

## Waverley Elementary School – Feasibility Study

Project No.: 17261.00  
Meeting #8

February 15, 2018

### Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Present</u>
Jan Hollenbeck	Principal, Waverley Elementary School	<a href="mailto:jan.hollenbeck@fcps.org">jan.hollenbeck@fcps.org</a>	Y
Kathy Prichard	Elementary School Director, FCPS	<a href="mailto:kathy.prichard@fcps.org">kathy.prichard@fcps.org</a>	Y
Randy Connaster	Maint. Project Manager IV, Maintenance & Operations, FCPS	<a href="mailto:randall.connatser@fcps.org">randall.connatser@fcps.org</a>	Y
Ana Mejia	Community Liason at Waverley ES	<a href="mailto:ana.mejia@fcps.org">ana.mejia@fcps.org</a>	Y
Mary Jo Richmond	Supervisor of Media Services, FCPS	<a href="mailto:maryjo.richmond@fcps.org">maryjo.richmond@fcps.org</a>	Y
Brian Staiger	Senior PM, FCPS Construction	<a href="mailto:brian.staiger@fcps.org">brian.staiger@fcps.org</a>	Y
Beth Paseirb	Supervisor of Facilities Planning, FCPS	<a href="mailto:beth.pasierb@fcps.org">beth.pasierb@fcps.org</a>	Y
Holly Nelson	Facilities Planner, FCPS	<a href="mailto:holly.nelson@fcps.org">holly.nelson@fcps.org</a>	Y
Michael Blake	Principal, Marks Thomas	<a href="mailto:michaelb@marks-thomas.com">michaelb@marks-thomas.com</a>	Y
Jennifer Lyon	Senior Associate, Marks Thomas	<a href="mailto:jenniferl@marks-thomas.com">jenniferl@marks-thomas.com</a>	Y
Ursula Fernandez del Castillo	Project Architect, Marks Thomas	<a href="mailto:ursulaf@marks-thomas.com">ursulaf@marks-thomas.com</a>	Y

### Meeting Notes

Meeting #8 was held to discuss to review several follow up items including updated cost estimates and phasing for the Renovation / Addition to the Waverley Building as well as discussing the evaluation criteria for the Design Options. 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 – project is nearing completion of the Concept Refinement stage, and development of the final Feasibility Study Report is in progress.
2. In about another month, the Report documents will be complete to submit to the Board prior to the mid-April BOE Meeting and Presentation.

#### II. Follow Up Items

1. Alternate Phasing for Renovation / Addition to Waverley Building:
  - a. Use of Rock Creek building and portables during construction. As this option (for both school sizes) poses the most interruption for students and staff on site during construction, it was evaluated how to reuse the RC building with the addition of portables for temporary swing space for length of construction timeline.
  - b. Per the revised site plan with alternate phasing (for both 725 & 1,019):
    - Phase 1 would include cleaning & repainting RC, moving FFE items over from Waverley to RC. Activity would have to take place during summer break. Portables would need to come on line in new location during the summer as well (whether relocate from Waverley side of site or bring in all new). If all new units are provided, that work *could* start prior to the end of the school year to help save time.
    - Phase 2 would be the large effort of gutting and renovating the Waverley building, including working on the new addition areas. Site work on the Waverley side of the site would take place.



- Once the new Waverley building is completed and occupied, Phase 3 would include demolishing the RC building, the portables, and then the remainder of the site work on the RC side of the site.
  - All would take place over a 20-26-month timeline. This is a 12-month improvement over the previous, 5-phase scheme. By using RC and portables the Waverley Building and that side of site would be clear and empty for uninterrupted construction activity.
  - Construction staging would likely happen at the back of the site (west end). This will impede the use of the space as a Play Field. The possibility of still clearing and using the future park site across the street should be explored (during design/construction) as an alternate option if this was to move forward.
  - Per the swing space plan of the RC building, there are 12 core classroom spaces available inside the building. Per the temporary use classroom plan, 24 students could fit in each classroom, which yields 288 students.
  - Portables would be necessary. 17 would provide space for 408 students (24 students on average per building). Jan concurred that each building typically holds 22-26 students.
  - In total, 696 students could be supported with this amount of space, which seems sufficient per the 10-year projections Holly provided the team earlier in the week (range is between 660-690 students for the two-year span).
  - Supplemental program spaces appear to fit inside the RC building. Exact space uses should be explored during design / construction (Art classroom may be used as a “Movement Room” currently). Space accounted for at the Cafeteria may need to be lessened as sides are also a hallway space. MT noted that is also how we counted the overall Cafeteria space in the Waverley building as a comparison.
  - Program not apparent in the RC building is a space for the Media Center. MT noted this may need to be provided for use by Waverley in the form of an open space portable (4-building).
  - Kathy noted that elementary schools use the Media Center spaces as a Specials class – so it will be necessary. If it is provided as a portable, placing it on site near one of the classroom corridor exit doors would be preferable for connectivity. An overhead roof covering could be built outside for weather coverage. The 4-room portable at Hillcrest would be available to possibly make this work.
  - Regarding placement of the portables on site – configuration like what is currently provided for at Waverley would need to be provided. Min. separation distance is 20’ as the buildings are not sprinklered. Process of relocating buildings could fit in a 45-day span. Everything could be included (footings, new skirting, new decks, ramps), however utility set up should be in place prior as that effort could be the critical time factor. New footings and utilities on the RC side of the site could start while school was still in session during the spring.
- c. Updated cost estimate for Renovation / Addition to Waverley.
- Phasing premium and swing space are variables that could add more cost to the project for both school sizes.



