

**Valley High School Site Design Team  
Minutes -- August 7, 2003**

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

Vicky Poole welcomed committee members to the meeting. She said that time has been spent since the last meeting reviewing committee feedback on the five concepts. Discussion at today's meeting will focus on the two concepts that received the most positive feedback.

Les Omotani reviewed the criteria and committee goals as developed by the Board of Education. He noted the charge: to decide to recommend to the Superintendent and Board of Education a preferred design solution for Valley High School. The list of criteria (as presented at previous meetings) was reviewed. Scott Hatfield suggested that the committee work with a matrix that compares each plan with the established criteria.

Dr. Omotani said the feedback from previous meetings seems to indicate support for plans two and three. RDG has information to present on refined concepts of these two plans. The committee will then be asked to provide feedback on the latest revisions. The next step would be to analyze the plans against the criteria.

Phil Hodgkin reviewed the planning assumptions:

1. The **entire** building will include allocation of funds to provide for:
  - Fire Alarm and Sprinkler System
  - Security (per District Plan)
  - Technology/Communication Wiring
  - Code/Life Safety/ADA compliance
2. Area Program Goal is 353,370 square feet
3. **Total Project Budget** for this project is \$31.5 million (Y2003)
4. Net gain of 400 parking spaces on site (final number to be determined through School/City process)
5. New 5000 s.f. boiler room and equipment for base physical plant is included (no distribution to remodeled area except where noted)
6. 1 million dollar allocation for furniture, equipment and teaching tool enhancements (specific selections TBD)
7. No inflation factor added to Plan 3 for longer construction period
8. **Key for Renovation** areas on Plan 2 and Plan 3
  - Level 1:** HVAC, controls, lighting, ceilings, finishes
  - Level 2:** Level 1 plus minor wall relocation
  - Level 3:** Level 1 plus major wall relocation and some millwork/casework (labs/specialty classroom amenities)

Hodgin then reviewed the revised concepts for plans two and three.

**REVISED PLAN 2** (includes a three-story addition, commons link

1. \$3,173,395 **over budget**
2. **Does not meet program** (14,057 s.f. **short**)
3. 183,676 square feet of **new** space
4. **3 ½ years** of construction (estimated)
5. Flex space available to help teacher/learning disruption
6. New “skin”/image to Woodland/35<sup>th</sup> Street
7. High identity entrances
8. Pushes main E-W hall to main commons area
9. Discontinues most of existing tunnels
10. Less roof area to maintain than Plan 3
11. Better parking opportunity than Plan 3 (parking effect on green is less than Plan 3).

**REVISED PLAN 3** (remodels more space, adds less new space)

1. **On budget**
2. 136,409 square feet of **new** space
3. **Meets space/area program**
4. **4 ½ - 5 ½ years of construction (estimated)**
5. Flex space available to help minimize teacher/learning disruption
6. New “skin”/image to Woodland/35<sup>th</sup> Street
7. High identity main entrances
8. Offers additional E-W hall connector
9. Re-uses some tunnels for piping only
10. More “re-roof “ area than Plan 2
11. Parking vs. green (effect on green worse than Plan 2)

**Conversation/dialogue on the two revised plans:**

- Does the additional two years of construction (comparing plans 2R and 3R) increase the operating cost to the school? **A:** Might increase costs, but we do not know if the cost would be significant. Additional time might alleviate disruption to students and staff.
- Concern expressed with north entrance – consider architecture to address this, special finishes, etc.
- Concern with circulation off 35<sup>th</sup> Street as presented in the site plans.
- Is main entrance coming off Woodland? Yes – as current concept illustrates. Phil explained possible alternatives and traffic flow.
- One of the plans had the building addition overlapping some of the classrooms. Revised plan 3 does not – what is the reason for this? It seems to reduce the size of the addition. **A:** The revised concepts do provide for less disruption
- Referendum plan for new construction located the new space along 39<sup>th</sup> Street south to Ashworth Road. What is the reason for the change in location of the new space? Would this hinder any future expansion or new construction for Valley?

