

School Design Team Meeting Minutes

Garfield High School

Meeting No. 12 / December 11, 2003 / 2:30 p.m. / Garfield Library

1. Additions to Minutes from Previous Meeting

None requested.

2. Introductory Comments

Larry Matsuda opened by explaining that the purpose of this meeting was to present the final area reductions, a new hybrid site plan, and proposed interior layouts in the existing building. He began by allowing everyone to introduce themselves around the room, as there were several new people present.

Don Gillmore explained that the group would be able to see actual plans today which will be presented to Landmarks Commission tomorrow. He then gave a rundown of future activities before introducing Tom Bates.

3. Final Area Allocations

Working from a single summary sheet, Tom reviewed the conclusions reached by each department at the last School Design Team meeting on November 20. He indicated that the net result was a total area of 251,540 square feet. He explained that the extra 1,540 sf above the 250,000 sf goal would not pose a problem and could be resolved later.

Comment: An observation was made and noted by several attendees that there might not be enough area in the Student Service Center to accommodate students, teachers, counselors, and supporting resources.

Response: Don responded that when we do interviews and determine furniture and equipment layouts, then we can decide if it is necessary to increase sizes of spaces.

Comment: It was called to our attention by a graduate of Garfield how important the Student Service Area is to students' long-term educational opportunities.

Q: It was questioned whether the added areas in the tables got incorporated into the plan.

A: Tom assured everyone that all areas were accounted for and that there would be further opportunities to modify areas and layouts during upcoming interviews.

When questions from the group about adding areas became a concern, Don reminded everyone that it would be necessary to refrain from adding area now as our budget would not allow for any more increases in area.

Q: Was there a room for Physical Therapy?

A: Not specifically, but it could be shared with some other area.

4. Site Layout

Tom Bates reviewed the three schemes developed by the group to date. He pointed out the disadvantages of each and gave the Landmarks Committee's concerns. Then he presented the hybrid solution, which represents a compilation of the group input from prior meetings.

Q: Are the football field and track full-size, and what is the capacity of the seating?

A: Tom reassured all that the track and football field were regulation size and explained that the seating capacity was 500 spectators.

Comment: A suggestion was made that the track be multi-functional and allow for track meets so students could stay on campus. A suggestion was also made that community use of the facilities be available.

Comment: An observation was made that there needed to be convenient parking to be able to carry athletic equipment into the gym.

Q: Where do the cars come from?

A: Don explained the various sources would be from sporting event attendees, performing arts center attendees, students, teachers, and users of park facilities.

Q: Does the program put too much emphasis on athletics?

A: It was pointed out that athletic events can provide revenues to help fund other educational needs. Besides, the current facilities are substandard compared to other more affluent schools on the Eastside.

More concern for the overall parking situation surfaced. It was also pointed out that the size of the gym would have to be balanced with the parking requirements.

A concern about field lighting was expressed, but Don reiterated that lighting of the field was not part of our program and therefore had no budget.

The shop teacher expressed concern about the function of his space and a possible conflict if he had to accommodate kayak storage also. He was assured by Tom that the functional layout was similar to present facilities and that kayaks would not be stored in his area.

Q: Would the new bleachers block the view of the rear façade?

A: No, because the seating structure is only 8' or 9' high.

Concern was expressed for the connection of the Teen Life Center to the Performing Arts Center as shown on the hybrid plan. Tom explained that this relationship was being studied and would be adjusted.

Don pointed out that because our eight-acre site is smaller than the standard 30-acre site for a high school campus, the use of shared parking and off-site parking needed to be considered. An area across 23rd Avenue at Jefferson was suggested for after-hours parking.

5. Interior Layouts

Tom presented schematic layouts for each floor of the existing building to show how the proposed conceptual program would fit in the constraints of the existing building structure as follows:

First Floor

The new administration and Teen Health Center were shown in their present locations. The student commons where the old auditorium was located opened vertically as a three-story atrium, replacing the library above. The space on the first floor forms a grand entry as approached from the front entrance.

Tom pointed out that existing corridors were retained and the thick clay tile walls would be replaced with thinner construction to net more area both in the corridor and the rooms on either side.

To the west of the new student commons would be the student services and culinary arts Lab and multi-purpose classroom. To the east of the student commons would be the marketing and business uses. To the north would be the main kitchen and serving area. Surrounding the kitchen would be the staff lounge, Tech Academy lab, storage, media lab, staff copy center, and wood technology. The boiler room and building services would be to the far south behind the media lab.

The boiler room would have new equipment installed to replace existing equipment.

It was pointed out that an activities coordination office would need to be shown with access to ticket windows.

Second Floor

Tom pointed out how two learning centers were located on this floor, one at the north end of the building surrounding the open space above the student commons, and the other around another atrium feature over the existing roof at the south end of the building. Skylights would illuminate both atrium features.

It was explained that the existing track would be removed.

Color coding makes the departmental organization more obvious.

Q: Could the existing garden area on the west side be filled in?

A: Tom explained that this would be a problem since it affected the historical façade.

It was pointed out how expanded hallways leading to both learning centers were widened and articulated to form defined entrances and identity to each.

Q: Where are student lockers?

A: The architects had not addressed this requirement yet.

The partition dividing the existing girls and boys gyms would be removed to form a large learning resource center. The historic library on the north side of the building would be partitioned. The Landmarks Board would need to approve these changes as well as the extent to which historic woodwork would need to be retained.

Comment: It was suggested that the learning center commons in the north learning center be moved across the hall to take advantage of the bay window feature and move the classrooms to the commons location overlooking the student commons atrium.

Third Floor

Learning centers would be located directly above those on the second floor, at either end of the building.

The art department would be rearranged in its present location along the north side of the building.

It was pointed out that sufficient restrooms for students and staff were located within each learning center.

Possibilities for utilizing the roof areas for garden on the roof area to the west of the west corridor were suggested.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was concluded with the understanding that further refinements would be made to the site plan and interior layouts for review at the next meeting.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 15, 2004 from 2:30 to 5:00 p.m. at the Garfield High School Library.

The preceding Minutes are the Construction Manager's interpretation of the items discussed and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting. Any persons desiring to add to or otherwise change the Minutes are asked to put their comments in writing to the Construction Manager not later than December 29, 2003; otherwise the Minutes will stand as written.

The preceding Minutes were prepared by Larry Samuelson, Project Manager.