



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 #4

TIME/DATE: 3:00 p.m. April 11, 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
Carol Comeau	ASD – Superintendent
Leslie Vandergaw	Executive Director of Middle School Education
Steve Kalmes	ASD – Director of Transportation
Lorena Scalph	Clark Middle School – English/French Teacher
John Gallup	Clark Middle School – Science Teacher
Paula Saindon	Clark Middle School – Life Skills II Teacher
P. Renée Rindone	Clark Middle School – Social Studies Teacher
Paul Witt	HDR Engineering for Ak DOT & PF Bragaw Interchange
Tom Dougherty	Ak DOT & PF Project Manager
Amy Yurko	BrainSpaces
Michael Carlson	McCool Carlson Green Architects – Principal
John Weir	McCool Carlson Green Architects – Project Architect
Ray Amsden	ASD Facilities – Director
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 May 3, 2006. After that date the minutes will stand as written.

- I) Outline and Purpose of Meeting: Following introductions, distribution of draft minutes from the March 28 BDC Meeting, and a briefing by Carol Comeau, Michael Carlson and John Weir reported on student workshops and engineers'

building conditions surveys and presented refined concept design schemes. Questions were fielded and issues discussed with a view toward narrowing the number of concept schemes to two for the next meeting.

II) Introductions – the Committee welcomed Paul Witt of HDR Engineers and Tom Dougherty of Alaska DOT & PF who are working on the Glenn Highway/Bragaw Interchange project, and Clark Special Education teacher Paula Saindon and Clark Social Studies teacher Renée Rindone. The Committee also welcomed ASD Superintendent Carol Comeau, ASD Director of Facilities Ray Amsden and ASD Construction Manager Mike Price.

III) Briefing by Carol Comeau

1. Despite the failure of the bond issues, the Clark Concept Design will move ahead on schedule. This is necessary in order to achieve a good cost estimate.
2. To better understand the results of the recent bond election, ASD is polling voters with two questions:
 - A. If you voted no, why – and what are your suggestions?
 - B. If you voted yes, what were the key issues that motivated your vote?
3. The current 70%/60% state debt reimbursement for school bonds expires October 31, 2006. The proposed November 1, 2006 through 2008 replacement scheme would provide 60%/40% debt reimbursement. Although the percentage of project costs eligible for reimbursement would be smaller under the proposed scheme, there would be no overall district cap.
4. The District's top three priorities for capital funding are Clark Middle School, Sand Lake Elementary School, and Chester Valley Elementary School.
5. Input from the Clark Middle School community will be important in helping ASD administration craft a response to the recent bond election results.
6. Key contacts among legislators in Juneau include Kevin Myer (Co-chair of House Finance Committee) and Max Gruenberg. Support from the Republican majority will be needed to pass legislation.

IV) Report on Student Workshops – McCool Carlson Green Architects conducted 12 student workshop sessions on March 30 and 31. Topics included learning signature,

learning spaces, diversity in design, artwork, team identities, and bringing Alaska into your work at school. Student work will be scanned and used for posters.

V) Learning Signature follow up

1. Synopsis of the concept of the learning signature – it is what captures the spirit and intent of the school. The learning signature is about program and identity, not just architecture.
2. Responses received to date, collated into eight categories and listed on a Learning Signature Worksheet, were passed out to all attendees. Attendees were asked to circle three categories that best express Clark’s Learning Signature.

VI) Building Condition Survey results

1. Engineers have completed their mechanical, electrical and structural surveys of the existing Clark building, which they classified into three categories:
 - A. “Facility A” – the one-story portion
 - B. “Facility B” – the two-story portion
 - C. “Facility C” – the library
2. Conclusions of the engineers were:
 - A. Facility A should be demolished.
 - B. Facility B is in better condition than Facility A and may well be salvageable. If Facility B is completely gutted and stripped down to the structural steel and foundation, these remaining components may be usable in the renewal. All mechanical/electrical systems in Facility B should be replaced.
 - C. Facility C is in good condition and should be retained.

VII) Michael Carlson presented refined Concept Design schemes – see attachment

1. Remarks by Michael Carlson – applicable to all schemes
 - A. Michael Carlson handed out a Goals and Objectives evaluation matrix sheet – attendees were asked to note areas where schemes are particularly strong or weak.

- B. Property boundaries on each scheme are identical and are the result of negotiations with the Municipality.
- C. The site has about 12' of slope downward from the building south to the field area.
- D. Site circulation in all schemes separates car from bus traffic: car access is from the Mountain View/ Price Street intersection; bus access is from Bragaw Street.
- E. Easements affecting planning for outdoor playing fields and courts include:
 - i. East-West overhead high-tension transmission line – it is desired to keep playing fields out from under this line.
 - ii. North-south drainage easement – cannot be moved.
 - iii. Glenn Highway right of way – moves closer to school in southeast corner of site and along the Glenn frontage.
- F. Playing field layout
 - i. Outdoor track – architects suggest moving this to the west end of the site.
 - ii. Hockey rink – should be located close to the gym entrance where hockey players put on their skates.
- G. Aid to comparing the schemes –the gym is in the same place on the site in every scheme.

