



Meeting Notes

Project:	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School 4301 East West Highway Bethesda, MD	Work Session #3
Meeting Location:	Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch Architects	Meeting Date: 11/8/2012
Owner:	Montgomery County Public Schools	Architect's Project No.: 12011

The following meeting notes are a summary of our understanding of topics covered at this meeting. The information has been condensed into a summary and is not an exact transcript of this meeting. If a conflict is noted, please contact our office so that the item may be corrected in a timely fashion.

Attendees

Gary Mosesman (GM)	SEI	Carole Brand	Community
Jim Emr (JE)	SEI	Eleanor Rice	Community
Ina Kovacheva	SEI	Stacy Farrar	BCC
Khalin Redding	SEI	Rafe Petersen	BCC
Karen Lockard (KL)	BCC Principal	Veronica Kidd	Community
Jim Tokar (JT)	MCPS	Stan Chase	Community
Bruce Crispell (BC)	MCPS	Claire Helm	Community
Michael Shpur	MCPS	Barbara Rice	Community
Michelle Hainbach	BCC	Mike Wolf	Community
Lynn Amano	Community	Dana Wright	BCC
Marcie Sandalow	Community	Suzanne King	Community
Deborah Missal	BCC	Sarah Beck	Community
Mary Cobbelt	BCC	Ana Conner	Community
David Rubashkin	Community	Elliot Kaye	Community
Jim Tapley	BCC	Teddy Springer	Community
Peter Siegel	BCC	Susan Kitt	BCC
		Hunter Hogewood	BCC

General	
1	MCPS briefly discussed the feasibility study process and noted that the meetings will be an additive process. MCPS noted that community and staff input during the meetings is very important. The notes from the meeting will be posted on the MCPS website. JT provided index cards if questions could not be answered in the given time period.
2	GM discussed overall existing site conditions and traffic circulation on site. GM reviewed restrictions on the site and identified building opportunities. Location of tennis courts and parking counts were discussed. Currently there are 234 permanent parking spaces on site.
3	GM reviewed circulation problems within the existing building. Stair A on the 2 nd , 3 rd , and 4 th floors is a congestion point and causes overcrowding in the area. All concepts will alleviate current congestion at stair A by re-directing traffic flow away from stair A. The concepts will redirect students to existing underutilized corridors which will improve circulation in the existing building.
4	GM reviewed initial design concepts. Concept A: (Area: 84,000GSF Efficiency Factor: 57%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new addition is located on part of the existing tennis courts with a single loaded corridor loop to the existing buildings on the main floor level.

Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School

Work Session #3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The single loaded corridor will cover a portion of the bleachers and is on 2 levels; fire truck access will be maintained via the existing fire lane and extend through to Pearl St. - A raised tennis court structure is proposed to accommodate all 6 tennis courts and provide additional surface parking below. In addition to the existing parking, it is anticipated that concept A will provide an additional 90 parking spaces. - Columns supporting the single loaded corridor will obstruct views from the bleachers. Additional bleachers will be provided to compensate for the seats with obstructed views. - Comment to improve sight lines from 50 yd. line seating would be preferred.
5	<p>Concept B: (Area: 90,000GSF Efficiency Factor: 60%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The addition includes a single loaded corridor over the bleachers on 3 levels and 4 levels of academic spaces over the existing tennis courts. - Circulation connection to the existing building on three levels. - A raised tennis court structure is proposed to accommodate all 6 tennis courts and provide additional surface parking below. Concept B is anticipated to provide 110 additional parking spaces - the most parking spaces of all concepts. - Columns supporting the addition will obstruct views from the existing bleachers. - Fire truck access will be maintained via the existing fire lane and extend through to Pearl St. - Comment to improve sight lines from 50 yd. line seating would be preferred.
6	<p>Concept C: (Area: 75,000GSF Efficiency Factor: 63%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The addition proposes to create a new front façade and plaza to the existing facility. - 4 story addition providing loop circulation and connections to the existing facility on all floors. - Concept C proposes an interior entrance plaza providing a gathering space which can help alleviate open lunch periods. - Most efficient of all concepts in terms of circulation and traffic flow. - Existing bus loop will be shortened and some parking will be lost. A raised tennis court structure is proposed to accommodate all 6 tennis courts and provide additional surface parking below. Additional 50 parking spaces are anticipated to be provided by this concept. - The exterior courtyard between the existing facility and the new addition will provide indirect light into the existing building. - It was decided to eliminate this concept due to the reduced vehicle circulation and parking.
7	<p>Concept D: (Area: 86,000GSF Efficiency Factor: 61%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concept D investigates the option of raising the proposed addition in front of the existing building to accommodate the existing bus loop. - The concept provides 2 stories of loop circulation and connection of the existing fourth floor with additional circulation in spaces. - Additional 76 parking spaces are anticipated to be provided by this concept. - The exterior courtyard between the existing facility and the new addition will provide indirect light into the existing building. - Upper level entrance serves as a canopy over existing bus loop. - Concept D is least efficient in terms of circulation and traffic flow through the building. - Concept D will now be concept C in future presentations.
8	<p>General Concerns on concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADA access in all concepts was a concern. SEI noted that the addition will conform to the current building standards and will be ADA accessible. - Temporary loss of the football field and tennis courts was noted and should be anticipated during construction.

Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School

Work Session #3


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constructability, staging, and cost concerns were raised in regards to all concepts; this will be explored further in the feasibility study. - Increased capacity will require an increase in buses. The impact of additional buses will be taken into consideration and further explored with the MCPS Department of Transportation in schematic design.
9	A general discussion of school capacity issues related to the current design parameters, eminent domain options, and potential project schedule were discussed.
10	Q: Has MCPS considered eminent domain on land next door? A: Additional land and shared parking was investigated with the modernization in 1999 and was not feasible. It is not expected to be feasible with current funding for the addition now.
11	Q: Will the feasibility study include concepts of a smaller size. A: JT noted that the study will explore the feasibility for the maximum size; if it is feasible to build to the maximum capacity, reducing the size of the addition will not be an issue.
12	It was noted that currently buses idle on Pearl Street in front of residential homes in the neighborhood. It is the intent to have all buses on site. The design team is working with MCPS to determine the number of additional buses and determine if it is technically feasible to have all buses on site. This will be reviewed in detail once the proposed concepts are determined. It was further noted that staggering of bus arrival may need to be considered.
13	General onsite parking was discussed. MCPS and the design team noted that all concepts presented will provide additional onsite parking spaces.
14	It was requested that a break-down of pro's and con's for each concept be presented. SEI will provide an initial pro's and con's for the next work session. However, participants will be asked for additional input at the next work session.
15	Q: What is the cost of each option and is this being compared with other approaches? A: Costs are not available at this time however, the Feasibility Study will provide cost estimates for each of the final plan concepts (typically three plans are provided).
16	Q: How many more students will be attending BCC? A: The current enrollment of BCC is 1840, with enrollment projected to grow to almost 2200 students by the 2017–2018 school year. This feasibility study is evaluating the potential for a maximum of 2400 students.
17	Q: How high will the tennis courts be? A: Parking will be on grade with one level above that will have tennis courts.
18	Q: Will spectator seating be provided on the tennis deck? A: SEI will explore spectator seating in the schematic design process.
19	Q: What is the current schedule for construction? A: Currently the CIP shows the scheduled completion for the addition to be August of 2017. Funding request will be in Fall 2013 and upon budget approval anticipated start of schematic design in July 2014. The size of the additional will be determined prior to funding request.
20	Q: Will the community be able to participate in the schematic design process? A: Yes, similar to this feasibility study, work sessions will allow for community input.
21	Q: Why can we not renovate portions of the existing facility? A: The school was recently modernized (2002) using MD State (MSDE) funding, the state will not contribute funds for facility renovations less than 15 years old, The charge of the Feasibility Study is to investigate a new addition that will fulfill program objectives without disturbing the existing school. Therefore at this time the project is for an addition only and renovation within the existing facility is not part of this stage of design.
22	Q: Would construction affect instruction? A: Instruction will not be directly affected; however, the football field and tennis courts will be required for construction staging in concepts A and B. This will limit the use of the fields for physical education. Concept D will require the use of the existing tennis courts, front parking lot and bus drive.
23	Q: Why is building in the existing courtyard not being considered? A: Difficulty of construction and it would be extremely disruptive to curriculum.
24	SEI noted that in all concepts student safety will be a priority. The location of portables and construction staging area will be considered with each concept.

Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School
Work Session #3

25	Any further questions should be directed to Karen Lockard and will be addressed at the next work session.
-----------	---

Future Work Sessions
Work Session #4 on November 28 th – 7:00 p.m. PTA Presentation on December 11 th – 7:00 p.m.
Location for all meetings to be at Bethesda-Chevy Chase HS cafeteria.

This concludes the notes of the work session as recorded by Smolen ■ Emr ■ Ilkovitch Architects.



Prepared by: Ina Kovacheva, LEED @AP BD + C



Reviewed by: Gary Mosesman, AIA, LEED @AP BD + C
ATTACHED:
Sign In Sheet 11-8-12.pdf