

**Valley High School Site Design Team
Minutes – July 8, 2003**

- Present:** Dr. Vicky Poole, Dr. Les Omotani, Dr. Donna Wilkin, Phil Hodgin, Mark Brauer, Dan Nelson, Cindy Todd, John Clarke, Denny Linderbaum, Scott Hatfield, Anne Lane, Melissa Lersten, Mary Whitaker, Ruth Henderson, Karen Downing, Bob Hardin, Sam Kranovich, Pam Wymer
Support members: Dave Person, Jeff Blosser, Galen Howsare, Kay Rosene, Gordon Dahlby, Dr. Phyllis Staplin
- Absent** Drew McLellan, Jason Scales, Katie Crane, Tom Murphy, Mark Marco

Welcome

Les Omotani welcomed all present at the meeting. The following information was distributed: updated committee rosters and committee charge/Board criteria. Dr. Omotani posed the question: what do you believe are the roles and responsibilities of members of the site design team?

Responses included:

- maximum impact on student learning with minimal disruption
- take into account different views
- spend the allocated funds most effectively
- achieve as many things as possible identified in the Design Down and connections
Committee reports

Dr. Omotani encouraged the committee to conduct ongoing discussion of the roles and responsibilities.

Dr. Wilkin invited team members to review the criteria as developed by the Board of Education. It was noted the criteria are not listed in a priority order. If the site design team believes additional criteria are needed or an existing one needs more weight, that may be indicated in the context of the recommendation. The Superintendent Board will review the team's recommendation based on the criteria provided. The criteria offer a framework for the discussion and deliberations of the site design team, Dr. Wilkin said.

Feedback/Planning since June 9 meeting

Phil Hodgin commented on the work done since the last site design team meeting. He said that program needs have been analyzed; committee responses (see June 9 minutes) have been reviewed and are reflected in additional design concepts. Hodgin noted that there is not enough money allocated to accomplish all that the committee has requested. He reviewed several charts and drawings including a space utilization analysis that reveals the usage of classrooms throughout the school day.

Hodgin then reviewed the design concept presented at the last meeting. He noted this concept maximizes new learning space, demolishes much space that is in need of renovation, provides a new commons and connections between new and older space. Hodgin summarized the comments of the committee on June 9 about this design concept:

- Positives
- Establishes "soul"
 - Opportunities for interaction (planning, facilitation of learning)
 - Would improve mechanical/electricity/lights
 - Less construction time than remodeling
 - Less congestion in halls
 - Adding more instructional space
 - Addresses Design Down ideals

Concerns No funds for furniture/F.E. (new and replacement of old)
 Auditorium power/air conditioning
 Something different with food service
 Capture ideas for existing space
 Losing green space with south drive
 Electrical problems in kitchen

Additional Design Concepts

Hodgin said several additional design concepts have emerged as a result of site design team discussion. Within the \$31.5 million budget, each of the concepts includes the following cost allocations: new boiler room (\$450,000), sprinkler/fire alarm (\$1.1 million), security (\$300,000), technology wiring/communication (\$1 million), site (\$2 million), FFE (\$500,000), technology enhancement (\$500,000), owner's costs/fees/contingency (\$4.65 million). These allocations total \$10.5 million, leaving \$21 million for construction and/or remodeling.

Hodgin reviewed the design concepts as follows:

Plan 1 Adds approximately \$4 million to the original budget

Pool remodel (\$500,000), fieldhouse seating/floor (\$900,000), auditorium air conditioning/wiring (\$900,000), art wing (\$500,000), cafeteria/food service area (\$500,000)

The current building is 322,000 square feet, projected space up to 354,000 square feet
If 176,000 sq. ft of new construction is built, there is not enough money allocated to address other areas of the building and new parking space. New construction would have to be reduced by at least 30,000 sq. ft.

Question: are these "high end" dollar estimates or conservative? Hodgin says the budget estimates are at the mid-level and attempt to adequately fund the project.

Plan 2 Three story addition (176,000 sq ft) in the existing parking lot

Retain all academic space and use until new construction is complete
Demolition of most of current academic space when new construction completed
Level 1 remodeling in remaining space – HVAC, lighting
More significant remodeling is not affordable
Safety issues would be addressed in remaining areas
More parking would be available when the addition and demolition are complete

Plan 3 More remodeled space

Addition would be smaller
Leaves existing media center (would be remodeled)
Commons space, link to new and remodeled area
Over budget – could cut back on level of remodel

Committee comment: would rather disrupt parking than the academic environment

Plan 4 Build new area where art/music and technology education are currently located

New student commons
Move current functions to southwest portion of building; smaller additions
Remodel remaining space
Provide additional parking
Difficult to get natural lighting to the space

Question: where are the “worst” tunnels? Is that a design consideration? Hodgins said that the tunnels would be a factor in the design process. RDG has the information on the tunnels. The goal would be to discontinue the use of the tunnels for air handling.

Plan 5 More emphasis on remodeling

New commons, entrance

“Fat C” arrangement of classrooms

Would be close to budget

Minimal parking space increase

Long-term disruption, depending on phasing of the project (at least four years)

Questions: Are all the new concepts (Plans 1-5) over budget? Hodgins said Plan 5 is the closest to the budget. All are doable as a concept, but cannot be fully accomplished as presented. The committee will have to consider trade-offs as planning continues.

Do our students truly spend the majority of their time in the classroom? Yes!

Can we think outside the “budget box”? Dr. Omotani said the charge to the site design team is to work within the budget as allocated. The group could identify areas that need additional dollars and work beyond the scope of the recommendation.

Gallery Walk – Committee members were asked to record positive aspects and concerns with each of the five plans presented. Comments are recorded as follows:

PLAN 1

Pros

Maximizes new instruction space

Strong entry statement

Helps us meet recommendations of connections committee with new spaces

Cons

Disrupts instructional space for new construction

Not touching many parts of building

Put counselors and administration in with the students and staff

Suggestions: Reallocate new administration/guidance dollars to new vocal/orchestra next to band. Remodel existing administrative office space or move in to new academic wing. Move counseling into academic wing. Spaces not touched handled by PPEL as need arises.

PLAN 2

Pros

Good idea to build in parking lot

The less parking released on 35th street the better

Removes older part of building

Minimum disruption of students/teachers

Energy efficiency? Appears to be best answer

Cons

Over budget – try less improvements in gym (fieldhouse)

No entry statement – redesign to make entry statement

PLAN 3

Pros

Keeps media center
New construction
Less disruption of instructional space – only disrupts parking 2 years
Great plan – touches all needs
Best plan of five ditto ditto
Less disruption

Cons

Lack of entry “statement”
North facing entry
Over budget – need to limit improvements in other areas
Problem with flow – entry pts to auditorium, cafeteria, vocal, art
Keeps tunnels and old infrastructure

PLAN 4

Pros

All new or remodel

Cons

Problem with renovating worst part of old (tunnels, etc.)
Too much disruption
Not as much natural light for classrooms
Fieldhouse exit problems
Minimal but expensive media center move
Not a good plan
Fails to address connections recommendations
Boiler room removed

PLAN 5

Pros

Budget okay
Re-models every part of building
Speaks to the need to re-think how we utilize learning spaces (question – do we really reduce classroom space? Unclear on this)

Cons

Limited new
Lots of disruption
No new parking
Remodel as we teach – no way
Too much disruption for too long

Next meeting: Thursday, July 17 4:00-5:30 p.m. Valley High School Media Center