

Weld 6 New MS

Project #1305

Attendees (x) and Distribution

DAG Meeting

April 1, 2013, 5:00 PM

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| X Wayne Eads - COO | X Adele Willson –Slaterpaul/ RB+B |
| X Bevan Arch – Assist to Wayne | X Lyn Eller – Slaterpaul/RB+B |
| X Brad Johnson – Dir. Support Serv. | X Rebecca Spears – Slaterpaul/RB+B |
| X Travis Guerette - RLH | X Derek Young – Slaterpaul/RB+B |
| X Jeff Kirtley – RLH | X Carol Henry – Design Concepts |
| X See sign-in sheet for DAG | |

Introductions:

A few DAG members who missed the first meeting introduced themselves.

The Design Team introduced Carol Henry, Landscape Architect.

Reviewed DAG comments and discussed MS Tours from March 29.

1. Discussed pros and cons of having classroom pods along a main corridor vs. wings off of a main corridor. (Security, efficient use of SF, flexibility, acoustics, supervision)
2. Looked at site circulation of each school, which used adjacent residential streets to provide separate building access for busses and parents.
3. Discussed different entrances, sizes of vestibules and security of each school.
4. General consensus was that low lockers are desired for better supervision.
5. Different relationships between cafeteria/stage/gym were discussed. (Flexibility, most use of space, acoustics, costs, seating arrangements) Also talked about night use of these spaces in regards to entrances and locking off the rest of school. Weld 6 New Middle School would like seating for 400 during performances.
6. Liked outdoor learning areas, that were associated with each classroom pod.
7. Did not like the noise and chaos, when entering a school directly into the cafeteria.
8. Loved all of the views and natural daylight, be careful of glare and the need for room darkening.

Site Masterplan Schemes (Scheme 1 was the favorite)

1. Pros:
 - MS students would not have to cross any roads to access fields.
 - One way drive allows most people coming and going to make right turns into and out of the MS.
 - Most cost effective scheme as far as how much grading will need to be done.
 - Allows future school and park the most flexibility.
 - Decent separation between busses and parent drop-off.
 - Had separated parking areas, one close to school, one close to fields.
2. Cons:
 - A lot of paving that splits the site in half. (half for MS, half for future school) This eliminates campus feel, with kids having to cross road to travel between schools.
3. Other comments:
 - No need for baseball and softball, just softball and can be further away from school. Move one soccer field, adding a track around it closer to the school.
 - Terraced grading good for seating at fields, not so good for ADA access.
 - Look at bike and walking path connections.
 - Cafeteria needs direct access to BB courts and fields.
 - Look at flipping bus and parent drop-off

Building layout schemes were briefly discussed (Scheme A had the most pros)

1. Pros:
 - Good curb appeal to 65th, no service area on east side.
 - Easy access to fields from Gym and Cafeteria
 - Gym/Cafeteria close to parking.
 - Good separation between public and private spaces for night access
 - South and/or West entrances available
2. Cons:
 - Classrooms close to 65th, would need to buffer with landscape.
3. Other comments:
 - Try flipping Gym and Cafeteria, or putting them side by side so both have direct access to fields.
 - Consideration for separating staff and parent parking?

Next Meeting

April 15th, 5:00 pm

Prepared By: Derek Young, AIA, LEED AP

These meeting minutes are believed to be an accurate account of the above referenced project meeting. If there are any questions and/or comments, please do not hesitate to contact RB+B Architects.