projected to be 613 – 9/30/18. We will need 9/2021 projection number - Beth will provide us the number. Rock Creek will be vacated in the Spring of 2021. Having the Staff lists from both schools may help in this study. Redistricting will also play into this enrollment number. Beth can get us the study of district buildings.
- Bottom option example is if we were to use RC building for the future permanent school.

BP

BP

2. Present updated schemes:

- 1,019 Waverley Building Renovation / Addition – with “L” shaped classroom wing:
 - Previous option was large building on site and very linear with a long travel distance. Main reason to preserve Rock Creek for potential swing space.
 - Refined option turns wing towards south and RC building. Very close to RC building (may have to tear some down), does make entrance better. Preserves lane behind building. Fire code is what is referenced in IBC and NFPA. Max distance from one lane to the other in a sprinklered building cannot be more than 450’.
 - On the interior plan side, it may not solve what is trying to be achieved. Longest travel distance would be 525’. Current longest travel distance in Waverley building is 280’.
- 1,019 Replacement Building – with split primary and intermediate classroom wings:
 - Previous option – discussion asked if each side of building could have classrooms with common areas in middle.
 - The larger building can fit, with preservation of Waverley building.
 - There could be multiple ways to lay interior out.
 - PreK, K, 1 can fit in one wing, 2-5 can fit in the other wing in a 2-story addition.



- Revised option shows that there is a lot of square footage for spaces fighting for the front entry space, but that is part of the challenge for a building of this size.
- Possibly a long service drive, but more study could shorten it with relocating Kitchen.
- Mentoring opportunities – splitting grades up – may be lost in this option.
- Beth commented about presenting floor plans in final Report - at this point we aren't designing the school. Probably only site plans w/ general spaces labeled would be necessary. We don't want to illicit conversation about design details. The presentation discussion needs to be about the size of school, the layout on the site. Marks Thomas noted that the plans for us are to be comfortable to say that a layout with the required program spaces and sizes could work. MT to add distances for corridors on the diagrams for information.
- Holly wondered if we could create a house feeling by floor? For instance, primary grades on first floor, secondary grades on second floor – could still have own identity on each floor. This was done on one of the previous examples. Marks Thomas noted that there are almost twice as many classrooms for upper grades - stacking to the primary grades is the challenge.

MT

IV. Presentation of construction phasing and swing space strategies

1. Option 1 – Replacement, 725 Students:
 - 150 parking spaces possible around proposed construction area.
 - Goal should be to preserve pathway from SW neighborhood houses for walking to school.
2. Option 2 – Replacement, 725 Students:
 - Preserves full drive loop. Back parking lot is built on by new building.
 - No field space available during construction except at north triangle.
 - Sequence standpoint is to demo RC entirely.
 - Larger construction area due to location of new building.
 - Parking: 45, 64, 74. MT to confirm numbers.
3. Option 1 – Renovation / Addition at Waverley, 725 Students:
 - Add portables, due to demo of lower wing (Classrooms – 8 classrooms). Would need 8 portables and possibly more if enrollment goes up.
 - Location of proposed 8 may not work due to existing portables (not on photo) and site sloping. MT to review.
 - Limit on number of portables on a site? County – considers them permanent because they don't know length of use for SWM reason. If construction period is defined, they would look at differently as it would be temporary.
 - Phase 1 – should be to demo RC, and allow space to bring in more portables, temp play areas, etc. to give more space to work with rather than demo in Phase 4.
 - “8 Classrooms” doesn't include smaller spaces used as classrooms, some offices, guidance...additional room would be needed, not just 8 new portables.
 - Moving Phase 1 to Phase 4 - site wouldn't be cleared until late winter. Would be ready for Spring '22. It would push Waverley reno work out another year.
 - Both versions of this option could end up having the longest construction schedule.

