



Meeting Minutes
BSD – Sehome High School Advisory Committee
Meeting No.5
March 1, 2016

Members Present:

Anderson, Mike	Johnson, Kevin
Ashby, Melissa	Keck, Kacy
Brawley, Jacqueline	Knops, Gail
Clarke, Steve	Kuss-Cybula, Michelle
Cowan, Ron	Lawyer, Curtis
Criez, Kevin	Peterson, Mark
Cushman, Colin	Schenck, Corrine
Denton, Julie	Smith, Dana
Dominguez, Kristi	Snyder, Craig
Gazow, Kurt	Stinson, Jonah
Ham, Zach	Tetrick, Jeff
Hankinson, Amy	Williams, Rachel
Hasenjaeger, Kathy	Zender, Martha
Jewitt, Tim	

Members Absent:

Allen, Jeff
Schubeck, Grace
Trulock, Oliver

Ron Cowan welcomed the group back together, thanking everyone for their investment in the project, and stating that the committee was coming to the most exciting part of this work.

Minutes from the February 2 meeting were provided prior to the meeting. There were no suggested edits and the minutes were approved.

Tim Jewett presented the updated Guiding Principles Version 1.3 after committee feedback from the last meeting, with revisions made to Guiding Principle 2 - (Supporting indicator 2.1), Guiding Principle 3 - (Supporting indicators 3.1, 3.2, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12), and Guiding Principle 5 - (Supporting indicators 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5).

After a short discussion, a few additional edits were suggested. These will be presented at the next meeting in Guiding Principles Version 1.4. Tim stated we want to keep measuring our work through these Guiding Principles, and Dykeman wants to make sure they are taking these to heart as we move forward.

Tim reviewed and summarized the activities that occurred during the Focus Groups at Sehome. The Dykeman team met with staff and others over a 3 day period February 16, 17 and 18. They spoke with representatives from each department and reviewed each topic area. Additionally they met with instructional technology, safety/security, transportation, and maintenance staff regarding district standards. Those interviewed were well prepared with questions and the meetings were positive and productive.

During the Focus Group sessions, Dykeman went through special requirements with staff, for example: how many students in each class, how many teachers, and what kind of activities need to happen in each space for teaching and learning. They discussed groupings, how many people needed to be in each space and those spatial relationships within the rest of the building. Additionally discussed were storage, common areas, environmental variables, and the desire for a lot of natural light.

Michelle Kuss-Cybula's team provided a detailed inventory of how many files, etc., they would need room for. The furniture, fixture and equipment requirements are important to make sure special needs are met for furnishings required for each department. All of these notes, conversations, and work of the committee will become the formal Educational Specifications document. The committee will see a comprehensive draft to review prior to publication.

At the last committee meeting, members broke into 5 groups and took part in an exercise to assess the best site location, orientation, and adjacencies for each programmatic element at the school as a whole. Zach Ham from Dykeman explained that the architects collected this information and as a group went back to their office and defined 'what were the big ideas'. They found there were definite similarities between the 5 schemes. Dykeman was able to condense the 5 plans into three concepts. Zach shared the three concepts with massing drawings, and requested the committee provide pros and cons that they saw with each plan.

After hearing and recording the committee's comments, Dykeman will review the three initial concepts and edit and/or create a fourth concept. Ron thanked Tim and Zach for the great ideas they presented from all that the committee has asked of them. Tim said they've tried to listen carefully, distil as best they could, and after today, do it again. They have plusses and minuses on each plan which is helpful as they move forward.

Tim shared that the target goal of square footage of the new building is 175,631 sq ft. They began with a comprehensive high school arrangement for 1,200 students. Using their experience, past completed projects, the committee and district staffs desires to provide positive teaching and learning environments, a draft numeric plan of 193,111 square feet emerged. The additional 17,480 square feet may be attributed to a number of factors including more space for interior circulation and mechanical spaces, 2 additional classrooms, the need for an additional science classroom, and a growing CTE department and the GRADS program.

To address the excess square footage Michelle and Tim lead a group exercise to come up with ideas and suggestions of ways to accommodate all of our programs and also help solve the dilemma. Michelle commented that everyone wants their space and it's our job is to push our understanding of our Guiding Principles, and as a committee, come together and look outside the box to help solve this dilemma.

Some suggestions included re-evaluating spatial needs in the library, administration and support staff sharing conference space, reducing classroom sizes, and common teacher planning areas. Tim and Zach listened to the group's recommendations, stating they will use these suggestions to create a revised numeric plan for review at the next meeting.

Ron stated that in solving the dilemma we are taking both a Partnership and a One Schoolhouse approach. By partnership he explained that the idea of using some project contingency to increase the budget will be explored to see if the final square footage can be greater than the original 175,000 target. By One Schoolhouse he reminded the committee of Dr. Baker's charge which included each member to bring their own perspective and share that perspective, but also to step back and look at the bigger picture. He expressed hope that the committee could help reduce the 17,480 by at least half, adding that we don't want to just slash square footage so that spaces don't work.

Tim stated they would be working on diagrams with the options discussed today, and refining the program from some of the specific suggestions. The process of selecting a general contractor is continuing and we hope to have that process wrapped up by the end of the month. We would like to bring them on as soon as possible so they can participate in this process and share their ideas on phasing, site planning, etc.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 15, 2:45p.m.-4:45p.m.

Meeting adjourned: 4:45p.m.