

NOTES**Schematic Design Worksession #1****Project: Kensington Parkwood Elementary School –
Addition + Minor Renovations**

GWWO #1435

Meeting Date: October 22, 2014

Report Date: October 27, 2014

IN ATTENDANCE:

Name	Initials	Organization	Email
Barbara Liess	BL	KPES/MCPS	barbara_a_liess@mcpsmd.org
Alayna Lynam	AL	KPES/MCPS	alana_v_lynam@mcpsmd.org
Greg Fioravanti	GF		gregfioravanti@gmail.com
Dale Martin	DM		dmar001@verizon.net
Marlaine Martin	MM		marjomar@verizon.net
Brandon Hartz	BH		brandonhartz@yahoo.com
Sarah Beck	SB		sarahcbeck@gmail.com
Janet de Jesus	JD		dejesusjm@gmail.com
Jill Gross	JG	PTA/Parent	jillsgross@gmail.com
Erik Lichter	EL		eriklichter@hotmail.com
Dafna Silberfeld	DS	PTA	dafnaesther16@gmail.com
Jason Cassano	JC	Parent	jcassano@gmail.com
Leo Schwartz	LS	Parent	leo@edgewoodbuilders.net
Christine Foster	CF	Neighbor	christinefoster@yahoo.com
Bailey Condrey	BC	PRA Past President	blcon350@verizon.net
Al Carr	AC	Parent	alfred.carr@gmail.com
Lindsay Field	LF	Parent	lindsaywfield@yahoo.com
Aimee Cunningham	AC	Parent	aimeec1@yahoo.com
Elizabeth Wood	EW	Parent	ewestinwood@gmail.com
Courtney Perna	CP	Parent	cperna30@gmail.com
Candice Marshall	CM	1 st Grade Teacher	Candice_e_marshall@mcpsmd.org
Marianne Oursler	MO	Parent	baryoursler@msn.com
Michael Shpur	MS	MCPS – DOC	michael_shpur@mcpsmd.org
Rakesh Bagai	RB	MCPS – DOC	rakesh_bagai@mcpsmd.org
Julie Morris	JM	MCPS – DOC	julie_a_morris@mcpsmd.org
Chris Elcock	CE	GWWO	celcock@gwwoinc.com

Al Ip	AI	GWWO	aip@gwwoinc.com
-------	----	------	--

The purpose of this meeting was to establish a Schematic Design starting point for the Addition project, based on the options from the Feasibility Study.

1. Rakesh Bagai (RB) introduced the project.
2. Mike Shpur (MS) discussed the design process, budget and schedule. The Board of Education (BoE) has approved funds for the project's design services, but funds for the actual construction are not yet in place. The BoE has authorized MCPS-DOC to move forward with the preferred Option 1 design from the 2013 Feasibility Study.
3. Notes from the October 7, 2014 meeting are enclosed at the end of this document.
4. MS stated that many projects have been delayed one year. Should funds become available sooner, MCPS will be prepared to construct projects earlier. Currently, KP's Addition is scheduled for August 2018 completion.
5. Julie Morris (JM) stated that the addition will increase KP's student capacity to 740.
6. There was a question regarding the White Flint development's impact on KP's enrollment, MS stated that the Garrett Park and Lux Manor schools will be affected most.
7. Al Ip (AI) reviewed the 3 options shown from the Feasibility Study, and discussed the preferred Option 1 in detail. He also described Site Alternates:
 - a. Alternate 1 – Add parking spaces at the parent drop off parking lot.
 - b. Alternate 2 - Relocate the maintenance shed to the hardscape play areas.
8. The community asked if the design team had consulted with Maryland-National Capitol Parks & Planning Commission about tree removal on the site. Chris Elcock (CE) stated the design needed further refinement prior to submitting for a Forest Conservation Plan and for Parks and Planning to review.
9. The community expressed safety concerns regarding the new retaining wall at the north end of the student drop-off plaza. GWWO will study options and grading at the new retaining wall.
10. The community asked if a covered area would be provided at the parent drop off. GWWO to study options for covered waiting area at the lower southeast entrance.
11. The community asked whether the new courtyard was a traffic space or for daylighting. There are six (6) new classrooms (three on each level), adjacent to the new courtyard. All six of these classrooms will have windows opening into the courtyard.
12. MCPS stated that the school will be responsible for its future use and maintenance. Principal Liess asked to save the existing plants currently located where the new courtyard is proposed.
13. The community asked whether the addition will be a green building. MS stated that MCPS usually pursues LEED Silver certification for new school buildings. He said that the KP Addition/Renovation, like most of MCPS's smaller scale projects, will incorporate LEED principles, but will not seek formal LEED certification.
14. The KP Addition will not have a vegetated green roof. If needed, MCPS and the design team will explore other stormwater management alternatives.

