

## MEETING NOTES

### Design Development Meeting 10 (DD 10)

**Project:**  
**FCPS – ES Prototype: Waverley ES (WAVES)**  
 GWWO Project #18045

Meeting Date: October 3, 2019  
 Report Date: October 7, 2019

#### In Attendance:

Name	Initials	Organization	Email
Brian Staiger	BS	FCPS	<a href="mailto:Brian.staiger@fcps.org">Brian.staiger@fcps.org</a>
Holly Nelson	HN	FCPS	<a href="mailto:Holly.nelson@fcps.org">Holly.nelson@fcps.org</a>
Curtis Orndorff	CO	FCPS	<a href="mailto:Curtis.orndorff@fcps.org">Curtis.orndorff@fcps.org</a>
Adnan Mamoon	AM	FCPS	<a href="mailto:Adnan.mamoon@fcps.org">Adnan.mamoon@fcps.org</a>
Paul Lebo	PL	FCPS	<a href="mailto:Paul.lebo@fcps.org">Paul.lebo@fcps.org</a>
Michelle Concepcion	MC	FCPS	<a href="mailto:Michelle.concepcion@fcps.org">Michelle.concepcion@fcps.org</a>
Dave Toth	DT	Oak Contracting	<a href="mailto:dtoth@oakcontracting.com">dtoth@oakcontracting.com</a>
Jason Fritz	JF	ADTEK	<a href="mailto:jfritz@adtekengineers.com">jfritz@adtekengineers.com</a>
John Berkey	JB	ADTEK	<a href="mailto:jberkey@adtekengineers.com">jberkey@adtekengineers.com</a>
Robel Gibbe	RoG	Hillis-Carnes	<a href="mailto:rgibbe@hcea.com">rgibbe@hcea.com</a>
Rajesh Goel	RaG	Hillis-Carnes	<a href="mailto:rgoel@hcea.com">rgoel@hcea.com</a>
Brittany Pavelko 📞	BP	Carney Eng.	<a href="mailto:bpavelko@carneyengineeringgroup.com">bpavelko@carneyengineeringgroup.com</a>
Jason Hearn	JH	GWWO	<a href="mailto:jhearn@gwwoinc.com">jhearn@gwwoinc.com</a>

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the schedule for site plan submission to the City of Frederick and Geotechnical report provided by Hillis-Carnes Engineering on 9/24/19.

- JH asked JF and JB to discuss the current site plan submission schedule.
  - JF acknowledged the missed submission that was scheduled to occur on 9/23/19.
  - Because review meetings at the City occur once a month, the next available submission date is the end of October. This forces all other civil/site dates to push back one (1) month.

- The tentative release date of 7/20/2020 for the Grading Permit would now be 8/20/2020.
- JH pressed JF and JB for options to mitigate the loss of time. JB mentioned submitting Improvement Plans with the site plan to see if review times could be consolidated. This likely cannot be confirmed as a viable option until the submission occurs.
  - Schedule creep is a concern given the timeframe to start construction. Installation of the construction fence and initial site work must occur during summer break (June 2020-August 2020). These activities can only start after the existing playgrounds and designated portables are removed, which again, must occur after school dismisses for the summer.
  - Ideally, work on the City lot (tree/brush clearing, grading and temporary parking) would occur prior to construction activities (April/May 2020).
  - JH asked ADTEK to propose an early “conditional” permit for the City lot. Assuming the work is encompassed in one set of documents, this could be the only way to begin work in Spring 2020. Added emphasis should be placed on the benefits this work provides to the City.
- JH requested an updated schedule from ADTEK that outlines milestone dates and potential options to absorb lost time.
- DT asked how phasing will be integrated into the drawings, especially in terms of Erosion and Sediment Control.
  - JH confirmed that phasing will be acknowledged in the new work portion of the architectural drawings, but demolition work should be contained in the civil/site drawings. This is mainly due to existing buildings being removed in their entirety.
  - JB confirmed that ADTEK is currently developing phasing sheets.
- JH directed the discussion towards the Geotechnical report and concerns about the recommendations for site preparation. BP joined the meeting via phone.
- Hillis-Carnes has recommended removing 5 feet of existing fill throughout the entire footprint of the new facility and replacing it with new. The samples taken as part of the study turned up widespread clays.
  - Early estimates indicate this recommendation could cost in excess of \$650,000.
  - JH questioned whether the condition of the existing buildings has any bearing on the recommendation. There appear to be no noticeable issues with the buildings due to differential settlement.

- RaG requested copies of the foundation plans for the existing buildings and for the proposed building as references. BS and JH will provide the plans for existing Waverley, Rock Creek and the new facility.
- DT mentioned the use of geopiers at Urbana and/or Butterfly Ridge, which is a much more cost-effective solution. RaG was not opposed to the solution, but the slabs-on-grade would still need to be addressed.
- Because of the potential for significant costs to remove and replace the existing fill, RaG will accept the following approach:
  - Undercut 24” minimum of existing fill below the base of each footing (spread and wall) and replace it with #57 stone.
  - Skim 18” of existing surface fill and replace it with 12” of stone dust/#10 screenings and 6” of crushed stone to support the structural slabs-on-grade.
- JH asked for a revised report listing this approach as an alternate. BS and DT requested that the report be revised so that this approach is the primary recommendation to avoid confusion. RaG and RoG agreed and will provide.
- DT asked for clarification on the Seismic Class “D” designation.
  - Hillis-Carnes utilized neighboring site data and the general conditions listed in IBC to establish the class “D” designation made during the study. An additional boring(s) to approximately 100’ or an alternative testing method is required to confirm the classification.
  - DT emphasized the potential cost implications of higher seismic classifications. Though it was a larger jump, moving from Class “D” to Class “A” at Frederick High School netted close to \$132,000 in savings, on the low end.
  - BS and DT asked GWWO to have further discussions with the structural and MEP engineers to understand the differences in design between the Class “D” and Class “C.” Once provided, FCPS and Oak will evaluate whether the additional testing is appropriate.
  - RaG will speak with a geologist to gauge the probability of lowering the classification.
- BP confirmed that the current design meets the requirements of a Class “D” seismic designation.
- DT questioned the use of fiber reinforcing in the slabs-on-grade as they have produced mixed results. BP is fine with using welded wire fabric (WWF) in lieu of fiber. JH instructed BP to make the change for Construction Documents.

- After the meeting, PL asked JH to review the discussion had earlier in the morning as part of the Blue Heron ES design meeting.
  - ADA requirements in child-centric restrooms tend to always be a topic of conversation during design. PL would like GWWO to address it once and for all. If a standard accessory must change to accommodate ADA, that is acceptable.

The foregoing represents the writer's interpretations of what transpired at the meeting. Please forward any changes or corrections within five (5) days to [jhearn@gwwoinc.com](mailto:jhearn@gwwoinc.com). Otherwise these notes will stand as the final record of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
GWWO, Inc./Architects



Jason T. Hearn, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
Project Manager

CC: All Attendees  
Tammie Smith  
Paul Hume  
Shawn Benjaminson  
Jim Barto  
Scott Moir