

MEETING NOTES

Construction Documents Meeting 6 (CD 6)

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

Meeting Date: February 6, 2020
 Report Date: February 11, 2020

In Attendance:

Name	Initials	Organization	Email
Brian Staiger	BS	FCPS	Brian.staiger@fcps.org
Paul Lebo	PL	FCPS	Paul.lebo@fcps.org
Adnan Mamoon	AM	FCPS	Adnan.mamoon@fcps.org
Bob Wilkinson	RW	FCPS	robert.wilkinson@fcps.org
Randy Connatser	RC	FCPS	Randy.connatser@fcps.org
Richard Gue	RG	FCPS	Richard.gue@fcps.org
Jim Barto	JBa	ADTEK	jbarto@adtekengineers.com
John Berkey	JBe	ADTEK	jberkey@adtekengineers.com
Tony Kukowski	AT	Oak Contracting	akukowski@oakcontracting.com
Dave Toth	DT	Oak Contracting	dtoth@oakcontracting.com
Jason Hearn	JH	GWWO	jhearn@gwwoinc.com

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss open action items needing resolution for the project.

- JH asked JBa to give a brief synopsis of the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for DT and TK. DT requested time during the meeting for review. During the second Site Plan review, the City of Frederick requested additional stormwater retention or modifications to the pipe (increase size) running through the neighboring Hickory Hill Apartment complex. A stormwater retention structure will be constructed at the southern corner of the site to avoid work outside of the project boundary.
- DT noted that the drawings for the City property were included in the CD pricing set with repeat numbers of sheets pertaining to the on-site work. Because of potential confusion, DT requested a different approach. JH asked JBa and JBe to add a prefix or suffix to differentiate the sheets.

- DT noted additional comments were not significant enough to warrant the group's time and deferred to a separate conversation with ADTEK for further coordination. JBa and JBe subsequently left the meeting.
- BS asked to revisit the security system partition discussion from the 1/9 curriculum review session.
 - Michelle Concepcion noted in an e-mail to BS that the Specialty Programs suite would potentially access the building proper outside of normal hours.
 - PL decided to eliminate any separation and put the entire building on a single partition. RC and RG subsequently left the meeting.
- JH requested a debrief from DT on the BHES conference call with ECS (Envelope Commissioning Agent).
 - DT noted that Brad Ahalt, FCPS PM for BHES, instructed ECS to review and confirm that the drawings comply with appropriate standards, nothing more. FCPS is not interested in additional, costly recommendations.
 - JH asked BS if further discussions with ECS pertaining to the following have occurred:
 - BS prefers ECS to serve as Advisor during Design and as the Prime Agent during Construction. ZA requested a separate call with BS and DT to discuss scope of work and an agreement to serve as the Prime Agent. BS will set up a meeting/conference call with ZM and Keith Nelson.
 - Assuming ECS is contracted to be the Prime Agent, BS, DT and JH prefer all testing requirements be in the BECxA-crafted Division 1 specification. Prior to Pricing, ECS instead provided markups to the individual sections provided by GWWO.
 - BS confirmed that no further discussions with ECS had occurred.
 - JH noted that markups pertaining to the mock-up were not included in the specification sections for CD Pricing. Both JH and DT have objections and concerns about the level of detail ECS has requested for the mock-up, as the need for testing and inspection on it is not entirely clear. FCPS will need to clarify scope with ECS. Unless instructed otherwise by FCPS, GWWO will design a mock-up that is representative of typical details and wall sections only.
- JH asked DT about the status of the CD cost estimate. DT expects it to be completed by the following Monday (2/10).
 - JH requested the opportunity for review as some important items that have been added to the project should be identified separately despite everything being aggregated into a single bid package. These items, which were not accounted for in the original FCPS budget, include phasing, additional stormwater work requested by the City of Frederick, and site work on the adjacent City Lot.

