



MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

DATE: March 24, 2011
RE: Brown Station Elementary School (13272) – Meeting #1
ATTENDING: See Attached List

REMARKS:

Meeting #1 for the Feasibility Study was held at this date. The following is a record of issues discussed:

1. Craig and Adrienne made a presentation of the process and composition of the committee.
 - a. This school modernization will be designed for a 740 core.
 - b. The students will attend Grosvenor during the modernization.
 - c. The existing gym is air conditioned.
 - d. The school currently has 4 portables.
2. Greg presented the existing plan and program spaces of the school as well as the proposed program to be included in the modernization.
 - a. The difference in the two programs is about 21,000 SF of usable space. This does not include the County day care facility Add Alternate, the 6 master planned classrooms, the corridors, stairs, or toilet rooms, etc.
 - b. The site has 9 acres, only 7 of which are usable.
3. The four proposed options were described as follows:
 - a. Option 1 – Retain existing school and add a one story addition to provide the required spaces.
 - b. Option 2 - Retain existing school and add a two story addition to provide the required spaces.
 - c. Option 3 – Demolish part of the existing school and add a two story addition to provide the required spaces.
 - d. Option 4 – Retain only the existing gymnasium and build a new two story school to provide the required spaces.
4. The feedback received from the attendees is as follows:
 - a. Options 1 and 2 were not preferable because the open space is greatly reduced and the site will not accommodate even the minimum MCPS site requirements.
 - b. It was agreed that both Options 3 and 4 showed potential because they might be able to accommodate the minimum MCPS site requirements.
 - c. Option 4 – a preference was expressed to provide a buffer between the hard play and the classrooms.
 - d. Site circulation – the recent site improvements related to vehicular circulation have been successful in solving previous circulation issues. However, some concerns were raised about how additional students would affect the current drop off and bus circulation.
 - e. Principal Baskerville requested a covered walkway at the drop off. Adrienne stated that a covered walkway would be part of the project; however, it may not be as large as they would like. Adrienne asked if the multi-purpose room could be used for dismissal in lieu of the covered waiting area outside. Principal Baskerville said that the after care program currently used that space after school.
 - f. An inquiry was made regarding the SW corner of the site. It is a stream valley buffer and cannot be developed.
 - g. The existing handicapped parking spaces are not usable when the buses are in the bus loop.
 - h. An inquiry was made about using the forested area around the school. Craig stated that there are requirements regarding how much green space is to be maintained, but that the design team would study this approach.
 - i. The current parking spaces are filled on a first come first serve basis.
 - j. More storage and staff toilets are required. Adrienne responded that the educational specifications outlined the requirements for both.



MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

- k. The lighting level in the parking lot is currently too low.
 - l. The K classrooms, PEP program and the County day care Add Alternate should be located as close to the drop off as possible.
 - m. The staff stated that the current neighborhood scale of the school was preferable.
 - n. The school prefers hall lockers over cubbies in the classrooms.
 - o. The current school has about 70 parking spaces. 100 are required for a reduced class size school. 30 additional parking spaces have been shown on all options.
 - p. Craig stated this project will follow the new SWM regulations. There will need to be multiple on site storm water areas and a green roof will be part of the scope of the project. In addition, geothermal exchange will be studied for this project.
 - q. A question was raised regarding who would maintain the green roof. The contractor will maintain the vegetated roof during its warranty period. Talks are ongoing with the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection as to whether they will be responsible for long-term inspection and maintenance. The school will not be responsible for vegetated roof maintenance.
 - r. Concern was expressed regarding the easy unsupervised access from the adjacent recreation center.
 - s. The design team is to show master-planned location for 6 additional classrooms.
 - t. The design team is to show proposed location for alternate day care scope on all options.
 - u. The design team is to show outdoor play areas for the PEP program and the County day care Add Alternate.
5. The following was requested of the design team for the next meeting:
- a. There is no need to pursue a one story option.
 - b. There is no need to pursue a two story addition that keeps the existing school.
 - c. The staff and community would like to see further development of the option that currently shows demolition of part of the existing school and a two story addition.
 - d. The staff and community asked to see one new building option with a courtyard and one new building option without a courtyard. At least one of which to include keeping the existing gym.
 - e. The staff and community asked to see a new layout of the site circulation to see if that gains any additional field space.
 - f. A three story building is not to be ruled out; however, this site does not lend itself to a three story option. The design team is to study and report on the findings.
6. Schedule
- | | | | |
|----|-------------------|---|-----------------------|
| a. | Feasibility Study | - | 2011 |
| b. | Design | - | June 2012 – June 2014 |
| c. | Construction | - | late 2014 – June 2016 |
| d. | Move In | - | August 2016 |

The next meeting will be Thursday, April 14 at 7:00 pm.

The proceeding is the author's interpretation of events that transpired at the above-referenced meeting. Any clarifications, requests for changes, or additional information may be submitted in writing within ten (10) working days from the date of these meeting minutes, for inclusion into the record, otherwise these minutes shall be accepted into the record as written.

Submitted by:
Robin Z. Puttock, AIA, LEED AP
Project Architect

Attachments: Attendance lists
cc: Shpur, Shuman, Karamihas, Lukmire, File 13272