MT

- Holly asked about the same cost of the swing space for the different school sizes. But, seeing as they have the same student projection they don't have different needs for additional swing space temporarily.
- Jan expressed concern that there won't be enough space for all the students between the classrooms and portables. 5 teachers per grade level + 3 PreK teachers. Jan & Kathy counted 33 teachers (which is really the baseline for number of classrooms necessary), not including EL or SPED & Specials classes. Goal is to have classrooms with 22 or less students through the Title 1 program (in Kindergarten). Likely, more than the 17 portables existing on site now will be needed. For the projected students during the construction timeline, a total of 34 classrooms and a Media Center space will be needed (4-5 additional / new portables over the 17 that could be brought over from Waverley). Jan's calculation for students next year (2018-2019 is 612 students).

MT

- Should all the portables be placed together? Ideally, the portables would be used by the older grades, allowing for the PreK and K to use the classrooms inside the building. Clusters of portables around the RC building would be ok.

NT

- (2) additional spaces for extra planning and program space, EL and SPED would be needed. The cost should be added for the extra spaces should be included in every scenario (there are 9 teachers sharing one space for these needs currently – it is doable, but not ideal). 3-4 groups of students use the "swing space" classrooms available at any given time (in current portables).
- Eric asked if the sloped areas on the site (north and south ends) could be used for construction lay-down. As these areas will be used for SWM infrastructures, it won't be likely. Holly will discuss the construction space needs in these options with Brian.
- Pool area inside the RC building would be blocked off and not used for safety. Costs are not included for any work in this space as filling in the pool even temporarily is not worthwhile.

## 2. Discussion of priorities / recommendations from Team member's perspectives:

- a. Holly requested feedback from FCPS Team for their priorities in evaluating the Design Options:
  - Capacity of school.
  - Construction timing - 24 months or less preferable (which is the time that is allotted in their CIP schedule now).
  - Construction operations (space for staging on the site, minimizing the disruption to students to keep the educational process intact).
  - Minimize disruption to students.
  - Educational adequacy. Correct number, size, adjacency of spaces to meet the required program.
  - Longevity of the building systems: do the walls and roofs need replacing in the future? Is Option less favorable if so?
  - Are all the site amenities provided?
  - Overall cost.



HN / MT

- Future Expansion (725 enrollment only). Should the need arise in the future for portables to be placed on site. Is there space on site for them? Site layout evaluation accounts for time during construction and the future.
- Environmental impact: minimal grading and tree removal.
- Building accessibility: maintenance and support vehicles.
- Energy efficiency and daylighting: which option maximizes them?
- Security issues should be a separate priority. Renovation options could pose additional concerns for site lines or security or if placement of additions is such that security and visualization is not as straightforward.
- Operation of the building – limit way building can operate. This is included within the educational adequacy priority. Items such as bus and car drop off location, long walks inside the building to the nurse or Gym/Cafeteria.
- Longevity of building systems (in a Renovation option) should be highlighted in one of the priorities. Comment on energy efficiency in the Renovation options: windows and doors will be replaced, but maybe not the roof. Existing exterior walls don't have insulation so that could be impactful on the building's functionality.

HN / MT

MT

- b. Holly then evaluated the criteria for each Option in a graphic chart:
- Holly wants the Report to explain why the Renovation only option was eliminated directly: there is no 725 students would fit into the existing Waverley Building at its current size.
  - The new phasing shown now makes the Renovation to Waverley option 20-26 months long. Brian indicated it doesn't if it is going to take more time than the summer to move WB students into RC.
  - Jan says it took them a solid week to move the (2) PreK classrooms to RC.
  - Would a delay mean more cost? 6-8 months initial to start or 28-34 months overall?
  - Demolition work and process should be included into the project timeline so we are comparing the disruptions of the school community better.
  - Replacement option timing is shorter than Renovation options.
  - Construction Operations in Renovations are challenging. Brian noted there won't be enough room for staging and construction while renovation process is ongoing without demolishing RC. There will be job trailers, parking for contractors and maintaining operations at Waverley. Construction can start from the back and progressively move to the front of the site.

