

Valley High School Site Design Team  
Minutes – March 8, 2004

Present: Phil Hodgin, Dr. Les Omotani, Dr. Vicky Poole, Dr. Donna Wilkin, Mark Brauer, John Clarke, Scott Hatfield, Ruth Henderson, Sam Kranovich, Dan Nelson, Jim Rode (guest) Support members: Eliz Erbes, Jeff Blosser, Dave Person, Craig Bullis, Scott Scholle, Brian Abeling, Dave Blum, Dr. Liz Celania-Fagen, Gordon Dahlby, Galen Howsare, Kim Jordan, Dr. Jody Ratigan, Kay Rosene, Linda Sanda, Dr. Phyllis Staplin, Dr. Deb Van Gorp

Vicky Poole welcomed those present. She commented that the professional design team has been working with district staff to “nip and tuck” the plan last presented on December 1. The challenge is to match the identified needs with the budgeted funds, Dr. Poole said.

Phil Hodgin commented on the work conducted since the December 1 meeting with the Board of Education. When cost estimates were developed for engineering needs, city requirements and the preliminary concept, the project was significantly over budget. Design modifications have been made to address this. The project is now at the schematic design phase.

The new construction is a two-story structure, rather than a three-story tower. Classroom space has not been lost, although the academic commons areas are smaller than in the original concept. The location of the new academic area has changed slightly. The site plan, as proposed, is still subject to city approval. Hodgin commented on similarities between the last concept and the schematic design now under consideration. He presented a more detailed construction schedule and noted the new boiler/chiller room would be built first.

Hodgin emphasized there are more needs than money to meet them. He reviewed a list of items that would be deferred until later in the project. These items could be bid as alternates and would be completed if funds are available as the project progresses. The “deferred list” would be prioritized by the Board of Education. Hodgin also reviewed the “wish list” – identified needs that cannot be addressed within the project budget.

Hodgin said the schematic design will be presented for Board approval on March 15 and, if approved, the design development phase would be completed by mid June.

Questions

Q: How is the academic space maintained?

A: By enlarging the two stories and minimizing non-assignable space

Q: The angle of construction of the two-story addition?  
What happened to the curved areas in the student commons?

A: The angle of the addition improves circulation within the two-story structure and the rest of the building.

The curved areas proposed in the student commons were revised due to costs. Alternatives are still under consideration to retain the spirit of the design. The curves have become truncated straight lines in the schematic design.

Q: The elevation levels of the two story addition?

A: Phil explained the revised elevation levels – improved circulation and cost efficiencies will result.

- Q: What happened to the greenhouse?  
A: Greenhouse is not in the current plan. That does represent a loss of academic programming. A committee member commented that the greenhouse was built with memorial donations in honor of Valley teacher Ivan Gilbert. It was noted that it is the choice of the committee to include the greenhouse.
- Q: Have we programmatically gutted this project? Should we invest in the current facility and not add new space?  
A: Believe the new space offers improved academic areas and is worth the investment. Dr. Omotani said that question has been discussed at length with the professional design team and district administration. The physical structure is not linked to the three learning communities. Dr. Omotani said the learning space is definitely improved over what is currently available.
- Q: Would the city require additional parking if the project scope was limited to remodeling?  
A: Hodgkin said he believes so.
- Q: Design Down, Connections and the Program Committees all identified “must haves” in a remodeled VHS. Are these features still in the design?  
A: Some space is provided to allow for new ways of learning. HVAC needs would not be addressed in as much of the building as originally planned. Dr. Omotani said the two story addition allows new learning experiences. Items were left out because adequate funds are not available. Some items now out of the project could be obtained in the future.
- Q: What is the floor height of the two-story addition?  
A: 14 feet.
- Q: In considering the elevation from the gym to the rest of the building – could the first floor of the addition be lower than the gym? Then a ramp could be utilized rather than a stairway.  
A: That option has not been considered.
- Q: What is the cost of demolition to make room for parking?  
A: \$450,000 has been budgeted.
- Q: How much will it cost to replace existing sewer lines? Oil tanks?  
A: We are working with the district’s Operations staff to determine those needs. Contingency money is being kept in place to address the “unknowns.”
- Q: What has been lost from previous design concepts?  
A: Greenhouse and the curriculum that goes with it. Hodgkin reviewed the “at risk” list. He noted that total replacement of lockers may not be possible. The renovation of the forum would have to wait until the end of the project to see if funds are available.
- Q: Can we find more money to complete some of the items on the “deferred list?” Are Physical Plant and Equipment Levy funds available?  
A: Galen Howsare said \$19 million in PPEL funds are committed to sales tax projects, not just to the Valley project. Revenue has fallen short of initial projections, he said.

Suggestion: revise the “wish list” and “deferred list” to accentuate the positive. Phil said an emergency response team had prepared the lists for discussion at today’s meeting.

The group discussed the greenhouse. It was noted that it would not be possible to relocate and reassemble the current structure. However, the group decided it would be acceptable to build a new greenhouse and retain the memorial to Ivan Gilbert.

It was noted that updated information should be presented to the community as soon as possible. Both the district web site and the Planning Place at Valley should have the schematic design materials available.

Hatfield said the work of the Site Design Team is complex. He noted that changes are both positive and negative. He said the site plan is not all that different. From a site committee point of view, we have responded and functioned appropriately.

Hodgin summarized meeting discussion as follows:

- The greenhouse needs to be included in the schematic design.
- In the schematic design materials and upcoming presentation to the Board, highlight all the design features that will enhance teaching and learning.

The group agreed the schematic design – with the addition of the greenhouse – could go to the Board on March 15. The Board Facility Committee will review the plans later this week. It was suggested that the priorities developed by the previous committees should be included in the Board presentation – align the current design features with those priorities.