

MEETING MINUTES

Project: Frederick High School Feasibility Study Committee Meeting #8

Meeting Date: October 11, 2012

Report Date: October 24, 2012

IN ATTENDANCE:

Name	Initials	Organization	Email	Phone
Beth Pasierb	BP	FCPS	Beth.Pasierb@fcps.org	301-644-5023
Jeff Marker	JM	FCPS	Jeffrey.Marker@fcps.org	240-236-7081
Kathy Campagnoli	KC	FHS	Kathy.Campagnoli@fcps.org	240-236-7055
Andrew McWilliams	AM	FHS	Andrew.Mcwilliams@fcps.org	
Bradley Ahalt	BA	FCPS	Bradley.Ahalt@fcps.org	240-644-5146
Joe Dattoli	JD	FCPS	Joe.Dattoli@fcps.org	301-644-5176
Ray Barnes	RB	FCPS	Ray.Barnes@fcps.org	301-644-5022
Jeff Love	JL	City of Fred.	jlove@cityoffrederick.com	301-600-3187
Paul Hume	PH	GWWO	phume@gwwoinc.com	410-332-1009
Kaitlyn Slowikowski	KS	GWWO	kslowikowski@gwwoinc.com	410-332-1009
Beth Amann	BA	Community	Westbrook.JDA@gmail.com	
John Amann	JA	Community	Westbrook.JDA@gmail.com	
Richard Duthoy	RD	Community	rjduthoy@gmail.com	
Patricia Kettlestrings	PK	Community	jpkstrings@comcast.net	301-694-7226
Casper Cline	CC	Community	casper2470@aol.com	
Nancy Cline	NC	Community	nccline2838@aol.com	
Tamar Osterman	TO	Community	tamar.osterman@gmail.com	
Scott Miller	SM	Community	smiller@thompsonsgas.com	301-302-8169
Jana Sheffman	JS	Community		
John Hewetson	JH	Community	jheweston@comcast.net	

The purpose of this meeting was 1) to review preliminary options for modernization of the existing facility and site placement and massing for a replacement building, 2) to discuss scoring and weighting of options under an proposed rubric.

- Options overview:
 - Options presented (shown in attached slide presentation):
 - Option 1: Retain entire existing school with additions to meet ed spec square footage requirements.

- Pros
 - Keeps existing building
 - Cafeteria is in a better location
 - Entry becomes more defined
 - Improved interior organization
 - Keeps iconic image
 - Addition will alleviate space shortage and help to organize building circulation
 - "Real" walls will be built internally
 - Ventilation will be improved
 - Site configuration is essentially unchanged and very little site work is required
 - Relationship between school facilities and surrounding neighborhoods unchanged
- Cons
 - Impossible to meet all Educational Specification requirements
 - Narrow corridors remain in many areas
 - Supervision issues remain in corridors
 - May not be technically feasible to bring building into full compliance with current codes and accessibility requirements
 - Minimal opportunities to add windows and skylights – many rooms will remain windowless
 - Ceilings may need to be lower than would be recommended for a new building to accommodate added ductwork and other systems
 - Possible inefficiencies of mechanical and electrical systems due to existing design constraints.
 - Limited opportunities to incorporate sustainable design features and practices
 - Parts of the existing may have to be rebuilt
 - Existing non-compliant pool to remain
 - Difficult phasing
 - Long construction duration
 - Existing site limitations not rectified
 - No dedicated, separated bus loop
 - Limited parking for stadium unchanged
- Option 2: Retain the 1939 original building with major additions.
 - Pros
 - Keeps most historic/iconic part of building

- 1939 building is in good condition
 - Ed spec compliance improved over Option 1
 - Floors will be level
 - Corridors are more organized
 - Service yard is cleaned up
 - Moves building front to original 1939 location
 - Smaller footprint than existing
 - Increased potential for daylighting
 - New Pool
 - Site configuration is essentially unchanged and very little site work is required
 - More parking near front/stadium area
 - Potential for slight improvement to bus drop-off configuration
 - Relationship between school facilities and surrounding neighborhoods unchanged
- Cons
 - School may not be usable during construction
 - Narrow corridors remain in some areas
 - May not be technically feasible to bring existing building into full compliance with current codes and accessibility requirements
 - Possible inefficiencies of mechanical and electrical systems due to existing design constraints.
 - Less space in between schools
 - Difficult Phasing
 - Difficult to meet many educational specification requirements
 - Existing site limitations mostly not rectified
 - No dedicated bus drop-off area
- Option 3: Complete new building on existing school site.
 - Pros
 - All new construction
 - Fully meets educational specifications
 - Compact floor plan
 - Daylighting in classrooms
 - Clear defined entrance
 - Clear interior circulation
 - Does not impact middle school
 - New pool
 - Provides dedicated bus drop-off
 - Parking is increased
 - More parking is closer to stadium

- Sports fields and rear parking area are essentially unchanged and very little site work is required in those areas
 - Relationship between school facilities and surrounding neighborhoods unchanged
- Cons
 - Students must move off site during construction
 - Classrooms around the gym restrict gym daylighting and outdoor access opportunities
 - Existing site circulation issues not completely rectified
- Option 4: Complete new building elsewhere on FHS site.
 - 4A – in existing playing fields.
 - Pros
 - All new construction – new feel to the school
 - Keeps public and instructional separated if needed
 - “Main street” feel
 - Fully meets ed spec
 - Daylighting in classrooms
 - Sustainable design opportunities
 - Students can stay in existing building during construction
 - Clear defined entrance
 - Clear interior circulation
 - New pool
 - Provides dedicated, separated bus drop-off and staff parking
 - Parking is increased
 - Sports fields can be consolidated into the center of the site.
 - A football practice field can be added to the site
 - Gives middle school more space
 - Cons
 - Brings building very close to the Westbrook community
 - Classrooms around the gym restrict gym daylighting and outdoor access opportunities
 - Parking becomes further removed from stadium
 - Too far back on the site

- Some buses need to double run
- 4B – in existing parking lot
 - Pros
 - All new construction – new feel to the school
 - Keeps public and instructional separated if needed
 - “Main street” feel
 - Fully meets ed spec
 - Daylighting in classrooms
 - Sustainable design opportunities
 - Students can stay in existing building during construction
 - Clear defined entrance
 - Clear interior circulation
 - New pool
 - Provides dedicated, separated bus drop-off and staff parking
 - Double run buses have an easier time
 - Parking is increased
 - A football practice field can be added to the site
 - Gives middle school more space
 - Maintains a separation from the Westbrook community
 - Could add an L shape to the building in the future
 - Each school has their own athletic fields
 - Cons
 - Mechanical penthouses may interfere with gym daylighting.
- Options noted above will all be developed to a higher level of detail for the next committee meeting. Graphics will include a more in depth look at the break down of the interior.
- Community Comments:
 - Separation between community and school is needed (i.e. fence, large trees)
 - Look at putting parking on the flood plane
 - Pool needs to be weighted higher in choosing by advantages
 - 4A is the least favorite option
 - Help minimize student parking in the neighborhoods
 - Add parking on Carroll Parkway
 - 4B gives the most ability to add on to later

- Pervious blacktops on the flood plane
- Buffer is needed from athletic fields to the community
- Don't put choosing by advantages on the website
- Put working documents on all drawings
- Pool being separated may be an issue later
- Figure out ballpark costs for next meeting

Next Meeting: Wednesday, October 31 at 1:00 PM in the FCPS Board Room.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Kaitlyn Slowikowski
GWWO, Inc./ARCHITECTS