

## Waverley Elementary School – Feasibility Study

Project No.: 17261.00  
Meeting #9

February 27, 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
Eric Phillips	Supervisor of AAE, Accelerating Achievement & Equity, FCPS	<a href="mailto:eric.phillips@fcps.org">eric.phillips@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
Dawn Worrell	Construction Accountant, FCPS	<a href="mailto:dawn.worrell@fcps.org">dawn.worrell@fcps.org</a>	Y
Gloria Mikolajczyk	School Facilities Architect Supervisor, MSDE	<a href="mailto:Gloria.Mikolajczyk@maryland.gov">Gloria.Mikolajczyk@maryland.gov</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 #9 was held to discuss additional responses received from Community Meeting #2; review the evaluation criteria and matrix for each design option; and to listen to each team member's thoughts and opinions on each design option. 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 the end of the Feasibility Study process. Development of the final Feasibility Study Report is in progress.
2. The presentation to the Board of Education will be on 4/11/18, likely at 6pm. Time will be confirmed. This meeting will be open to the public.
3. Holly will be taking the Executive Summary and Recommendation sections of the Report to the Cabinet on 3/19.
4. Final Report and recommendation will be submitted to the BOE around 3/21.

#### II. Community Input

1. Additional Community and Staff Comments:
  - a. Updated responses from community members at Community Meeting #2 were received and evaluated. A total of 80 responses are now tallied:
    - A large school is preferred.
    - A replacement school is preferred.
    - Location of the building back by the homes is preferred more than locating it closer to the street.
    - Parking – location preference is split.
    - A two-story building is preferred (with a more compact floor plan).



### III. Evaluation of Options

#### 1. Updated Criteria:

##### a. Educational Goals:

- Capacity: option provides the required capacity.
- Educational Adequacy: the option allows for the correct number, size, and adjacency of rooms to meet the required educational program.
- Daylighting: option maximizes access to daylight in instructional rooms.
- Operational Effectiveness: building will effectively serve the administrative and support functions of the school.
- Flexibility: the building layout provides flexibility for future changes in educational programming.

##### b. Building Functionality:

- Security: building layout allows for clear site lines and avoids creating areas that are difficult to supervise.
- Site Amenities: option provides the required site amenities.
- Building Accessibility: option allows for adequate access by maintenance and support vehicles.
- Future Expansion (725 only): option allows for location of future portables.
- Longevity of Building Systems: the building will minimize the need for major building systems replacements within the next 20 years Life Cycle Cost: option minimizes the long-term costs of operating and maintaining the building.
- Maintenance: option allows for design and installation of systems with proper access for service and maintenance.
- Energy Efficiency: option minimizes energy usage.

##### c. Construction and Cost:

- Construction Timing: option allows the project to be completed in 24 months or less.
- Initial Cost: option minimizes construction costs.
- Construction Operations: option provides adequate space to stage construction on the site.
- Minimize Disruption to Students: project schedule minimizes the number of moves for students and staff and minimizes student exposure to dust and noise.
- Environmental Impact: option allows for minimal grading and tree removal.

#### 2. Review/Discussion of Evaluation Criteria Matrix and Recommended Options – 725 Options:

##### a. 725 – Renovation/Addition to Waverley:

- Extreme barriers from an Administration and Operations side.

##### b. 725 – Renovation/Addition to Rock Creek:

- Better renovation/addition option than the option at the Waverley building due to less disruption to the students and teachers.

##### c. 725 – Replacement Option 1:

- Replacement is preferred.
- This option is better than either of the renovation/addition options.

##### d. 725 – Replacement Option 2:

- Replacement is preferred.