**A:** Some reasons for the Plans 2R and 3R new space location:

- Connects dining area with other core parts of the building (locating new space to the west leaves a lot of space between academic and dining areas)
  - Hallways are redesigned as commons space
  - Could impact track
  - Natural lighting would be limited
- Commons should be located in the middle of the space; serve as a “hub” for students. Distance from academic areas to dining area would not be of concern.
  - Phil drew some modified concepts – placing of commons, student services areas, main entrance, etc.
  - City engineers are suggesting that no more traffic be added to 35<sup>th</sup> Street, additional flow could go on Woodland or 39<sup>th</sup> Street. Plan 3R breaks up the parking spots. Price grass parking lots for event parking. Three stories on 35<sup>th</sup> Street might not be aesthetically pleasing to residents.
  - Comment supporting the relocation of the addition to the southwest. Seems it would be less disruptive while under construction.
  - How would this impact budget? Phil – needs further discussion, planning to decrease linkages and maximize teaching spaces.
  - Could the addition go north? That could create issues with dining area. The location of the serving area should not control the plan. Could the servery be separate from the kitchen?
  - Could the commons be moved to the south of the building, then locate a new dining room on the other side of the kitchen? Use glass to the south to take advantage of local weather conditions.
  - Positive comment on the appearance of the site with the addition located to the south.
  - Support for Plan 3R; likes the three-story addition on 35<sup>th</sup> Street and locating new parking elsewhere on the site. Would like to see vocal and orchestra located closer to the band area. Could link a future auditorium to the music area. Is there enough room to move the commons area to the south and preserve the softball complex? Concern with expense of locating the dining room south of the kitchen. Also concern with distance between kitchen and serving areas and the efficiency of the lunch periods. Concern with distance between media center and classrooms with a south-side academic addition.
  - Concern that modifications proposed will create more budget challenges. Location of future auditorium in Plan 3R would not be possible with modifications discussed. Support for more, smaller parking areas. Not as supportive of Plan 2R; would create a large concentration of parking.

First time the group has looked at the whole site. Comments have been directed to the full site, rather than the internal building. Comparison of criteria to Plans 2R and 3R:

Plan 2R is the better plan in addressing the following:

- Minimizes disruption by building more new space
- Minimizes time of project
- Minimizes relocation of student
- Provides more parking (although ingress and egress concerns)
- Improves the learning environment
- Concentrates attention on where students will be spending the most time; places a priority on core classroom space
- Is prudent about expenditures to fix core infrastructure
- Anticipates remodel issue
- Renovates/overhauls heating, cooling and electrical systems

It was noted that many of these benefits are derived from the larger square footage of new construction compared to Plan 3/3R.

Scheme 3 is the better plan in addressing the following

- Stays within the budget

Both plans address the following:

- Attends to health, safety and code issues throughout the building
- Designs moderate interior/exterior finishes

Unknown as to which plan better addresses the following:

- Incorporate what's been learned through the Design Down and Connections Committee about quality learning spaces
- Improve operational efficiencies; reduces costs of operation
- Be consistent with what was stated in the referendum, 10-year plan and 10-year Master facility improvement plans
- Make appropriate modifications based on input from a variety of sources

- Is it possible that the City of West Des Moines would not give permission for a specific plan to be carried out? **A:** A representative of the City planning staff serves on the committee to alert us to areas of concern the City might have.
- Discussion of current traffic flow challenges and future traffic plans. Current design of 35<sup>th</sup> Street access is not efficient.

### **How do we move forward?**

Compare the plans against the questions posed in the Connections Committee report. Plan 3R may well address all of these questions.

Scheme 3 is more economical. Location of the new space and additional parking are very similar in both concepts.

Neither plan addresses specifics of the learning environment. Opportunity will occur as the program committee meets to specify features of learning spaces.

Is it possible to relocate the addition? RDG will study the possibilities.

Support expressed for Plan 3R.

Must have some remodeled space because the budget will not allow for all new. More comfortable with new construction south of the field house. Need to compare plan 3R with 3-B (relocated addition).

Plan 2R seems to line up with the criteria better than 3R. However, the budget issue is of prime concern and Plan 3R is on budget.

By next meeting, develop concept drawings that relocate the addition as suggested and stay within budget limits. Committee would then compare this new concept with Plan 3R. Discussion of moving vocal music and orchestra. Would those classrooms be too far from the existing auditorium (performance center for those groups)?

Next meeting:

- review 3R and 3B

- create matrix of criteria

- Utilize meeting time to compare plans and criteria

- provide time for more in-depth discussion of the concepts

Are we letting the site determine the function of the building? A committee of staff will identify specific uses of the space. Connections Committee questions will be critical at that stage. Site Design Team is still identifying where to locate the new space, how to address parking concerns, etc.

Should we include additional criteria from what we have learned in visits to other schools?

**A:** That may be a part of the recommendation, but the list from the Board should be of primary consideration. It will be possible to link the Board criteria to the Connections Committee report.

Can the committee give the Board a choice of design options? Concern with long construction schedule in Plan 3R. Believe the charge is to bring an option that meets all of the criteria. It would be possible, however, to include information on a more expensive option. Note: construction timeline is not the same as disruption. While current plans under consideration may have a long construction time span, the disruption to teaching and learning is not as significant as in earlier remodeling plans.

Discussion of use of Physical Plant and Equipment Levy funds or re-allocating sales tax monies.

**NEXT MEETING;    Thursday, August 14                    4:00-6:00                    VHS Media Center**