- JH turned the group’s attention to the IAC structural reviewer’s requirement to submit a 2018-compliant design. The following concerns outlined in an earlier e-mail were expressed:
 - While things can be updated quickly within calculation programs, the cross-checking and potential updates to drawings can be much more substantial as it could impact all disciplines.
 - GWWO/Carney Engineering Group is in no way trying to circumvent a potentially more stringent design; the issue is time.
 - This project was started nearly a year before DGS adopted IBC 2018 and submissions were made prior to that. In GWWO’s experience, most, if not all, jurisdictions tend to honor the adopted code at the time design began. This project was halfway through Design Development when the DGS standard was released (7/2019).
 - Going beyond the requirements of the AHJ (City of Frederick) is something GWWO does not want to do as it will incur extra design fees and lost time to a very tight, carefully planned schedule.
- PL, AM and BS instructed JH to submit to the IAC as scheduled on 2/14. BS and AM asked JH to sit in on a call to Clarence Felder after the design meeting.
 - AM, BS, JH and DT were able to reach Clarence Felder by phone. AM and JH explained the situation to Mr. Felder, to which he requested a day to research the issue more so he could respond accordingly to AM.
- The group reviewed the fly-through animation prepared for the Board of Education meeting on 2/26.
 - RW appreciates the bird-free canopy design.
 - JH acknowledged that some color correction is required in the opening scene as the walls appear brown, not white.
 - PL asked for confirmation that a recessed screen was not proposed outside of the main office. JH confirmed that the screen is one of those usually installed along the “Main Street Corridor” and is not recessed.
 - PL’s concern about color remains. JH reiterated that everything shown in the Media Center is either paint or Tectum acoustic panels. JH confirmed with the manufacturer that Tectum panels can be painted (with a sprayer) up to six (6) times without losing their acoustic performance.
 - JH explained the rationale behind the iconography signage in the main corridors. The local community is heavily ESL (English as a Second Language), so universal wayfinding would be a coveted asset. This was confirmed by Kathy Prichard during the 1/10 curriculum review session.

- RW and PL asked about the construction of the signage. JH proposed “pin-mounted” extruded plastic letters/graphics screwed into a plywood backing behind the drywall.
- DT and TK recommended Acrovyn panels as mounted letters have been torn off walls at other locations. JH asked for clarification on how the letters were installed, to which the team said they had been adhered. If mounted onto a plywood backer, JH firmly believes students could not rip them from the wall. Despite JH’s opinion, the group prefers Acrovyn.
- Icon signage outside of the main spaces are to be eliminated.
- PL and BS asked for the third video screen outside of the gymnasium to be removed.
- PL asked that all areas with wall tile that covers CMU be painted instead.
- DT questioned the location of the drinking fountain in the gymnasium. JH confirmed that an alcove for the fixture had been created.
- PL questioned the need for glass backboards at the secondary basketball courts. JH said opaque backboards are likely an option.
- JH confirmed for DT that the Tectum panels are standard sizes, each finished with a single color.
- RW questioned whether the gym light fixtures were LED and had protective cages. JH confirmed.
- DT questioned door protection at the classrooms as it appears tile does not run continuously. JH proposes using clear, polycarbonate corner guards over impact-resistant drywall being FCPS prefers to limit colored wall tile.
- PL and RW questioned the guardrail design as a student had recently climbed a railing in an open stair and threatened to jump. JH confirmed that the rail is per code and that the infill mesh panels discourage climbing.
 - DT recommended storefront as an option at future locations. JH emphasized the added cost associated with storefront and an associated door.
- DT made a point to highlight the green metal panel at the bus entry. The green was chosen to accentuate the “Gettysburg Green” vector outlined in the design concept for the building. The paint sample for the color was included with the exterior material palette presented during the 9/5/19 design meeting.
 - Direction is imperative at this juncture, so JH asked for a yes or no regarding the color. PL prefers a neutral palette to ensure his liking in the future. DT expressed concerns about the durability of metal panel at main entrances. JH agreed to remove the metal panel and replace it with gray masonry.

- The entrance canopies and soffits will remain metal panel but will be painted gray.
- PL agreed to flexibility at the interior in exchange for neutrality at the exterior.
- PL requested additional bike racks at the rear of the building.

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. 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