14. The community inquired about whether KP will have photovoltaic (PV) panels. MCPS has experimented with PV panels on other schools and is meeting with firms about uses on other projects.
 15. MCPS stated that the portable classrooms will be removed upon the addition's completed construction.
 16. GWWO to study south retaining wall, and new east path options.
- Schematic Design Worksession #2 is scheduled for Thursday, Nov 6, 2014 @ 4:00pm.

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

Respectfully Submitted,
GWWO, Inc./ARCHITECTS

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Al Ip', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Al Ip

N:\Projects\14Proj\1435\02-Design\Admin\Meetings\2014-10-22 SD Worksession 1\2014-10-22_NOTES KPES Worksession 1.doc

Encl: Kensington Parkwood Meeting 1 Notes

With the appropriation of planning and design funds, the Board of Education authorizes the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Division of Construction to develop plans for construction of new schools, revitalization and expansion of existing schools, and additions to schools that are in the best interest of the school and the students while delivering the specified educational program. Construction budgets are established based upon concepts and corresponding construction cost estimates developed during the feasibility study phase of a project.

During both the feasibility study and schematic design phases of a project, MCPS reaches out to many stakeholders including the school's staff and administration, the Maryland State Department of Education, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Montgomery County Departments of Transportation, Environmental Protection, and Permitting Services, and the County's Office of the Fire Marshall. The MCPS Department of Transportation and Department of Facilities Management also provide important data and information required for the efficient operation and maintenance of schools.

MCPS values our relationship with the communities served by our schools. Therefore, we extend our outreach effort to include, as stakeholders, adjoining property owners, parent/teacher associations (PTA's), those whose properties directly face our school as well as the heads of community associations, homeowner associations, civic associations and the general public. As stakeholders, all are invited to attend and participate in the scheduled work sessions conducted during both the feasibility study and schematic design phases of projects. Concepts and designs are developed in consideration of the input received from stakeholders at work sessions.

During these processes, the architects and engineers work collaboratively with school staff and administration to refine and modify concepts and designs to develop plans that, to the greatest extent possible, meet the requirements of the school's prescribed educational program. Additionally, project designs must ensure the following elements:

- Student, staff and community safety during and after construction
- The ability to maintain continuous delivery of the educational program
- Preservation of required, prescribed program space within and outside of the building
- Compliance with building codes and regulations
- Building efficiency
- Constructability on time and within the prescribed budget

Of the concepts developed during the Kensington Parkwood Elementary School addition feasibility study, the school's educational and administrative staff and PTA representatives have expressed that they prefer and support Option 1, a plan that locates the addition on the front/side of the school. Unlike the option that places the addition on the rear of the school and displaces 14,000 square feet of hard surface outdoor play area, Option 1 can be constructed with the least impact on the continuous delivery of the on-going educational program.

Additionally, Option 1 provides for maximum student safety by providing separation between students and construction activities. Option 1 can be constructed as one addition project while Option 2 requires two construction areas that impact the existing building.

Accordingly, the schematic design will move forward based upon Option 1. However, as previously stated, with stakeholder input, the architects and engineers will continue to refine and modify Option 1 to develop plans that, to the greatest extent possible, best meet the requirements of the school's prescribed educational program.