



ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Facilities Department
1301 Labar Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99515
Phone: (907) 348-5207
Fax: (907) 348-5227

PROJECT: Clark Middle School Renewal – Concept Design

SUBJECT: Building Design Committee Meeting #3

TIME/DATE: 3:00 p.m. March 28, 2006

LOCATION: Clark Middle School Band Room, 150 Bragaw St., Anchorage

PREPARED BY: Michael Logan

ATTENDEES:

Cessilye Williams	Clark Middle School – Principal
Shannon Gallagher	Clark Middle School – Assistant Principal
Mario Toro	Clark Middle School – Assistant Principal
Lorena Scalph	Clark Middle School – English/French Teacher
Mark Wood	Clark Middle School – Science Teacher
John Gallup	Clark Middle School – Science Teacher
Ramona Rivers	Clark Middle School – FCS Teacher/Electives Dept. Chair
Lynda Van Winkle	Clark Middle School – 8 th Grade Publication/Tech Coord.
Rocky Pasquale	Clark Middle School – Art Teacher
Terry Schoenthal	Land Design North – Principal
Michael Carlson	McCool Carlson Green Architects – Principal
John Weir	McCool Carlson Green Architects – Project Architect
Rob Balivet	ASD Facilities – Manager Design Planning
Mike Price	ASD Facilities – Construction Manager
Mary Cary	ASD Facilities – Project Manager
Michael Logan	ASD Facilities – Project Support Team

These meeting notes are ASD's interpretations of items discussed and decisions made. Any changes are to be sent to ASD in writing by April 11, 2006. After that date the minutes will stand as written.

- I) Outline and Purpose of Meeting: Following introductions, distribution of minutes from the March 9 and March 15 BDC Meetings, and a review of the Concept Design schedule, Michael Carlson briefed attendees on additions to Project Goals and Objectives and Learning Team Layouts resulting from the March 15 BDC Meeting. Terry Schoenthal of Land Design North presented a site analysis and John Weir and Michael Carlson presented concept design schemes, with discussion by

attendees. Copies of the Muldoon Middle School floor plan and of the Clark Educational Specifications Draft for Board Review were available.

II) Introductions – the committee welcomed Terry Schoenthal of Land Design North, a landscape architecture firm with experience in site design who are working with McCool Carlson Green Architects on the Clark Renewal Project.

III) Clark Middle School Renewal Goals and Objectives – Michael Carlson outlined three additions to the Goals and Objectives resulting from comments at the last BDC meeting:

1. Clark’s extensive ESL program is now specifically cited in the “Facilitate Learning” goal.
2. The “Cost Effective” goal is clarified: project budgets need to be met “with efficient use of funds providing real and perceived value to the community and taxpayers.”
3. A goal has been added to the list: “Embrace the Community: celebrate the positive values of the surrounding community. Create a School that respects and complements the neighborhood.”

IV) Learning Pod Layout #6, developed in response to March 15 BDC Meeting comments, was presented. Features include:

1. Science rooms grouped around shared prep room – these can be stretched to increase access from ends of pod.
2. Team communities defined by core and resource classrooms, locker placement and team commons.

V) Site Analysis Presentation

1. Highlights by Terry Schoenthal and Michael Carlson:
 - A. Building orientation – the site elevation drop to the south creates a solar access opportunity. Excellent views of the Chugach Mountains are to the southeast.
 - B. Security on south side of school – has been a concern; design opportunities exist to increase visibility of the south campus from inside the school.
 - C. Easements – including the Eklutna water main line, the east-west high-tension line, and the north-south community drainage line – will affect site development.

- D. Current high pedestrian use – should be maintained and encouraged, with attention to channeling traffic onto safest routes.
- E. Bus access – is best provided off of Bragaw; egress here may be right-turn only.
- F. Primary car access – is best provided via the signalized Mountain View Drive and Price Street intersection.
- G. Soil fill – will likely be needed and will likely be available from the Glenn Square development.
- H. The ML&P substation – will likely expand but will probably stay at its current off-campus location.
- I. Porcupine Drive access – may be brought closer to campus by the Glenn Square development to the southwest.
- J. Proposed Special Olympics building on Mountain View Drive – program links with Clark may be possible.
- K. Glenn-Bragaw interchange – will strongly shade the southeast corner of the campus.
- L. Because of the important neighborhood role of the Mountain View/Bragaw intersection, a “strong front door” at the northeast corner of the campus could be considered.

2. Comments by attendees; responses by the design team in italics:

- A. The hill west of the track – “is a very critical part of the Clark Middle School ski program.”
Response: Noted for design.
- B. Soil quality – the ski hill “is probably a stump pile;” other soil on the north part of the campus is thought to be good gravel.
Response: Test borings will profile the soil content throughout the site, including the ski hill. The area has a good reputation for gravel soils.
- C. Tree buffers – John Gallup asked that existing tree buffers, especially between the school and adjacent roadways, be maintained to the extent feasible, and voiced concern that use of fill could cause loss of trees.
Response: Ed Spec playing field requirements necessitate impacts to vegetation. Fill is needed to cover the north-south drain

line. Designers will work to preserve the treed buffer along Mountain View Drive.

