

## MEETING MINUTES

### Project: Frederick High School Feasibility Study Committee Meeting #12

Meeting Date: December 19, 2012

Report Date: December 21, 2012

#### IN ATTENDANCE:

Name	Initials	Organization	Email	Phone
Beth Pasierb	BP	FCPS	Beth.Pasierb@fcps.org	301-644-5023
Ann Bonitatibus	AB	FCPS	Ann.Bonitatibus@fcps.org	301-696-6805
Cathy Menzel	CM	FCPS	Cathy.Menzel@fcps.org	301-696-6902
Bradley Ahalt	BA	FCPS	Bradley.Ahalt@fcps.org	240-644-5146
Ray Barnes	RB	FCPS	Ray.Barnes@fcps.org	301-644-5022
Brett Stark	BS	FCPS	Brett.Stark@fcps.org	301-644-5257
Joe Dattoli	JD	FCPS	Joe.Dattoli@fcps.org	301-644-5176
Michael Doerrer	MD	FCPS	Michael.Doerrer@fcps.org	301-696-6900
Larkin Hohnke	LH	FCPS	Larkin.Hohnke@fcps.org	301-696-6810
Tony Driebeibies	TD	FCPS		
Kathy Campagnoli	KC	FHS	Kathy.Campagnoli@fcps.org	240-236-7055
Jeff Marker	JM	FHS	Jeffrey.Marker@fcps.org	240-236-7081
Paul Hume	PH	GWWO	phume@gwwoinc.com	410-332-1009
Bryan Fisher	BF	GWWO	bfisher@gwwoinc.com	410-332-1009
Beth Amann	BA	Community	Westbrook.JDA@gmail.com	301-620-4166
John Amann	JA	Community	Westbrook.JDA@gmail.com	301-620-4166
Richard Duthoy	RD	Community	rjduthoy@gmail.com	301-663-4985
Jana Sheffer	JS	Community	Jsheffer29@gmail.com	301-639-9635
Patricia Kettlestrings	PK	Community	jpkstrings@comcast.net	301-694-7226

The purpose of this meeting was 1) for the committee to be updated on the FCPS community engagement efforts and 2) to select one of the six feasibility study options to recommend to the Board of Education as a preferred option to carry forward into design.

- FCPS representatives discussed the highlights of the community engagement report that was being prepared for inclusion in the final Feasibility Study Report. The full community engagement report will be included in the Feasibility Study Report as Appendix G.

Following the discussion of the alternative options, the committee discussed the six feasibility study options in an effort to reach agreement on a preferred option. Main points of the discussion are as follows:

- Options in which students would need to be housed in relocatable classrooms, off site, or some combination thereof were thought to be impractical and to have too many potential impacts upon instruction and the cohesiveness of the student body.
- Most committee members felt strongly that the only viable options were those in which a new building could be constructed in full while students remained in the existing facility. As a result, Options 1, 2 and 3 were rejected by the committee for recommendation as the preferred option.
- Among the remaining Options 4, 5, and 6, Option 4's negative effects on the neighbors and its relocation of the building to the "rear" of the site made it significantly less desirable to the committee than Options 5 and 6.
- The committee's concerns with Option 6 were that the building is still close to some Westbrook neighbors, it loses the Culler Lake orientation of the existing school, and its parking was not as optimal for stadium events as that of Option 5.
- Some committee members expressed a preference for Option 6, stating they felt it had more potential to maintain separation of the middle and high school buildings and preferring its site arrangement for accommodation of more practice fields than are feasible under Option 5.
- The majority of committee members agreed that Option 5 strikes a good balance between the instructional mission of the school, the history of the site to its surroundings, and the wishes of both the immediate neighbors and larger community.
- The committee commended Option 5 for its well-defined main entry, similar site orientation to the 1939 building, its central location of the building near athletic fields, and its location of parking centrally to the school, stadium, and potential pool location.
- Option 5 received the best score on the Weighing by Advantages Matrix and is one of the lower cost options.
- There was wide agreement that Option 5 could be further enhanced by blending many of the advantages of Option 6 into Option 5 as the project moves into design.
- The committee recommended Option 5 as the preferred option with the understanding that increasing the distance between the middle and high school buildings and working to maximize athletic practice fields will be further explored as the project moves forward into design.

Next Meeting: Meeting 12 was the last regularly scheduled meeting of the FHS feasibility study steering committee.

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,  
Bryan Fisher, AIA  
GWWO, Inc./ARCHITECTS

N:\Projects\12Proj\1212\01-Design\00-Admin\Meetings\2012 12 19 Minutes FHS FS Meeting 12.docx