

VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL SITE DESIGN TEAM
Minutes of Meeting – August 14, 2003

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

Dr. Poole welcomed the Site Design Team members to the meeting. She said the focus of today's meeting is to consider plans that have emerged from discussion at the August 7 meeting. Dr. Omotani invited Phil Hodgkin to review Plan 3B, reflecting the revisions from committee discussion.

Hodgkin said the concepts under consideration attempt to balance new and remodeled space. He reviewed the features of Plan 3 as considered previously. He presented highlights of the new concept – 3B:

- New construction on the southwest corner of the building
- Main entrance would be to the east
- Some of the most recently remodeled space would be saved
- More mechanical equipment would be placed on the roof
- Possibilities exist for future expansion/renovation
- Administration and guidance located centrally
- L-shaped commons
- Creates academic space and activity space
- Concept is approximately \$900,000 over budget, but there are many possibilities for cost cutting

Questions: will the common spaces be similar in both plans? **A:** yes. Biggest change is the location of the new construction.

Hodgkin showed three-dimensional illustrations, from several vantage points, of Plans 3 and 3B to illustrate placement of the sections of the building. He also presented drawings and photographs of “commons” areas published in architectural magazines and seen in schools toured during the Design Down process. Hodgkin showed examples of the “fat c” design for academic areas.

Dr. Omotani invited questions on Plan 3B:

- How would the construction be phased? How do the two plans compare with regard to disruption to students and staff? **A:** Factors are about equal. Plan 3B might take a little bit longer, but more of the building could remain standing while remodeling occurs. Plan 3B would need a little less “skin” added during the construction. Plan 3B is better for phasing remodeling of the media center and administrative area.
- How does new parking space compare in the two plans? **A:** With Plan 3B, would have to add parking south on 39th Street.
- How does total square footage compare in the two plans? **A:** The square footage is comparable and would meet the program needs.
- Where would new mechanical space be located? **A:** Budget for both plans includes a 5,000 sq. foot boiler room that is not shown on the concept drawings. The located is to be determined.

Comments on Plans 3 and 3B:

- Concern with location of administrative offices in 3B. Would prefer location closer to the entry of the school for customer service and better security. Concern with entry that is similar to the current building footprint. Concern with loss of media center space.
- What was the process for recommending to re-locate media center? **A:** Travel distance from new academic areas to media center; preservation of more recently remodeled space and classroom labs. Details may still be discussed.
- 3B is more community friendly. Like the placement of the entry farther from the street. Like the concepts in 3B.
- 3B is more student-friendly. Improves access to academic areas from other parts of the building. Will also put staff in closer proximity.
- Plan 3B allows the commons to be more accessible and comfortable for students. Takes the three-story addition off of 35th Street.
- Support for flexible commons area, passive supervision. Could we consider de-centralizing guidance and administration.
- Support for Plan 3B – better site plan, more flexibility; auditorium could be placed in proximity to classrooms for performing groups. However, how efficient is the gap between the field house and the new addition? (consider wider space between the two walls) Not as concerned with “preserving” the current media center space (would be OK to re-locate).
- How many classrooms do we have right now and how many would we have after the construction project? Need the at least same number or even more classrooms to have an improved facility.
- How is the larger space between classrooms utilized at Valley Southwoods? Good to have illustrations of commons space as in presentation at today’s meeting.
- Thanks for the “mile-high” view at the last meeting! Agree with comments by others in support of Plan 3B. Parking would not be displaced during construction (Plan 3B). Look closely at layout of parking spaces – Plan 3 may be a bit better. Positive comments about the site plan.
- Where is the main entrance located in each plan? The appearance would be more impressive set back from 35th Street.
- Comments on location of parking – concentrate in few areas or have more, smaller areas for parking spaces? Concern with loss of green space for physical education classes and other outdoor activities. However, more parking is needed. It may be possible to “horseshoe” parking around the building and save more green space.

Site Design Team members were asked to analyze Plan 3 and Plan 3B against the criteria established by the Board of Education. Information was then collected and summarized.

The group decided to present Plan 3B to the Board of Education workshop at 5 p.m. on August 25 at the Learning Resource Center. All members of the team are encouraged to attend. Dr. Poole and Dr. Wilkin will convene a program committee to develop details on utilization of the space. The Site Design Team will next meet to hear a report from the program committee. The Site Design Team will receive minutes of the Program Committee meetings. If any concerns arise as the program committee works, Site Design Team members are invited send comments to Dr. Omotani, Dr. Poole, Dr. Wilkin or Phil Hodgins.

Dr. Omotani thanked all members of the group for their participation in the process and their continued involvement in the project.