MT

MT

MT

MT

MT



- Demoing RC at end in order for it to be available to use in Phase 3 for cafeteria/gym space.
 - MT noted that these diagrams are trying to illustrate a sequence, they don't represent all the possible concerns. Sometimes these studies prove what will not work.
 - Facility design team needs to be comfortable to describe the process and concerns on logistics with phasing. The State requires us to look at all options. Point is to show them it's feasible. Know how many months it would take. For them to be able to make a decision, decision would be to agree with which category to move forward with.
 - Renovating dining in an occupied building – people ideally should be out of the school completely during this work, and bring in catering or relocate.
 - Advantage for having open space at entry of site would allow for a more suitable portable layout to occur.
 - Phase 3 loses more classrooms, lose media, admin. Phase 1 builds new classrooms and media to make up for that loss.
 - 8 options, present 4. Let's eliminate some options so our team doesn't do more work than necessary.
 - Gloria – can show the State an option that doesn't work to describe the full process.
 - Beth – thinks this option is more of a 5-Phase, 3-year. Split Phase 3 up to not disrupt everything.
 - If we include this as one of the options, its disingenuous to say it is one of the options due to these issues.
 - Add in actions of things that must occur in each of the Phasing highlights would help for evaluation.
 - This option – show RC is not useable, space is used for portables. Show cost of moving portables in.
 - Another option would be to fully move to RC (and prep RC), add portables, school relocates to south of site so all of Waverley side of site is building area for less Phases. This would only work for 725 option.
 - Include time to demo RC – 3-6 months. Brian can get us info on similar projects. 1-2 months for clean out; 1-2 months for abatement; 1-2 months for demo. Regrading / misc. site cleanup work = how long?
4. Option 1 – Renovation / Addition at Rock Creek, 725 Students:
- Preserve half of entry loop, rear parking lot.
 - Express in option extent and description of demolition – what it means – as opposed to just generalizations.
 - Construction schedule – our estimation may be on target at 18-24 months.
 - Nice thing with this option – no one in this building to work around.
 - How does this get done w/ SWM requirements? Civil said fitting it on the North would not be an issue. Get Shawn & original project designer on phone to discuss how SWM will work during construction as well as after.
5. Option 1 – Replacement, 1,019 Students:
- Preserve half of entry loop and rear Parking Lot.
 - Could driveway be used for busses in some way?
6. Option 2 – Replacement, 1,019 Students:
- No play field areas available during construction.
7. Option 3 – Replacement, 1,019 Students:
- Play field area available, but very less parking available.
 - Add in GSF – new, reno, demo – on all exhibits.
 - Relook at parking by portables – 40 spaces are more like 12. Can fit 10 on pavement towards north.

MT,
FCPS

MT

MT

MT

MT

BS,
MT

MT

MT,
FCPS

MT
MT



- To provide parking, we could try to use spaces on entry driveway, however in current travel directions, it's not wide enough. School could make it a one-way, because it's on our property.
 - 8. Option 1 – Combined Buildings, 1,019 Students:
 - Schedule should be adjusted – Phase 1, then moving kids in year, takes time. Schedule would have to be added to.
 - Putting Phase 3 into Phase 2 would give back an area for parking and play.
 - Phase 1 would take 18 months. Take 6 months to move. Phase 2/3 after.
- MT
- MT
- MT
- V. Final Thoughts:
1. Prior to next meeting – one pager of each option to Feasibility Team for review. Goal at next meeting is to get the options off the table to talk more seriously about the ones in the running and then the ones most appropriate.
 2. Cost modelling should be received by then to include in our discussion. Cost estimates including the 40-year life cycle may not be available for next meeting, but we will see what we can do.
- MT
- MT

Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for **February 1, 2018 from 2:00-4:00pm** at the FCPS Central Office Board Room. Meeting topics to include feedback from Community Meeting #2 as well as refinement of presented design options thus far.

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:

Glenn Fogle, Richard Gue, Rick McTighe, John Veronie, Sandra Fox, Tonya Street

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

