



Meeting Minutes
BSD – Sehome High School Advisory Committee
March 29, 2016

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Allen, Jeff
Dalton, Mark
Gazow, Kurt

Ron Cowan welcomed the group back together. Minutes from the March 15th meeting were provided prior to the meeting. With no suggested edits or changes, minutes were approved. Ron then shared a list of Plus/Delta's from the previous meeting. The group had the opportunity to do some hands on work that was positive. We are continuing to try to have time for questions and provide the agenda further in advance of the meeting in order to make the meetings as productive as possible.

Ron introduced Pete Dawson, Jeremy Carroll and Jon Tesarik from Dawson Construction, the contractor selected for the new Sehome High School. Ron shared that a selection committee recently finished a three month process and Dawson rose to the top. Dawson brings a combination of great competence and character; they are highly skilled in their work and

principled in their actions. Ron thanked Dawson for their past work with Bellingham Public Schools, citing both the Bellingham High School rebuild and the Whatcom Middle School rebuild, completing the Whatcom project a year ahead of schedule.

Pete Dawson addressed the committee, thanking them for the opportunity and expressing how excited Dawson is to begin working on the Sehome project. Many on the Dawson team assigned to work on the Sehome project also worked on the Bellingham and Whatcom rebuilds. Dawson's office boasts 15 Sehome graduates and over 40 children or grandchildren who have attended or will attend Sehome.

Ron explained the contractor selection process for the Sehome project is different than past projects and as a result we receive the benefit of the contractor's expertise at the beginning of the project. We are excited to be working with Pete and his team to make sure the Sehome project is done right.

Ron told the committee it is time to press on as we need to have our recommendation in terms of a site plan and schematic plan completed prior to the end of the school year. This may require additional meetings, with Ron suggesting the committee may wish to meet weekly to get the job done. A majority of the committee favored meeting weekly to reach our timeline rather than extending further into May or June if additional meetings are necessary.

Michelle Kuss-Cybullla shared committee feedback from the last meeting regarding lockers. The group participated in a short discussion, commenting that lockers may be needed for sports, and questioning what new things have impacted high schools, how we do education differently, and wonder if technology changes the need for lockers.

Dana Smith shared she'd had a discussion with her marketing class about lockers. The students said lockers were a good resource as they like having a space of their own. They thought that the traditional locker seems too large, preferring a gym size locker. They didn't care for stacked lockers as often someone would be standing in front of their locker. If textbooks are on devices, lockers provide a safe place to store them, adding that outlets should also be considered. At the next meeting Michelle will bring additional feedback from students.

Tim Jewett discussed Guiding Principle V1.5 in a new handout, explaining from comments heard at the last meeting, Indicator 3.10 was edited from "Healthy food is celebrated" to "Healthy food is celebrated and promoted by providing easy access to healthy food choices in a welcoming environment". The committee was pleased with this change.

Tim went over an updated Draft Numeric Program, indicating a square footage overage of 1300. The goal was reduce the total square footage to 183,623 or less. Tim had the group participate in an exercise looking over the new Draft Numeric Program, suggesting areas that could be reduced in square footage to make up 1300 square feet.

Suggestions began with reducing General Education classrooms from 850 square feet to 825, and reducing extended learning areas from 850 square feet to 750.

Jeff Tetrick said it might be better to reduce the number of extended learning spaces instead of the size of them. Tim replied it is something they will look at although the idea is to provide enough extended learning space to serve a reasonable number of classrooms.

Jackie Brawley commented she felt uncomfortable reducing the General Education classrooms when our Guiding Principles state teaching and learning is most important. Dana agreed, saying she would like to see some conference spaces shared, keeping the square feet in the classrooms.

Tim said that at 825 square feet, classrooms will be slightly larger than they are currently in the existing school. With 28 students, an 800 square foot classroom is the lower end of the normal range. Colin Cushman commented teachers he has talked with would like their classes at least as large as they are now, which they will be. Tim stated with the comments he is hearing, the committee would rather reduce a few of the components across the board rather than reducing individual classrooms. Ron suggested Tim and Zach take the committee ideas and comments and look at some peripheral spaces to see if they can find reductions other than from classrooms. Ron added that needing to reduce square footage is a typical part of the process with every project. Tim said he appreciated the group wrestling with this dilemma and at the next meeting Dykeman will be back with a new approach.

Zach Ham then reviewed content gathered from the adjacency exercise that the committee worked through. There was discussion on what are characteristics of a successful extended learning area. Tim stated they are important to the mission of teaching and learning and questioned how big do they need to be and how do they relate to other spaces. Dana stated that we like common space and functionality. Michelle said diversity in the space is important. Some teachers need quiet; some need more space for projects that can't be accommodated in a classroom. Steve Clarke stated circulation done in conjunction with an extended learning space may allow more students into that area. The circulation area becomes part of your commons space. Additional ideas that emerged from committee comments included extended learning areas that are transparent, inviting, flexible, and multi-functional.

Zach went over the Site Diagramming Exercise Schemes that have been previously presented. From pros and cons the group provided, Schemes 4 and 5 were developed. Zach noted that with Scheme 4 and 5 there is some campus separation, and concerns with views and orientation, isolation of fields, community presence, site security, and complexities of phasing. Dykeman went back and made sure they addressed these concerns expressed by the committee. From this process Scheme 6 emerged and was presented.

Scheme 6 would not require phasing so there would be less disruption during construction. It follows the topography and takes advantage of the big design goals – views, daylight, community presence, private on one side and public on the other, site security, access to the fields, (near gym and PE), and outdoor commons space. Going with the topography all general purpose classrooms will have a view to the south with an opportunity for some outdoor learning spaces. It allows for a bus loop that is separate from parent drop off, and the commons, administration and library are all in the middle for community presence.

Mark Peterson felt the parking area didn't appear very sustainable, and asked if there was a way to provide some sustainable aspects such as rain gardens or bio retention. Tim stated that regardless where the parking is placed, rain gardens and bio retention will be incorporated into the project. Michelle added that the parking exists now, but it is more spread out than what is shown in Scheme 6.

Amy Hankinson commented that compared to Scheme 4 and 5 half of the school seems to be looking at the parking lot. Kathy Hasenjaeger expressed her fondness of Scheme 6, noting that those classrooms would actually be looking at Sehome Hill to the north, providing all classrooms with views.

Rachel Williams would like to retain some green space and pedestrian accessibility. Tim explained there will be green space and paths off of Bill McDonald Pkwy.

Mike Anderson was pleased with this Scheme 6 as the school can be built without phasing and with one building there is only one mechanical system, one electrical system, etc.

Jon Tesarik stated from a contractor's perspective it's a great plan.

The committee's overall response to Scheme 6 was very positive. Ron said the group has done a great job collectively. The design team has been given a great deal of information from many sources and they've come up with a creative solution. The committee gave the Dykeman team a round of applause. Next time the committee meets; Ron has charged Dykeman to return with a suggested scheme and perhaps a floor plan. Tim stated they will come back with a preferred scheme. It will not be the final, and the committee will want to poke at it with testing questions. Dykeman will not be able to meet all of the goals all at once, but we will test out our Guiding Principles. Zach added our Guiding Principal descriptors will help in designing the space.

Meeting Adjourned 4:45p.m.