

Lopez Island School District
 PDAT Workshops 3A & 3B
 26 March 2015

Lopez Island School District Improvements

TCF Architecture Project Number: 2014-012

Attendance:

Present?	Name	Contact Information
X	Brian Auckland, Lopez Island Elementary School Principal & Superintendent	bauckland@lopez.k12.wa.us
X	Russel Barsh, KWIAHT / Lopez Island School Science Enrichment	rlbarsh@gmail.com
X	Kathy Booth, Lopez Island Special Services Teacher	kbooth@lopez.k12.wa.us
X	Georgeana Cook, Community Representative	mycoachgmc@hotmail.com
X	Bill Evans, Community Member	
X	Jennifer Everett, The Robinson Group	beverett@robinson-co.com
X	Brian Fitzgerald, TCF Architecture PLLC	brian@tcfarchitecture.com
X	Patsy Haber, LISD Board Member	Habers211@gmail.com
X	Cheryl Harlan, Lopez Island School Para-pro & Custodian	charlan@lopez.k12.wa.us
X	John Holding, LISD Board Member	john@holding.com
X	Paul S. Henriksen	
X	Andrew Hickman, TCF Architecture PLLC	andrew@tcfarchitecture.com
X	Denny Jardine, Lopez Island School Maintenance	djardine@lopez.k12.wa.us
X	Tina Katzenberger, Community Representative	tkatzenb@hotmail.com
X	Kathryn Kester, Lopez Island Secondary Teacher	kkester@lopez.k12.wa.us
X	Teri Linneman, Lopez Island School Bus Driver & PSE President	tlinneman@lopez.k12.wa.us
	Kirk Robinson, The Robinson Group	bkrobinson@robinson-co.com
X	Dave Sather, Lopez Island Secondary School Principal	dsather@lopez.k12.wa.us
X	Carol Steckler, Community Representative	humhouse@rockisland.com
X	Lorri Swanson, Lopez Island Elementary School Teacher	lswanson@lopez.k12.wa.us
X	Kirman Taylor, Community Representative	kirmant@gmail.com
X	Dan Drahm, Boundary Water	dan@boundary-water.com
X	Jack Pinkard, PCS Structural Solutions	jpinkard@pcs-structural.com
X	Mark Humiston, Hargis for part A	mark.humiston@hargis.biz
X	Jared Robillard, Hargis for part A	jared.robillard@hargis.biz
X	Teta Brown, TCF Architecture PLLC via telephone for part A	teta@tcfarchitecture.com
X	Sean Ragudo, TCF Architecture PLLC via telephone for part A	sean@tcfarchitecture.com

Distribution: Attendees via LISD PDAT Google Drive.

Action Items:

Item #	Topics/Discussions	Discussions/Action/Status/Follow-up
1	Introduction	A. John Holding (JH) welcomed everyone back and noted that it felt like the project community is coming together. He followed with a brief overview of the agenda followed by John asked if anyone was having issues with access to the project documents using the Google portal.
2	Part 3A – Sustainability Discussion / WSSP Scorecard	<p>A. Brian Fitzgerald (BF) spoke of his understanding that sustainable design and actions are important to the Lopez Island community and followed with a description of the Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol (WSSP) which is a LEED like analysis for schools based on a similar program in California. It differs from LEED, which utilizes accredited professionals and a national clearinghouse to certify buildings as compliant with levels of sustainability – Platinum, Gold, Silver. WSSP is self-scored and pass/fail. It may or may not be required for this project but the underlying goals are what will be discussed tonight. While going through this exercise of reviewing the scorecard, note that many items have simply become standard practice in today’s world – an example being recycling to the greatest degree possible. Also, things like photo-voltaic cells (PV) and water harvesting are approaches that are possible, but often carry significant additional capital cost. The requirements to pass on the scorecard are 40 points for new buildings and 29 for modernization projects.</p> <p>B. A question was asked whether additional funding could be available for doing extraordinary things as in a LEED Gold or Platinum building. The answer, for this project, was no, it is simply pass/fail.</p> <p>C. BF added that due to the way that Washington state funds K-12 construction and renovation, only the Middle School / High School portion of the building or shared space was eligible to receive state funding.</p> <p>D. The next hour plus was spent reviewing the scorecard with Teta Brown (TB) of TCF running through the points, what was required and how they were typically interpreted. Where applicable, the design team engineers added clarification of what was typical, what was possible and how they viewed the opportunities as they apply to Lopez Island School. See the attached scorecard which contains Teta’s scoring along with Sean Ragudo’s notations regarding discussions or additional research to be done.</p> <p>E. Following the completion of the scoring, which passed, everyone attended the community dinner held in the LISD Multi-Purpose room.</p>
3	Part 3B – Ed Spec Progress Review and Discussion	<p>A. BF updated on the progress of the Ed Spec conferences with staff and community members.</p> <p>B. JH reminded everyone that costs had not been looked at for any work yet, just ideas.</p> <p>C. BF updated the PDAT on design team progress.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The engineers have been reviewing the school over the last two days to better understand the existing condition of the systems and components in place. 2 Likely there will not be any cost estimating work ahead of the next workshop scheduled for 4/15. 3 The Ed Spec currently being developed through the input of staff, faculty and community members in tandem with the design team will serve as the road map for the project. 4 There is a long list of improvements that need to be made to keep the building operating over the long term and it is currently assumed that this work will account for 2/3 of the budget. <p>D. Elementary School: Goals include modernizing the classrooms and addressing the core of the building to improve educational functionality.</p>

