



Meeting Minutes
BSD – Parkview Elementary Advisory Committee Meeting No. 5
January 21, 2015

Call to Order:

Terry Brown opened the meeting at 3:37 pm

Minutes:

Time was given to review the minutes from January 14. There was one comment about which meeting number it was on January 14. No other questions or edits and the minutes were approved by consensus.

Review of site plan revisions and update: (See attached)

- Fence pushed out to provide about 40' more play surface.
- Proposed location of garden shown (it was noted that it is about 10% larger than current garden and supervision of that site might be easier as well)

Review of floor plan revisions and updates: (See attached)

- There are more access points added - doors out to playground and door out of gym near commons area
- Revision were made to the existing staff restrooms and the PE office space (possible alternates)
- A window wall in the office, additional general storage, area for laundry, a possible area for custodial desk and storage, and public-only restroom were all added to the plan (possible alternates)
- Not pictured but noted – resurfacing and new finishes in the south end student bathrooms and 'freezeway' heating/circulating improvements depending on gym and commons design (possible alternates)

The floor plan was color coded to easily see what is new construction, renovation, or possible alternates depending on budget.

The new construction and renovation will be part of the base bid. Alternate items will be part of the alternate bids and depending on how bids come in, decisions can be made about which of those items will be included according to budget.

Reminder that the specifics of the design of the kitchen space will be determined after some consultation with Food Services staff.

Exterior Perspective: (See attached)

Group and community input considered about aesthetic and building material for the development of the exterior design.

- Play structure is designed as "de-mountable" so it can be moved in the case of a future rebuild.
- Enclosed walkway along commons
- Glass overhead 'garage door'
- Ramp leading to music stage
- Materials are still undetermined: brick, wood cladding, panelized wood material, glass are all being considered
- Overhangs for weather protection
- Some slot windows for protection from play equipment outside but add natural light to corridor to commons inside
- Roof lines all tie in with this design but the gymnasium roof could still be removed from the structure in the event of a future rebuild
- View shows some additional windows in the gym as an option



Q: What would the exterior wall construction be? Plaster?

A: Not sure yet, but not stucco. Will confer with Buildings and Grounds for input about what works well on the other schools in the district.

There was a suggestion about adding a shed for playground equipment on the northeast corner of the building. The architects pointed out an area of unused space inside off of the addition that isn't as big as desired but is available and although it's possible to include an additional storage shed for playground equipment as a part of alternate items, that area is also the site of proposed future bathrooms. It was the consensus of the group that additional student restrooms are important enough to be considered as an alternate bid now instead of later. It was decided to include those restrooms into the consideration when prioritizing the additional items.

Proposed Garden: (See attached)

- Uses the existing fence line along far south corner
- In the view, the shed and greenhouse are scaled to actual size.
- Existing monkey bars included in design
- A new fence line is shown that extends to sidewalk
- These are ideas - planting and design are flexible
- Work will include relocating garden and bringing water to location.

Comment: one benefit to relocating the garden to this spot is that in a rebuild if the playground is relocated, this garden can then be expanded to increase outdoor learning space.

Discussion:

Ron Cowan, Assistant Superintendent of Finance and Operations, asked the group: have all the possibilities been incorporated as suggested or is something missing?

Q: In a future rebuild, there is potential for play equipment to be located north where primary wing is currently located. What would that mean for student flow from the gymnasium and cafeteria outside? It seems like it would create a similar issue to what there is now with students traveling down two separate hallways to get outside.

A: Terry Brown said that the north wall of existing gym could be designed so a hallway from the commons/gym complex could be created as a direct line to playground. The covered play would likely be moved over there as well.

Terry Brown asked if there were any new ideas.

Q: Will there still be a loft in the PE equipment room in this iteration?

A: The plans aren't designed to that level yet but it can certainly be done.

Budget:

New construction (base bid elements) is within budget

Repurposing/renovation spaces are considered as a separate set of expenses

2.6 million is the total construction budget

Estimates were given for each aspect marked up to maximum allowable costs and including a contingency of 20%.



Numbers are based on many things, including: cost estimating guides, the architects experience with these kinds of projects, and cost of materials.

Prioritizing alternates:

As a preface to the discussion about prioritizing alternate items, the question about the existing music portable was posed. Once the new music room is built, does that free up the portable for one of the alternate needs? From a building perspective, the only thing it would have to be used for is a classroom in case of increased enrollment or smaller class sizes. The only alternate items that would make sense in a portable are custodial, PTA, or small group instruction space.

Discussion was held to prioritize the following items:

- 1) South toilets – the group agrees that this brings a lot of benefit for relatively low expense
- 2) Revised PE storage/office – revised to not include the plumbing for toilet and shower and to not include changing the floor elevation
- 3) New student toilets – from a student flow and supervision perspective, this is very important but very expensive
- 4) Revised staff toilets – revised to be a ‘face-lift’ to surfaces and fixtures instead of the more comprehensive redesign originally proposed
- 5) New staff toilet and custodial – revised to be a simpler design than originally proposed
- 6) Small group instruction
- 7) PE storage/PE office
- 8) Freezeway
- 9) Window wall – the group agrees that this is the lowest priority. Some suggest it should be dropped from the list altogether but others say it does need some attention because it is rotting and needs to be replaced. The group was reminded that part of bond issue is dollars set aside for necessary district-wide improvements and this particular item could potentially be handled from that budget
- 10) Public toilet – the group agrees that this is not a necessary item to prioritize after all and can be dropped from consideration

Discussion surrounded a possible future rebuild of Parkview and which items would remain and which would be demolished. In the long term, all of the new construction will remain but any of the additional items that are outside of that would either be incorporated into a gym renovation or be removed altogether. Because an item like new staff toilets could potentially be gone in a few years, decisions were made to revise and/or prioritize based on not spending money on what may be demolished relatively soon.

Q: If there is no money for PE storage and office and it doesn't occur, where would the PE teacher go?

A: There would be some value-added engineering and solutions would be found at a lesser cost, they would just not be performed to this design standard. Buildings and Grounds could work to create a modified space.

Ron Cowan asked the group to consider our core mission in making these prioritizations.



Recommendation to Dr. Baker:

After discussion of the two options posed at last week's meeting, and no one from the group felt strongly about being included on a writing team, it was determined that Mylo Allen, Jackie Brawley, and Ron Cowan have a good record of what the group desires and will develop a draft which will be sent to the committee for review.

Next steps:

Garden-

Mylo will gather stakeholders to determine when the garden will be moved and when the planting will occur. Costs associated with moving the garden will come from the project budget but happen internally and will not be part of the bid process because the move needs to happen sooner than the bid process would allow.

Space design-

Architects will arrange to sit down meetings with staff to discuss individual spaces in more detail.

SEPA and other land use agencies/processes –

The architects, Ron Cowan, and Curtis Lawyer will handle these processes.

Next group meeting (present final design before it goes to a community update meeting) –

February 18 3:30-5:30pm in Parkview Library

Project/Design Open House update to community –

March 4, 2015 at 7pm in Parkview Gymnasium

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.