

## MEETING NOTES Schematic Design Meeting 04 (SD 04) Preliminary Floor/Site Plan Options

**Project:** FCPS – ES Prototype

Waverley ES (WAVES) and East County Area ES (ECAES)

GWWO Project #18045 and #18050

**Meeting Date:** December 13, 2018 **Report Date:** December 18, 2018

## In Attendance:

Name	Initials	Organization	Email
Roger Fritz	RF	FCPS	Roger.fritz@fcps.org
Beth Pasierb	BP	FCPS	beth.pasierb@fcps.org
Brian Staiger	BS	FCPS	Brian.staiger@fcps.org
Brad Ahalt	BA	FCPS	Brad.ahalt@fcps.org
Holly Nelson	HN	FCPS	Holly.nelson@fcps.org
Steve Raff	SR	FCPS	Stephen.raff@fcps.org
Kathy Prichard	KP	FCPS	Kathy.prichard@fcps.org
Mary Jo Richmond	MR	FCPS	Maryjo.richmond@fcps.org
Kathleen Hartsock	КН	FCPS	kathleen.hartsock@fcps.org
Dave Toth	DT	Oak	dtoth@oackcontracting.com
Eric Feiss	EF	GWWO	efeiss@gwwoinc.com
Scott Moir	SM	GWWO	smoir@gwwoinc.com
Jason Hearn	JH	GWWO	jhearn@gwwoinc.com

The meeting was held to review progress of the development of a new ES prototype as part of the SD phase for WAVES and ECAES. Topics included review of GWWO's process, potential programmatic arrangements in response to the process, and early looks at site design options.

**SD 04.01** SM reviewed Agenda/Objectives.

- Guiding Principals
- Module > Component Studies
- Potential Plan Options
- Review of Action Items

- Schedule Preview
- **SD 04.02** JH reviewed the Guiding Principles that the Design Team has been using in the development of the new prototype:
  - Establish regularity; promote flexibility
    - o Equitability across FCPS facilities
    - Allow for informed modifications
  - Emphasize standardization of spaces
    - Comfortable scale(s)
  - Ease of site adaptability
    - o Reduce impact to existing grades
      - Less Impact = Reduced Construction Costs
    - o Story-based design
    - o Community ownership
- SD 04.03 JH led discussion on "What are we creating?" explaining difference between "Prototypical" and "Modularity".
  - JA: No. For instance, Frederick HS uses geothermal.
- **SD 04.04** JH reviewed how programmatic elements, in particular classrooms because of prominence, are being used to establish a regular grid and module.
  - Reviewed pros/cons between rectangular and square space.
  - Given spatial requirements of Pre-K/K vs Grades 1-5 classrooms, both shapes will be required, but can work off the same grid/module rules.
  - Grid proposed to be 30' x 30' and will establish a 5' module that works with 15-30-45 regularity of spatial composition.
  - Other spaces will be configured to work within this module to create several components that can be configured in a variety of ways, depending on specific site and school requirements.
- **SD 04.05** JH discussed the progression from module study to component studies..
  - A/B Modules
    - A Learning Space
    - B Circulation/Support/Transitions
  - Service Core Modules
    - o Full module Learning Space
    - o 2/3 module Circulation/Support
    - Intersection of module transition
- **SD 04.06** Initial reaction is that Service Core Modules are not preferred due to creating of double-corridor in classroom wing.
  - BA: Concerns with building efficiency and size of building as a result.
  - KH/SR/KP: Concerns with visibility in corridor.
  - SM: Understands concerns, however, references previous projects where the Service Core approach has provided a compact footprint, with the ability to create "found space" and provide additional 21st Century Learning spaces;

Feedback from users has been positive and visibility has not been a concern that has been conveyed; Offers to arrange visit if FCPS wishes to see more.

- SD 04.07 SM reviewed Potential Building Plans that are a result of the Component Studies and illustrated their flexibility.
  - While WAVES currently shows A/B Modules and ECAES shows Service Core Modules, either approach would work to create the programmatic arrangements presented.
- **SD 04.08** FCPS: Cafeteria and Gymnasium must be side-by-side to allow for use as one large assembly space (ECAES showed them separate).
- **SD 04.09** BA concerned about "kink" in layout of ECAES.
  - Angles allow for building footprint to work with topography;
  - Classroom wing runs parallel with existing topography to reduce impact to existing grades.
- SM presented a courtyard scheme acknowledging that they are not allowed per the Ed Spec; Discusses the benefits and opportunities afforded by the approach.
  - FCPS has concerns about safety.
  - Courtyard approach will not be considered moving forward, though the compact footprint created by this arrangement is favorable
    - Flexible arrangements of this option can respond to preference of a compact footprint.
- **SD 04.11** FCPS items to consider:
  - Separate bus/car traffic.
  - Separate entries for students arriving by bus and students arriving by car/walking.
  - Three (3) distinct playgrounds and their proximity to classroom wing
- **SD 04.12** GWWO items to consider as design progresses (into Design Development):
  - Location of lockers
    - o FCPS would like to avoid locker alcoves.
  - Lockers vs Cubbies in Kindergarten
  - Built-in casework in classrooms vs. centralized/shared storage rooms.
- **SD 04.13** FCPS direction:
  - Continue development of both floor plan arrangement options as follows:
    - o A/B modules
    - o No courtyard
    - o Gymnasium/Cafeteria adjacency
    - o Separate entrances for bus and car riders.
    - o Compact building footprint.
- **SD 04.14** Short discussion followed in reference to Action Items.

Meeting Notes, December 13, 2018 FCPS – ES Prototype SD 04 Page 4

- FCPS Lutz Engineering will be CxA on both projects; RFP out for Building Envelope Cx; RFP out for CM for ECAES.
- GWWO All Add Service Proposals received and being prepared.

The foregoing represents the writer's interpretations of what transpired at the meeting. Please forward any changes or corrections within to <a href="mailto:smoir@gwwoinc.com">smoir@gwwoinc.com</a>. Otherwise these notes will stand as the final record of the meeting.

Next Meeting: Thursday, January 11, 2019

Topic: Progress on Building and Site Plan Development

Respectfully submitted, GWWO, Inc./Architects

Scott Moir, AIA, CDT

Associate • Project Manager

CC: All attendees