- This option is preferred over Replacement Option 1.
- e. Discussion – 725 Options:  
General Comments:
  - Renovation options will still saddle school with some of the building elements that are still in play.
  - Replacement options eliminate staff packing and moving – pays attention to the consideration for Staff.
  - There is less disruption to Students in the replacement options.
  - Construction side – there is difficulty to do renovation/addition options with an occupied site.
  - Both renovation/addition options limit future expansion if enrollment should grow past 725 in the future.
  - Preference is split between Option 1 or 2 for the replacement options.
  - Replacement over renovation/addition options – renovated schools leave items after construction that will require maintenance and correction once the buildings become operational.
  - Yellow items (on the matrix) may include additional time added to the project to figure out if there is a solution.
  - Cost of the options (Brian): paying the same amount of money to reuse a lot of the existing building vs. constructing brand new = no brainer for a Replacement preference.
  - Maintenance (Randy): replacement option – still leaves openings (on the site) for possible future Portables, Option 1 may be better, but it is also possible in Option 2.
  - Dawn – Replacement schools are the way to go, prefers Option 2.
  - Ana – Replacement Option 2 is preferred for similar reasons – construction time, meets criteria in cost effectiveness.
  - Gloria – criteria laid out for a Renovation option would not be a good move – too many items that can't change: location of program spaces, corridors, daylight. Replacement schools can solve these concerns. Biggest factor in doing a Replacement would be that the students can stay in one place and not be phased – this is a big perk for this school community.
  - Beth – sees number of compromises that would have to be made in a Renovation/Addition – cost, time, better arrangement, more impact on students, no historic value in saving the building for the students.
  - Holly – see the value in preserving historic structures (even though this building is not historic), may be some heartache to get rid of existing school by the community, but the “pros” for the Replacement options are so much better than the Renovation/Addition options; layout of Renovation/Addition options are more compartmentalized, timelines are not as attractive.
  - Design Team – big picture perspective – no significant value trade off in proceeding with a Renovation/Addition option. Logical decision is Replacement. Environmental standpoint – Renovation would still lose energy – Replacement starts fresh with current building technologies, systems and techniques.
  - Beth noted that the Report should say there are several ways we can replace a building on site - we investigated several options and there are

MT



several ways to achieve it. Report shouldn't need to say Option 1 or Option 2 – just state that the recommendation is a Replacement school.

3. Review/Discussion of Evaluation Criteria Matrix and Recommended Options – 1,019 Options:

- a. 1,019 – Renovation/Addition to Waverley:
  - Extreme barriers from an Administration and Operations side, especially due to the construction phasing and length of project.
- b. 1,019 – Renovation/Addition (and combination) – Waverley & Rock Creek:
  - Largest of any of the other options, but allows for a possible “dual school” layout. Construction phasing and length of project are also a negative.
- c. 1,019 – Replacement Option 1 and 2:
  - Replacement is preferred.
- d. Discussion – 1,019 Options:  
General Comments:
  - Complexities become more prevalent in larger schools. Administration organization for a school of 1,019 would be exceptionally difficult. Goal should be to make teachers’ jobs easier and make school culture better for the kids.
  - Finding the balance in the design size of the building – between 725 and 1,019 may be something that will need to be considered moving forward.
  - Larger student options – we may want to find a fair way to characterize that the Renovation/Addition options may not even be something to be carried through to the recommendations – that the Replacement options may have several design solutions to answer the enrollment concerns over time.
  - To create such a compact family comfortable environment in a 1,019 scheme, it will really come down to the design and layout of the spaces – two schools that share common spaces or even two buildings on site.
  - The Feasibility Study options illustrate that the school would roughly need this amount of square footage.
  - Study Report – discuss philosophy of a 1,019 school – yes, some key points will be described in the Report.
  - Meetings to hash out the Ed Spec program for a 1,019 school would be necessary during the design process. The Report should recommend that the design criteria be worked out and explored during the design process for a possible 1,019 school.
  - Holly: phasing process is long and disruptive in the Renovation/Addition options, combining schools was interesting but result is a long building with varying floor heights. Either of the Replacement options will be challenging for the construction staging, but all in all recommendation is Replacement.
  - Beth: BOE asked us to look beyond the standard size school for 725 students and add 2 more classrooms at each grade level to 1,019 – wanted to consider the larger school option as there are no other future sites available in this area for additional school buildings. They will have to consider administering and managing the larger size of school and number of students – Renovation/Addition options appear to make this option more difficult for that management. Spaces provided will have to support

MT/  
FCPS

MT

MT



the school as best as they can. Replacement option would better accomplish these items.

