

Valley High School Site Design Team
Minutes – July 17, 2003

Present: Dr. Vicky Poole, Dr. Les Oomtani, Phil Hodgkin, Anne Lane, Jason Scales, Scott Hatfield, John Clarke, Cindy Todd, Sam Kranovich, Pam Wymer, Karen Downing, Ruth Henderson, Bob Hardin, Mark Brauer.
Support members: Dave Person, Jeff Blosser, Galen Howsare, Gordon Dahlby, Eliz Erbes

Absent: Denny Linderbaum, Melissa Lersten, Mary Whitaker, Drew McLellan, Katie Crane, Tom Murphy, Mark Marco, Dr. Donna Wilken

Welcome:

Dr. Poole welcomed the committee members and commented on the progress made at the last meeting. The format for this meeting was to review the pros and cons of each of the five plans with the goal of narrowing our focus.

Meeting Proceedings:

Phil Hodgkin explained that each of the plans discussed last week did not represent the same square footage. He reminded us of the active process of good listening. That would be to suspend our own response process as we focus intently on the thoughts expressed by others. The committee was reminded that the drawings we have been studying are still just blocks of color. He asked if everyone felt good about our progress last week. Heads nodded affirmation.

Phil reviewed the pros and cons of each plan as were expressed last week and were printed in the minutes. Members of the committee were invited to advocate for their position. A discussion of each plan follows:

Plan 1: It was suggested that the administration space could be saved and the money used to re-locate the orchestra room and the vocal room to the band area. It would be beneficial to have these programs together. Consideration could be given to moving the counseling center or Family and Consumer Sciences to the 400s.

It was suggested that we focus on building structure. For example, the strong entrance statement would depend upon the direction of entry. Would the three story structure on the east side of the campus block the view of the main entrance from 35th street? There are median issues on 35th Street as well.

Plan 1 suggests that we place parking where the old part would be razed. This plan is \$1.4 million over the target. We would have to look at ways to par down the costs. Square footage drives it over the target. Only Plan 5 is within the budget. All others must be examined to reduce the costs to the target budget.

Plan 2: Phil reviewed the pros and cons from last week's minutes. The major difference between plans 1 and 2 is the way we're handling construction. This one (#2) gave \$28 per square foot to remodel the gray area. The North entrance opportunity provides a defined entrance.

One member asked if the district had information on traffic counts. "Where is the direction of traffic movement around the site?" Mr. Howsare reminded us that the center of growth is south and west so likely most traffic comes from there. Could Woodland Avenue handle the traffic? One member suggested the city would have to make it a four-lane.

It would be helpful for each member to have a thumbnail sketch of each plan. Phil agreed. We began to discuss the concept that more money spent per square footage would make it easier in the long run for the district to maintain. Phil summarized that each member would like to know the new square footage, the remodeled square footage, the number of parking spaces, and the key points identifying areas that get more than base line improvements.

Questions: Can we debate the use of moneys designated for other projects? Can we debate the need for a sprinkler system in all of it, etc.?

Dr. Omotani: From the Board's perspective, "No. The Board's expectation is to do fire, safety and code throughout the building."

Question: Has the Board discussed the timing and replacement of what's left?

Dr. Omotani: When we talk about fire, safety, and code in the non-blue areas, air conditioning is not considered. The Board wanted a design that new mechanicals could plug in to should any existing mechanicals go down. If you took the dark gray out of plan 2, you lower the cost to \$1.4 million over budget as in Plan 1.

Phil: "We probably won't have a choice to only sprinkle part of the building. This will not meet the Board or the community expectations. There are different answers to various parts of the building." He illustrated with the band rooms, weight rooms, field house as being in some cases better than some colleges. Every area has its own answer.

Kitchen/dining areas need to be improved over the next 20 years. This is true of the auditorium, art areas, etc.

Plan 3: Phil reviewed pros and cons listed in the previous minutes. This plan keeps the existing media center (14,500 sq. ft.). A new one would likely be smaller. Even with that this, plan 3 is still \$1.8 million over budget.

We should consider moving the main entrance to take advantage of art displays. Maybe put it on the North to the center of the student center. This plan saves the forum.

There was a suggestion that the administrative offices should be located near the entrance. Phil responded that would be in keeping with good current school design.

Karen asked if the new blue would take all of the parking. Phil said it would take faculty parking plus. We need more parking. We have resisted putting all dollars into new square footage. Money will be needed for fixtures and furniture as well.

How wide is blue space indicating the student gathering space? 40 feet. There was concern expressed regarding security problems. It was also stated that there are two grease pits east of the cafeteria. The space could be a courtyard, or we will find additional opportunities with natural light. This would create an upscale space that would feel very comfortable.

The cafeteria location could possibly move either during this renovation or in the future.

Phil showed us that the referendum would have done something like this: Phase One would build new with minimum tear down. Phase Three would be remodeling science areas. If we build a separate addition, there would be less disruption. The more you move the blue piece down, the more you disrupt parking. Also the farther you get from administration. The more of the old you save, the lower the cost.

We will study the administration section staying in Plan Three. We will look at the music piece and at pulling the blue section down to stay out of the "I" section of current Valley. This will reduce time line of disruption.

Question: Where are the uglier tunnels located?

Phil demonstrated the major arteries. There are no tunnels in the big I. Tunnels go through the north of the science rooms. They are a negative for air use, but not for wires.

Question: Is the value of the sq. footage of the "I" greater than the value of parking around the east side?

The question is whether you have saved any money when you are all said and done. Three stories provide more new structure and provide additional parking.

The community suggested that the "I" was built to hold an additional story. It was doubted that due to all the cost saving measures at that time that they would have put money to withstand the weight bearing of additional stories.

The more you save and remodel, the more money you have to use, but the less site availability for parking.

Question: What would the green be re-purposed for?

Maybe art, showcase pieces, counseling, etc. We kept the quarter mile of movement. We kept the new restroom facilities. This plan captures the connections recommendations.

Plan 4: Phil reviewed the pros and cons.

If we build two stories above the existing space, school would not be as disrupted. This would open up the 35th Street set back area for parking.

The blue square is located in the middle with 2 -3 stories with no green (remodeling). Then the disruption to classrooms only happens in the bottom part of the blue where technology, vocal, orchestra, and technologies are located.

One member of the committee would like to build on top with the disruption being for the footings and columns only. It would be very expensive and very difficult. And the bottom floor would be the least changed.

One member suggested that we step back and refresh ourselves with what is on the list. What will be left to remodel? Cafeteria, auditorium, etc. How might they be a part of a future referendum? We do not want to create something that will be difficult to do something with in the future. We ought to know where those will be in the future when funds are available. "Plan two is definitely the best plan," one member said.

It appears that Plans Two and Three most closely adhere to the Board criteria. We will want to examine the possibilities or combinations thereof.

The comparative matrix and the drawings will be attached to the minutes.

Next meetings:

August 7 Time: 4:00 – 6:30.

August 14 Time: TBD