

Gunn High School Facilities Steering Committee
Architectural Renovations
MASTER PLANNING MEETING
Feb. 4, 2009

In attendance: Paul Stickney (PAUSD Facilities Management Consultant), Erwin Lee (Deems, Lewis, McKinley architect), Dean Schmitz (DLM architect), Jeanne Beck, Kristi Bowers, Judy Buttrill, Kim Cowell, Paul Dunlap, Roni Habib, Lisa Hall, John Hebert, Chris Horpel, Joan Jacobus, Tom Jacobowsky, Noreen Likins, Dawna Linsdell, James Lubbe, Matt McGinn (for Don Briggs), Todd Summers, Lettie Weinmann, Phil Winston, Board of Education member Camille Townsend, Gunn students Joyce Liu and Rachael Flesichmann, four members of the public. (notetaker: Martha Elderon).

- I. HIGHLIGHTS OF FEB. 2 COMMUNITY PRESENTATION
 - a. A powerpoint presentation was given by DLM architect Erwin Lee showing highlights of the community Facilities Meeting held Feb. 2, 7-9 pm in Gunn's Library.
 - i. The three prominent issues discussed were: (1) traffic impact (the Arastradero intersection and western backroad near Miranda), (2) single-story vs. multi-stories, and (3) impact on neighbors of a parking structure or new gym.
 - ii. Documents and drawings from past meetings were reviewed, and past ideas and revisions were presented
- II. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS MASTER PLAN SITE DIAGRAM
 - a. The Master Plan has undergone several revisions since it was first introduced in **November 2008**. Six Facility Steering Committee meetings have been held (the public was invited to more than half), along with site walks and principal meetings.
 - b. The four main facility needs (educational programs, growth strategies, infrastructure/maintenance, and enhancements/upgrades) have been addressed.
 - c. Different plans detailing multi-story building configurations, single-story building configurations, traffic flow and car/bike parking areas, tennis court location, and backfield buildings have been presented by DLM architects. It was emphasized that all plans are still in process and specific locations are still to be determined.
- III. SINGLE- VS. MULTI-STORY BUILDINGS
 - a. Advantages of multi-story buildings are:
 - i. preserve open space and pedestrian paths
 - ii. reduce sprawl
 - iii. buildings are more efficient (single-classroom width allows air and light from both sides)
 - iv. reduce infrastructure and earthwork costs
 - v. save trees and increases permeable surfaces
 - vi. don't impact existing parking space
 - vii. with fewer buildings, narrow in-between spaces are reduced, creating easier supervision
 - b. Disadvantages of multi-story buildings are:
 - i. vertical circulation is required
 - ii. stairs and elevators are required (increasing time it takes to get to classes and possibility of injury)
 - iii. create unknown problems as a new building style
 - c. Public Comments:
 - i. (*AJ Lumsdaine*) She feels the single-story option has not been fully researched, and that problems can be solved through good design. She asks that pros and cons of single- and multi-story buildings be printed for public view. She points out the

disadvantages of increased liability insurance and more difficult disability access with multi-story buildings.

- ii. *(Bob Moss)* He agrees with AJ that single-story buildings could work. We have good campus supervision now with one-story buildings. We should consider evacuation difficulties and earthquake safety and get a cost comparison between one- and multi-story buildings. *(DLM architect Erwin Lee responds that California has rigorous earthquake standards for “essential facilities” such as schools and hospitals, no matter how many stories they have. The local multi-story VA hospital was recently renovated under these guidelines).*
- d. Facilities Steering Committee Decision:
 - i. It is the committee’s consensus to recommend a two-story option to the Board of Education since this aligns with recommendations from the High School Task Force.

IV. GYMNASIUM OPTIONS

- a. Addition of a second gym north of our current gym necessitates relocation of the tennis courts. The athletic department requested their orientation be tilted on a north-south axis instead of remaining parallel to the current gym.
 - i. Advantage: the mid-day sun wouldn’t shine in players’ eyes.
 - ii. Disadvantages: some trees would need to be removed and the location of the second gym would also need to change.

V. REVIEW OF PROPOSED PROJECT LIST AND BUDGETS

- a. At our first meeting Nov. 5, 2008, a list of facility needs was made, all of which have been addressed in the Master Plan:
 - i. IA building and pool renovation (currently under construction)
 - ii. Administration building renovation with more focused entry
 - iii. More classroom buildings
 - iv. A second gym and new entry for original gym
 - v. Spangenberg interior and entry renovation
 - vi. Music Building expansion
 - vii. RC building expansion and renovation
 - viii. Modernization of existing buildings
 - ix. L31 expansion
 - x. Placement of computer labs throughout campus
 - xi. Creation of more offices and storage space
- b. The draft of a Project List and estimated construction costs was distributed and shown on a powerpoint slide. An additional 30% of the quoted construction costs needs to be added to the current totals to account for “soft” costs such as architectural fees, permits, etc. Erwin will give Noreen a complete list of costs with this inclusion.
- c. 25 projects approved for Bond A funds are listed roughly in the order they will be started:
 - i. Classroom Building A (Titan Village), Second Gym and Lobby in existing gym, SAC/Media Arts/Conference Room building, Classroom Building B (L31, world languages area), Science Lab connected to current science building, Performing Arts building (adjacent to Spangenberg, replacing M1 and M2), Spangenberg Lobby and upgrades, Special Ed. Center (in current M-S building), Admin. expansion & remodel, Guidance & counseling remodel, Classroom Building Mod-L (L-building), Quad, Main Entry area, Parking/drop-off improvements, Miscellaneous improvements (landscaping, etc.), Modernization /Upgrades (current electrical, heating systems), Field Structures (at north end of football field), Improve amphitheatre, Modernize existing gym, Modernize Spangenberg, Utility/Infrastructure (replace utilities, upgrade drainage), West access road and

- parking (near Miranda), Furnishing/fixtures/equipment (for all new buildings), Technology upgrades, Interim Housing (temporary classroom placement during renovation, probably moving portables to parking lot).
- d. The total “hard” construction costs of these renovations total \$92.2 million. Since the Measure A Bond allocates only \$76 million, priorities need to be established.
 - i. The two current priorities are: (1) building more classrooms and (2) building a second gym.
 - ii. Starting with Titan Village makes sense since the 18 portables can be moved to the parking lot and used as interim classrooms during construction.
 - iii. Construction of a second gym requires no displacement of students.
 - iv. Selected projects would be planned in a way that would leave the campus viable and complete even if all 25 projects could not be executed.
 - e. The order of the projects is next to be determined. The first phase of construction should take about 18 months, from June 2010 to January 2012.

VI. FINAL COMMENTS AND FUTURE MEETING DATE

- a. Comments:
 - i. *(Joan Jacoubus)* She thinks we need enough parking for large Spangenberg events.
 - ii. *(Bob Moss)* He suggests starting the projects in this order: 1, 4, 5, 3, 6, 8, 10, 24.
 - iii. *(AJ Lumsdaine)* She thinks we can preserve open space with a re-design of the one-story building plan.
- b. The next Facilities Steering Committee meeting will be Feb. 19 at 12:30 in the Staff Lounge.