- Gloria: Replacement schools have so much more positive outcomes than the Renovation/Addition options. The Combination option looks scary – not sure what we gain by doing that. Replacement Options – students stay in Waverley during construction. Possibly a 3<sup>rd</sup> story would make the Replacement buildings more compact of a footprint – could be explored during design.
- Ana: Replacement more appropriate choice. Option 2 preferred due to new residential developments near the school site – she sees what the school goes through with the Portables – she hopes there are NO additional portables ever.
- Dawn: Likes the Combination option, but Replacement Options are the way to go. Either 1 or 2.
- Randy: Replacement option preferred, in possibly a hybrid of 1 & 2 – building could be pulled away from Waverley boundary for more separation.
- Brian: Renovation options provide no room for staging and provide challenges for administrators with a long building on one floor; Replacement buildings preferred – cost and time are important factors. Leaning more towards a hybrid or Option 1 as it appears more compact than Option 2. More compact can result in quicker responses inside the building.
- Eric: Renovation/Addition – can take up to 3 years – that’s too long for this community. Cost and length of Renovation/Addition layouts – go with the Replacement options. 1,019 takes care of worry of future growth, but more of a compact new building would be a better situation. Dual Principalship, design something manageable for students and staff.
- Jan: Replacement 1 or 2 preferred, even though she doesn’t like either one, due to the size for a 1,019 school. Are there other alternatives to building a large school? Can this be a conversation before the decision is made? Impacts of a 1,019 school would be seen in a different manner: 3-year old’s’ on site would be intimidated, large building would not maximize Admin. time in any way. She would not want a building in a positive welcoming environment where people disappear because of the size. It’s daunting to think about a school of this size and all the “what if’s” that are unknown.
- Kathy: Waverley community has many evening and afterschool activities – with 1,019 students attending during the day, at any given time the campus can be overflowing with a lot of people. Sees safety and supervision concerns with a school of 1,019’s size. Dual Principalship – can make the decision to do this if needed with shared philosophies of administration and deliberate pairing and division of responsibilities. What makes a school so successful is the culture that is created inside the building – Principals know a student by name, knows the students’ families, their story, throughout their 6 years at school – add 300 students to the culture makes personalization of school as a family much harder. Development age from 3-10 at this school should be a consideration. Waverley is a Title 1 school which they are very proud of – making growth in

FCPS

FCPS



FCPS

achievement. When they do research to determine best practices, most successful T1 schools are 400 students or less.

- MaryJo: Wilson Winds school (Montgomery County) – built with a capacity of 746, and then was over 1,200 just 3 years after completion. Probably has 12 portables on site. Teachers must schedule time to use shared spaces such as the Media Center. We need to be mindful that this doesn't happen at Waverley. Also, can't imagine duplicating what is going on at Hilcrest.

#### IV. Feasibility Study Report

MT

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

###### a. Ed Spec – side by side comparison

- Indicate “Difference between 725 and 1,019”.
- Yellow means there is a difference in the 1,019 compared to approved 725. A key will be added to the spreadsheet.
- Say that the 725 is the “Board Approved Elementary Ed Spec 725 SRC”.
- Say “Draft Proposed Elementary Ed Spec (1,019 SRC)”

MT

###### b. Have a draft ready to send to Entire Team for comments – MT will provide by 3/2. FCPS Team will provide comments by 3/12.

HN

###### c. Holly is still reviewing earlier drafts in house.

#### V. Other

MT

##### 1. Community Meeting #3 – Thursday, March 8:

###### a. Process

- Indicate “Difference between 725 and 1,019”.
- b. Go over options, review some of past meeting comments.
- c. Attendees will be able to write notes or responses – and then there will be an open forum to ask and answer questions – offer a lot of time for this at end of meeting.

##### 2. Board of Education Presentation – April 11.

#### Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be Community Meeting #3, scheduled for **Thursday, March 8, 2018 at 6:00 pm** at the Waverley Elementary School cafeteria.

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:**

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

