Meeting Minutes

SDAT Meeting 06
Prepared by: Matthew Bissen
May, 21 - 2:45 PM

Attendees:

■ Farah Thaxton (FT)	WWES	■ Jill Farbarik (JB)	WWES
■ Brian Langley (BL)	WWES	■ Marie Sumpter (MS)	WWES
■ Katie Barrett (KB)	WWES	■ Paula Wittmann (PW)	WWES
■ Wynne York-Jones (WYJ)	WWES	■ Nicole Selstead (NS)	WWES
□ Ashley McClaran (AM)	WWES	■ Melissa Winchester (MW)	KIDSinc
■ Mike Skutack (MS)	SPS	■ Paul Wight (PW)	SPS
■ Michael McGavock (MM)	mcg-ARC	■ Mitch Kent (MK)	mcg-ARC
■ Matthew Bissen (MB)	mcg-ARC	■ Brett Santhuff (BS)	mcg-ARC
□ Deborah Northern	SPS	□ Kelly Vancil	WWES

ITEMS DISCUSSED

I. INTRODUCTION

II. ACTIVITY

A. Heard Report backs from (FT) & (PW) on comments/questions raised during the staff and PTA board meetings which occurred since the last SDAT.

1. General positive feedback and support for project direction.
2. Concerns raised with regards to pedestrian access and site flows.
3. Quantity of Parking – Staff feedback was for more if possible.
4. Lack of faculty restrooms and support rooms in the new wing.
5. Understood and supported the reasons to move off site to a swing school for one year. Questions of childcare program were raised.

B. Site Design Development

1. Presented site layout and design development
   a. Reviewed more open play areas with less obstructions. Moving in the right direction. Group encouraged team to continue take the approach of less is more with regards to landscape elements. Concern about viability of trees in the center of the upper courtyard.
   b. Plan is to relocate existing play structure. Will investigate budget options to provide new.
   c. Loading dock and delivery access will shift west with site access from the existing curb cut at 5th Ave. 7 parking stalls are provided to minimize the amount of play surfaces displaced and not exceed the City 5,000 SF pavement threshold for higher storm water treatment requirements. Group felt this was appropriate balance between parking and play. Design team to address concerns of potential pedestrian – vehicular flow conflicts.
   d. Is there the potential to use the bus drop-off lane for additional parking? Team will investigate.

e. Design needs to accommodate a location for the child care shed or accommodate new in the design.
f. Design needs to accommodate a ball wall. The current building/stair design will displace the existing walls.
g. Discussed site arrival by pedestrians. 3 desired (Main Entry, North playground, Childcare)
h. Make sure flows around SW corner of addition are clear, secure, and intuitive.

C. Building Design Development
1. Presented overall design concept and important drivers
    a. Daylight & Energy
    b. Smaller scaled spaces within larger spaces or the school.
    c. Low stakes performance and support diversified teaching and learning approaches.
2. North Wing: Presented 3 options – East Commons with 2 stage locations & West Commons
    a. Group preferred east commons. It placed the commons near the main entry and supports goals to make the school more welcoming and a resource to the community. It establishes the commons at the north end of the academic corridor and acts as a destination and focal point in the school. It also organizes primary teaching spaces (Library, Art/Comp Lab, and Gym) in the same area in the new north wing addition. This develops a more clear academic vs public zone.
    b. Of the East Commons options, the group preferred the east stage position. It allows for a small group of offices to be developed north of the main entry to increase visibility and presence of staff at the entry. These offices will account for the displaced offices due to the south wing connection.
    c. Early cost evaluation shows the north stage option is a 15% total budget premium with the east stage a 3% total budge premium. The West Commons does not hold a budget premium.
    d. Discussed pro-cons of the gym to the east with regards to flows – Lunch recess vs PE. No clear resolution since both have a large number of students moving in the corridors. The commons in a more publicly situated position is more important than corridor flows.
    e. Discussed acoustics and teaching approaches in the gym and why there is a need for a full-sized gym. The program calls for a full-sized gym for potential community use. This poses challenges for teaching two classes of PE simultaneously. (FT) to reach out to District staff on concerns with the gym program requirements.
    f. Design team is still developing minor and support spaces.
3. South Wing: Presented further design development of the 'interconnect' learning commons model and small nook areas.
    a. Concern with regards to the number of restrooms available to students on the upper floor. Design team to look at options.
    b. Learning Commons Configuration - (FT) shared feedback from her outreach to other staff and that distinct learning commons areas were preferred. They provide more focus, better acoustics, ownership, and did not fully rely on furniture to function well.
    c. Concern about Room 110 and the PTA storage displacement. It can be located anywhere in the building. Design team to look at options.

d. Question raised about classroom storage. Casework will be used to provide classroom storage. It will be designed in the next phase and reviewed with the district and select staff.

III. HOMEWORK

1. Reflect on content and reach out to various constituents regarding the ideas discussed.

IV. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:40 PM. NEXT MEETING WILL BE ON TUESDAY, 6/11 STARTING AT 2:45 PM.