MT

- It may be necessary to show both the project timeline and construction timeline for the RC swing space option – to help explain how long it would take to get portables and the inside of the building readied for Waverly's use.
- Educational adequacy: RC Renovation as better adjacencies than Waverley Renovation, although the class shape is not ideal.
- Beth asked if the size of the building limits our choice of replacing mechanical systems or installing & maintaining them correctly. MT noted that this is described in our draft Report. Renovation options have higher life cycle costs for bldg. systems than a Replacement because of those existing building condition issues to have to work around.



- MT
    - Burdens of having a renovated building should be reflected in the cost or evaluation in some way. Indicate possible trade-offs and inconveniences. Operation / Maintenance issues.
  - MT
    - Evaluations of the Life Cycle Cost, Design of Building Systems Cost, and possible Compromises Needed should be indicated somewhere in the Report.
  - MT
    - It should be indicated that it will be difficult to place the portables in the future in the RC Renovation option.
  - HN  
HN / MT
    - Holly will divide chart into sections (construction, use, future possibilities).
    - Indicate if the design option is a rigid layout or does it accommodate future educational flexibility? Indicate that the building is sized and built for the size indicated and that a building expansion size or cost were not built in to the options. Beth noted that whatever direction the BOE decides, expansions won't be planned for. If neighborhood expansion continues after the new building is open, then portables may be necessary 10, 15 years down the line.
  - MT
    - Options should mention access around the building as recommended by the fire marshal.
- c. Beth indicated that we will request that the Board decides on the size of the school (725 or 1,019) and when they do they wouldn't want to add portables to it in the future.
- d. 1019 Options:
- HN / MT
    - Jan says we should include transition times and adjacencies as a "con" or possible scoring factor in the priorities in a school this size (include in the line about operational effectiveness).
- e. How do we score these criteria? Colors? Numbers?
- f. Judy Center & International Office: Judy Center is for the Waverley school. The International Office could be relocated during construction. If both are moved off site, coordination as to how families will gain access to those services during the temporary displacement will have to be worked out.

### III. Feasibility Study Report

#### 1. Review progress draft of Report:

##### a. Updated Program provided by FCPS:

- Now includes 2 full size Music Rooms w/ 2 Storage Rooms – correct.
- Gym square footage will now include Spectator Area space – correct.
- Computer program is now called "STEAM Instruction" with 2 spaces – correct.
- SPED Resource Rooms (2) are now 840sf with bathrooms – correct.
- (1) Math Intervention room at 840sf – correct.
- (2) Calming Rooms at 200sf ea. – correct.
- No Sensory Rooms – correct.
- Community Resource spaces now include (2) Restrooms, (1) 800sf Parent Resource Room and (1) Family Literacy Program – correct.



- International Suite alternate becomes 1,500sf – correct.
  - Overall the 725 student school increases by about 3,000sf – correct. MT noted that almost all of this additional program would want to be located on the ground floor of the building for proper adjacencies.
  - Overall the 1,019 student school decreases by about 3,000sf – correct.
- MT b. Program Space summary spreadsheets in the Report – revise so that 725 and 1,019 columns are side by side – reformat spreadsheet. Beth also requested that the differences in the 1,019 programs be highlighted in some way so they stand out.
- MT c. In the Report, revise any mention of “School District” to say, “school system”.
- MT d. 10-year enrollment projection provided by FCPS – use as a planning guide for swing space options only, don’t publish data in our Report.
- MT e. Appendix – include Community Engagement, Meeting Notes, Alta Survey. Anything already published on the FCPS website for the project doesn’t need to be in the Appendix.
- MT f. MT will continue to update and complete the draft Report, and follow up with Holly regarding any further clarification items or questions.

#### IV. Items to confirm at next Meeting

- MT / HN 1. Presentation Date and Recommendation to Board of Education:
- a. Submit materials (Report document) to Board by 3/21.
  - b. Presentation date will be Wed. 4/11, likely in the evening.
    - Report
    - Slide Presentation (Powerpoint), including staff report and any attachment
    - Holly will prepare a cover sheet – attach Feasibility Study Report & Powerpoint
- MT 2. Information to be presented at 3/8 Community Meeting:
- Updates to the Question responses from Community Meeting #2 – Holly provided additional forms with responses. MT will evaluate and update the data from the responses.

#### Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, February 27, 2018 from 1:00-3:00pm** at the FCPS Central Office Board Room. Meeting agenda to include review of final cost estimates and evaluation criteria, and to make selection of options to present at the next Community Meeting and to the Board of Education for our study recommendations.

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:**

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

**Design Team Consultants:**

Patty Nyikos – Nyikos Associates; Shawn Benjaminson, 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