VIII) Discussion

1. General Comments by attendees

A. ESL

- i. The initial levels of ESL are taught separately from other classes. Should more customized ESL spaces be provided?
- ii. Response by Amy Yurko – the Ed Spec responds to ESL needs in several ways:
 - a. ESL students are accommodated in classrooms that are the same size as the core academic classrooms

(900 ft²) in order to provide flexibility in room use and assignment.

- b. 9 teams instead of 8 are provided in order that one team can be an ESL team if desired.
 - c. Smaller resource rooms are available in each pod. These can be flexibly assigned to any program, including ESL, as class sizes require.
 - d. In each pod, two regular-size classrooms are separated by a divider which can be opened to create one large space. Also, in each pod two resource rooms are similarly connected. These provide further room size flexibility to meet variable program needs.
- B. Planning for Relos – although the intent of the District is for relos not to be needed when the renewal is completed, it is District policy to plan for 4 relocatable classrooms in all middle school designs in case of future need. Title 21 of the municipal code requires the spaces where these relos would be put to be shown on the master plan submitted to the municipality for review.
- C. Gym – location will remain the same as in the existing facility or, if the gym is put in a new space, the existing gym shell will be gutted and refurbished for other use.
- D. After-hours use – The gym, MPR and other community use spaces should be accessible from outside the building without going through academic spaces. Areas of non-community use spaces should be able to be closed off after-hours.
- E. Pedestrian safety – if the east and west parking lots and vehicle loops are not connected, students will not have to walk across traffic on the campus site, Steve Kalmes pointed out.
- F. Lower level ceiling height – Overhead clearance on the 1st floor of Facility B is 10' 8" – programs chosen for these spaces will need to meet Ed Spec requirements for overhead clearance. The Weight Room could be housed on this level. It would not be very feasible to lower the first floor spaces' floor level to gain overhead clearance. Structural columns in 1st floor spaces also limit their suitability for programs such as dance and aerobics.
- G. Natural light – importance was emphasized

- i. “It’s really important to have that sun.”
- ii. “It makes all the difference when you’re pulling 14-hour days if you have [natural] light.”

H. Building visibility from streets

- i. Clark benefits from its visibility from surrounding roadways: “We get tons of supervision from people that are passing by.”
- ii. The community, in turn, can benefit from architecturally engaging views of Clark from Mountain View Drive, Bragaw Street and the Glenn Highway.

2. Comments on specific schemes

A. Scheme B

- i. Attendees liked the non-pod, core portion of B, including the “learning mall.”
- ii. Pod layout – provides fairly discrete, separated teams. However, putting two teams together in one area puts 200 students in that one area. View and natural light access from pods to southeast is good.

B. Scheme E

- i. The gallery was seen as a positive feature of Scheme E, providing a nice waiting area that has good visibility from administration, along with an easily supervised hallway that features added functionality.
- ii. Having both administration and student services by the main entry was seen as a plus.
- iii. Could the upper wall of the gym be open for visibility? – Yes, it could be opened up with glass, Michael Carlson said.
- iv. Pod layout – pods and teams have good containment and separation in this scheme, attendees said. As in B, view and natural light access from pods to southeast is good.

- v. Outdoor access – is good for side teams in ground level pods. However, on other levels, stairs would be needed for direct outdoor access from pods.
- vi. The main, car drop off entrance would be heavily shaded throughout the day in this scheme.
- vii. Fire lane – could afford bus drop off at fields. However, it would require a retaining wall along its south side, as well as gates at both ends to control unwanted access.

C. Scheme G

- i. The front façade of G facing Mountain View Drive received favorable comment.
- ii. The mixing together of teams in G was viewed less favorably than the discrete separation of teams in E.
- iii. The upstairs “alley” with 6 teams would put over 500 students on one level, creating some supervision challenges. However, this same configuration could facilitate looping.
- iv. Location of the Assistant Principal at the tail end of the long Level 2 corridor is not ideal for supervision.

D. Scheme H

- i. Visibility from classrooms for supervision within each team is good.
- ii. Supervision of main pod halls from team classrooms was seen as more problematic. The architects suggested glass walls could be used between the halls and classrooms. Cessilye Williams suggested blinds that close from the bottom up for these vision windows.
- iii. Some attendees suggested combining pod layout elements of H and E with elements from the north end of G.
- iv. Having separate bus and car drop off entries funnel into a single entry hall is a positive feature.

IX) Meetings

1. The next Clark BDC meeting will be held from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM on Tuesday, April 25 in the Clark Middle School Band Room. The architects

will present two refined concept designs and attendees will help select one for further development. Architects will present strategic approaches to phasing.

2. The architects requested more ideas for public outreach. Cessilye Williams extended an invitation to present at the Parent Teacher Conferences next week.
3. The final scheduled Concept Design BDC meeting will be on May 11. There will probably be one more meeting after the May 11 meeting.

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

Attachments: Meeting Agenda and Concept Design Schemes B1, E1, G1, and H

cc: Meeting Attendees; File