		<p>E. Middle School / High School: One of the thoughts is a potential new building (Brian showed a diagram) and improvements to the existing school as previously discussed – Science, PE, Classrooms.</p> <p>F. Site: The priority is to address the main front parking lot by the Gymnasium.</p> <p>G. There are also several big discussion points including the potential for combined administration and where that might best be housed – at the current wood shop area? This would require connecting the two buildings. He is also looking at school security with a controlled entry point.</p> <p>H. If the administration were moved, as discussed, it would potentially impact the buses to a single drop-off / pick-up point and a separation of cars (parent drop off, students, staff) and buses for safety.</p> <p>I. An idea that was presented was to utilize the existing district shop (bus barn) for an expanded weight and fitness program. This is an ideal ‘adaptive reuse’ of existing space which saves money and is a sustainable strategy. The structural engineer reviewed it today and believes that using it for this purpose is possible.</p> <p>J. By connecting the buildings, as noted above for convenience, it would provide greater access control.</p> <p>K. The multi-purpose room space would be better if it were more adaptable for multiple purposes. Possible ideas included utilizing the current elementary school office space (should the offices be combined elsewhere) for multi-purpose room storage and new restrooms along with a family restroom. The flooring for the MP room was also discussed.</p> <p>L. Kitchen: The food service consultant met today with district personnel and several ideas were discussed – tying culinary to the kitchen, expansion of the kitchen, utilization of the courtyard.</p> <p>M. In the elementary school core area, currently used for art, potential ideas were to create pull-out spaces, art areas and potentially skylights to bring daylight into the building.</p> <p>N. The potential new building shown by Brian had ideas for housing art, instructional shop, design lab, flex lab, support spaces, storage and district shop. The size of the building would need to be looked at and the circulation – covered walk, enclosed corridor – would also need study. BF indicated that he was picturing potentially a ‘light-industrial’ type of feel to the space. This has the potential to provide a new space for the art program.</p> <p>O. Science: Discussions with Russel and Jennifer opened ideas for a possible ‘advanced’ lab that could house the instrumentation that Russel has the connections to acquire over time.</p> <p>P. Culinary Program: Discussed possible relocation closer to the kitchen.</p> <p>Q. Locker rooms: Some renovation, remain largely intact.</p> <p>R. Middle School / High School Office area: Should a combined office move forward, BF talked about conversations with the students about study spaces for small groups and individuals with the possibility of spaces for distance learning and conference rooms. Another idea was to utilize that space for the culinary program or an Audio-Visual Classroom.</p> <p>S. A comment was made that utilizing the bus barn and/or adding a separate building south of the school could impact the security ideas being discussed.</p> <p>T. Brian Auckland (BA) spoke a bit about the elementary program, noting that he had heard concerns regarding the distance from the elementary classrooms to the potential shared office near the gym and discussed his prior experience where his kindergarten students, in a typical elementary school, would have a similar distance walk and would be comfortable with it very quickly. He did add that it</p>
--	--	---

