



Sacajawea Elementary School SDAT 5 - Meeting Summary

Project Sacajawea Elementary School
NAC No. 121-23082
Meeting Date January 9, 2024
Meeting Time 4:00 – 6:00 pm
Meeting Location School Cafeteria

In Attendance: (strikethrough means did not attend)

SDAT

Barry Fisk, Sacajawea Elementary
Kara Golbert, Sacajawea Elementary
Chrissy Jackson, Sacajawea Elementary
Margaret Murphy, Sacajawea Elementary
Aaron Reddecliffe, Sacajawea Elementary
Jennie Tucker, Sacajawea Elementary
~~Justin Pritchard, PTA~~
~~Karen Murphy, PTA~~
~~Robin King, PTA~~
Logan Billingham, parent
Laura Maman, Community Member
~~Megan Powell, Community Member~~
Mike Skutack, Seattle Public Schools
David Jackson, Seattle Public Schools

Design Team

Kevin Flanagan, NAC Architecture
Lisa Glenn, NAC Architecture
Bingram Lai, NAC Architecture
Brian Love, NAC Architecture
Pamela Oakes, Profitable Non-Profit
Matt Rumbaugh, NAC Architecture
Boris Srdar, NAC Architecture
Ann Vacek, NAC Architecture

Agenda and Discussion Summary:

1. Educational Specifications

- a. There was a discussion of the ways to adapt the elementary educational specification to create a site specific ed spec that serves Sacajawea Elementary's unique educational needs.
 - i. Lots of resource / space in the general ed classrooms for tutors and IA office space.
 - ii. Current model is to push-in as much as possible.
 - iii. Currently have two caseloads of Extended Resource – (2) ½ classrooms and (1) full classroom.
 - iv. Resource – (1) full classrooms
 - v. Reading specialist – 1 office space or workroom.
 - vi. ELL – push in and pull out (currently serving about 25 students. Pull out is typically for assessment.
 - vii. Distinct – 1 teacher, 2-3 IAs, 7-8 students. Change 1 flex classroom to a distinct classroom.
 - viii. Extended Resource – (2) ½ size classrooms
 - ix. OT/PT – (1) full sized classrooms.



- x. Early learning needs (2) classrooms plus (1) classroom for developmental preschool.

2. Discussion of Schemes

a. Little Bend

i. Positive

1. Like the front door on 20th Ave
2. Clear diagram – easy to understand and clear organization
3. Appears to have the most playground area.
4. Nice entry sequence
5. Love the shape. It seems to preserve the spirit of the existing building.

ii. Negative

1. Entry is the closest to 20th Ave so the building will appear closer to the neighbors to the North.
2. Improve visual surveillance between classrooms and the learning commons.
3. Need more shared space/open space in general.
4. The floor plan looks a little monolithic.

b. Central Stair

i. Positive

1. Like the library breezeway similar to Wing Luke
2. Central stair helps ease the pick-up and drop-off
3. Safe, easy, and clear
4. Delineation of pods and common learning space per pod.
5. Level 3 is set back and less imposing from the street side of the building.

ii. Negative

1. Change to just a ramp instead of a stair through the middle of the building.
2. Concerns about accessibility of the central stair.
3. The continuity of the stairs at the 3rd level is unclear.

c. Atrium

i. Positive

1. Like the “wrapping around” of the school w/ art
2. Level 2 glassy-nice curb appeal
3. Library concept in the middle of the school is appealing.



4. Pods pushed to the North w/ minimal offset. Good views to the North.
5. Like the atrium's flow and how it gives students the change to look down to other levels within the building.
6. Curved interior spaces is appealing – like the softer organic shape.

ii. Negative

1. Missing a covered play area integrated into the design.
2. Maybe make the design more monolithic, like the Burke Museum. The design right now looks like a lot of small boxes. This building is bigger than the surrounding houses. That's unavoidable so don't try to break up the building into house sized pieces.

3. Next Steps

- a. Next Meeting – SDAT 6 on January 23rd, 2024.