D. Storm sewer tie-in line – Can it be lowered?

Response: Opportunities for lowering the line are limited due to invert elevations at Bragaw drainage swale.

VI) Presentation of Concept Design Schemes

1. Some features of the Schemes:

A. Scheme A: Saves/transforms most of existing structure; center section demolished; tall N-S spine with daylight monitor minimizes side halls; new 2-story MPR.

B. Scheme B: Organized around site slope; MPR by main entrance; pods have view of fields; fairly compact.

C. Scheme C: MPR at center and near entrance is a focus for public as they enter the school.

D. Scheme D: Cross circulation; library oriented to interior of school (as in F and G).

E. Scheme E: Most compact; short internal circulation paths; school set back from community across parking; pods stacked on three levels connected by a community core; build all pods in phase 1.

F. Scheme F: Linear mall scheme reaches toward Bragaw & Mtn View intersection; central MPR; central library.

G. Scheme G: leverages view; MPR could be feature element.

2. General Comments by attendees; some responses by design team follow in italics. Further responses will be embodied in revised schemes to be presented to the BDC on April 11.

A. Using the existing building footprint – this is seen as a source of compromises in the Wendler renovation. Examples cited: students at Wendler pass through other pods to get to their own pods; visitors pass through the MPR to get to admin/student services offices.

B. MPR – emerged as a focus of attendee comments.

- i. “The MPR is our main hub.” Attendees asked that the MPR be placed central to the school, yet with good access from a main entry.

- ii. Kitchen/servery – needs to be on an outside wall for deliveries.
- iii. Both the MPR and the gym are used before and after school, but student access to the MPR is more important than student access to the gym. Good traffic flow between the MPR and classrooms is important. The MPR opens at 7:30 a.m. and is the main space where students congregate before 1st period.
- iv. The MPR should not be located right at the entrance of the school. Wendler was cited as an example of what to avoid.
- v. Cessilye Williams compared the proper relation of the MPR and school entrance to that of a family living room or den to the front door of a home. A space near the main entry needs to provide visitors with welcoming orientation and direction; the proposed welcoming center can do this for Clark. However, an MPR open to and in direct view of the school entrance may not be desirable, just as it may not be desirable to have the front entry of a house open directly into the living room or den, Ms. Williams said.

C. Gym

- i. Muni gym rentals –use an outside entrance, not necessarily the main entrance of the building. Make sure the outside entrance to the gym is in a visible place.
- ii. Complete replacement of the existing gym – envisioned by one attendee.

Response: Feasibility of replacing the gym depends on cost effectiveness. Converting the existing gym to be the MPR is another possible option.

D. Library – should have an easily accessible public entrance way.

E. Containment of the pods by grade level – emerged as a desire. Containment is perceived as mitigating security and supervision concerns. (C. Williams and S. Gallagher)

F. Schemes with parts of the building very close to Mountain View drive – transparency of the inside of the school from the street needs to be controlled due to security concerns.

G. Building entries – best for security is to have all students come into the school in one area, even though the bus and car drop-offs need to be separated. Hanshew was cited as a positive example.

H. “Are we stuck with the Parks & Recreation Building?” an attendee asked.

Response: Yes, this building is likely to remain in its current use. Parking requirements of this building will have to be accounted for in site design.

3. Attendee comments on specific schemes:

A. Scheme A

- i. Location of gym and MPR could be swapped to make the MPR more accessible to students.

B. Scheme B

- i. The pod at the Southeast corner “looks like it could be a monolith.”
- ii. The gym isolates the pods and cuts them off from the school.

C. Scheme C

- i. Presents a hard edge to the west.

D. Scheme D

- i. Parking would be lost during some of construction.

E. Scheme E

- i. Phasing – Scheme E presents a phasing advantage in that it would allow students to move into all three renewed academic pods at the completion of Phase 1 (C. Williams and S. Gallagher).
- ii. Height of the building – could be a concern.
- iii. Having the three grades/pods on three separate levels is seen as an efficient means of containing the grades/pods and separating their traffic flows.
- iv. Flipping the locations of the MPR and gym could better serve students by placing the MPR more central to the

school. Or, shuffle the locations of MPR, gym, and art/music complex.

F. Scheme F

- i. Layout – the wandering path and curved walls are appreciated, but a convex rather than concave shape for the walls might allow better visual connectivity and supervision inside the building.
- ii. Cost of the curved walls – might be decreased by adopting a “stepped” design.

G. Scheme G

- i. Entrance design is good because it puts the main entrances near the MPR and gym, which are high-public use areas.
- ii. Southeast orientation of the pods is good.
- iii. Flow of students to buses and car drop-off is good.

VII) Meetings

1. The next Clark BDC meeting will be held from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM on Tuesday, April 11 in the Clark Middle School Band Room. The architects will present a reduced number of more detailed schemes. Information from engineers’ assessments of the existing building will be available.
2. Concept Design Student Workshops will be held this Thursday and Friday, March 30 and 31.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

cc: Meeting Attendees
Leslie Vandergaw
Amy Yurko
File