		<p>would be a good idea in that instance to have a direct path from the playground to the nurse office.</p> <p>U. JH added that the addition of ‘thoughtful’ sidewalks connecting key parts of the campus was a good idea.</p> <p>V. Someone pointed out that it would be ideal if the elementary school were on the high school side, noting that hindsight can be 20/20.</p> <p>W. A concern was raised regarding the travel distances and potential impacts to SPED students.</p> <p>X. Another comment was made that as a parent, knowing that there are adults, besides the teacher, who are nearby.</p> <p>Y. Someone commented that the older kids congregating near the gym could cause fear in the younger students. A follow up comment was that the older kids could use the opportunity to help the younger ones and with Coach Berg’s office along the pathway that is also helpful.</p> <p>Z. A question was asked about a counselor being located on the elementary side. BF responded that one of the ideas was to provide breakout spaces and private spaces in the elementary area for the students to meet with counselors / SPED helpers. It was also discussed about having counselors away from the office in the shared area – neutral ground. This may also address the time concern and the Lobo Lab could serve as a ready space for large meetings with AV capabilities built-in.</p> <p>AA. With that the discussion turned to the computer lab and with a likely move to a 1 to 1 model where each student had a computer there would not be the need for a dedicated ‘lab’.</p> <p>BB. Dave Sather (DS) also spoke about the possibility for a distance learning space and indicated that the Lobo Lab or part of the MS/HS office could be utilized for that.</p> <p>CC. A request for open space for tinkering was brought up.</p> <p>DD. A question was asked regarding square footage allocation with all of the proposed shifts discussed.</p> <p>EE. Someone added that it would be wise to design in such a way that future additional classrooms or spaces could be added easily. Don’t be short-sighted.</p> <p>FF. A question was asked regarding the student center not being in direct line of sight of the office.</p> <p>GG. It was pointed out that the Art Classroom building is ill-sited.</p> <p>HH. Denny Jardine (DJ) reminded that the MS/HS students would like an outside eating / meeting area with tables. BF suggested that the area between the Gymnasium and the Elementary south of the bus barn could be used.</p> <p>II. A question was asked about HS parking if it were to be moved south and supervision.</p> <p>JJ. A plea was made to save the trees that were recently planted along the west side of the site next to the road. JH noted that even if improvements were made in that area, islands could be created to protect the trees.</p> <p>KK. Bus concerns were raised. Students on the sidewalk are an issue. There have been issues w/ the mix of ages in the past. A suggestion was made that dismissal times could be staggered to mitigate this so elementary students got to the buses first. Water for bus washing should be looked at. Need parking for a ‘guest’ bus – 7 total including all district buses.</p> <p>LL. What about the old pre-school. It is currently being used as Denny’s office.</p> <p>MM. DS asked about impacts to instruction during construction. Phasing will need to be determined and there will be discussions on how best to proceed with work.</p> <p>NN. Russel indicated that if the darkroom were not going to be used in that capacity, the area it is located would be an ideal electronics lab. Someone asked if there is a</p>
--	--	--

		<p>need to maintain a darkroom. JH answered that with digital photography it is unlikely.</p> <p>OO. Someone asked if classrooms would remain where they are. That is not known. At the classrooms with offices with the offices be removed? That is also not known.</p> <p>PP. A suggestion was made to move the IT headquarters (Jesse's classroom) away from a room with an outside door. There was a previous break in.</p> <p>QQ. A suggestion was made to provide better golf club storage.</p> <p>RR. Q questions was asked regarding the proposed legislation limiting students per classroom. It is likely going to affect K-3 with a maximum of 17 students and currently this would be accommodated.</p> <p>SS. It was asked whether the pull down doors in rooms 1, 2 & 4 could be re-purposed into tables.</p>
4	Wrap up	<p>A. JH reminded members of the PDAT to do public outreach. Also reminded everyone that this project anticipates no growth.</p> <p>B. BF thanked everyone and noted that there are lots of interesting ideas here. All will be considered, but it is unlikely the project can afford them all.</p> <p>C. A comment was made that art is important to Lopez.</p> <p>D. Another suggested no gravel.</p> <p>E. Next meeting 4/15 Wednesday at 4pm will include discussions of design ideas.</p>

Minutes by Andrew Hickman, TCF Architecture, PLLC

END OF MEETING MINUTES

If any information contained in these minutes does not meet with your understanding, please provide written comments stating any differences, or exceptions taken, to TCF Architecture PLLC prior to the next meeting. Revisions and clarifications to these notes will be formally made at the following meeting. In the event no exceptions are taken within one calendar week, TCF Architecture will assume that these minutes reflect a true and accurate record of the meeting.

(Note: Follow-up information or status updates, not specifically discussed at the meeting, may be included herein and identified as such.)