



QUATTROCCHI KWOK
ARCHITECTS

10/12/2016 3:00pm

Donald Lum Elementary Modernization & New Construction – Phase II Site Meeting 1

Attendees:

See Attached sign in sheet

Discussion Item No. 1: Introduction

- Robbie Lyng (RL) gave an introduction to the phase I work which was recently completed.
- Purpose of the meeting/committee was to get input on the Phase II project(s)
- Discussed the Bond that was passed and explained how the oversight of that bond will proceed and that additional money could be available in the future.

Discussion Item No. 2: Agenda

- Mark Quattrocchi (MQ) gave an overview:
 - Include site fencing as part of safety and security measures
 - New door hardware for the classrooms as well.
 - Review of the Master Plan for the campus
 - Only the master plan work in Board approved Implementation Plan will be completed for this phase
 - Review of Phase 2 scope
 - 4 new classrooms
 - Safety & Security – as budget allows
 - Technology Upgrades – as budget allows

Discussion Item No. 3 – New Classrooms:

- MQ asked what the best use of the new classrooms would be.
 - Jesse Woodward (JW) Indicated that a dedicated Kindergarten cluster with playground would be ideal at or near where the current portables are located.
 - Currently the kindergarten classrooms are spread around and do not have bathrooms.
 - There are also two K-5 Autism Special Ed rooms. One located in the New modular (triple wide) near the parking lot and 1 in one of the Existing Modulares near the main campus

- RL proposed an alternative to demolishing the existing modular buildings that would refurbish and reuse them instead of demolition. Perhaps this could be done in addition to the new classrooms.
 - Shariq Khan (SK) indicated that this would avoid negotiating with the City of Alameda on property lines and building locations
 - RL indicated that the existing modular buildings would be stripped down to the frame and provided with new exterior and interior finishes.
 - MQ asked if it was Ok to remove only some of the existing portables?
 - (RL) indicated that this was OK but that the buildings would most likely not be able to be replaced in their current location. MQ indicated that ideal location for kindergarten classrooms is at site of current portables because of immediate access by parents from Otis Street.
 - It was discussed that there is a 15' setback along Otis Street, which may impact the location of the fencing.
 - There is currently an "arc" area near the back of the campus that could be utilized, if the new fence is realigned.
 - What is the best place for Kindergarten?
 - Near the front of campus or at the back locations were discussed
- SK indicated that this meeting was an opportunity to change the use, that Kindergarten is not the only option and that it is ok to deviate from the original master plan in terms of new classroom uses.
- MQ asked if flexible general use classrooms would be appropriate
- Anne Faria-Poynter (AF) indicated that the use of the outdoor blacktop area is increasing especially since the SDC Classes and there was a some reduction in the available area due to the new parking lot.
 - She suggested using the "arc" area created by the back fence realignment for any new classroom
 - (RL) indicated that both the Park and Fields are available for use by the school. The park use will need to be coordinated with the City.
- (JW) indicated that locating any classrooms directly adjacent to the play areas may be problematic due to the noise and distraction.
 - Suggested the bottom left (near the existing parking lot) may be another good location for kinder rooms.
- Kimberly Hare (KH) indicated that one of the strengths of Donald Lum is the strong collaboration between teachers. Isolating certain classrooms in the back of the playground may have a negative impact on this.
 - She was concerned that if extra classrooms were provided, the district may add additional students to the campus.
 - She asked if there was a need for additional capacity.

- SK indicated that the other schools in the district are far below their intended capacity, therefore It would be less likely for the district to move students to the campus.
 - There is not a lot of expected growth for the school

Discussion Item No. 4 – Additional Classrooms:

- JW indicated that facilities for an afterschool program and additional play structures may be a good idea.
- MQ indicated that the discussion may be getting too detailed at this stage and wanted to redirect the conversation back to the initial question. What is the best use of the new classrooms?
- Derick Douglass (DD) indicated that one dedicated general use science classroom would be extremely beneficial, in that the Foss Kits could be removed from each classroom and alleviate some of the storage issues.
 - Also indicated a music room may be a good idea
- JW indicated that additional classrooms may not be needed and that the campus could even go down a classroom.
- Amy Miller (AM) said that an Art/Makerspace may be beneficial and it may be connected to the science room – AKA a “wet” room. OR this wet room can be a Makerspace and Science room.
 - A PE or sensory room may be a good idea.
- MQ asked how many Kinder classes there are
 - (KH) indicated that there are currently 3
- RL and MQ indicated that QKA will provide 3-4 options for the committee to review.
 - Will provide a better focus for discussion
- AF reiterated her concern on the available blacktop area
 - MQ indicated he will review the CDE recommendations for outdoor play area

Discussion Item No. 5 – Fencing Alterations:

- MQ discussed the two options developed for site fencing
 - Option 1 includes the fencing along the sidewalk along Otis Street
 - Would require opening the gates in the morning to allow access to the drop off area.
 - Has advantage of not looking like school entry when school starts (because of closed gates).
 - Option 2 includes the fencing to follow the drop-off area with gates to be locked once school starts.
 - Originally concerned that this would feel confining but after site visit found there to be enough space
 - Aydan Ryan (AR) asked if there could be a way to change the plan so that the fence aligns with the building or that the fence could be lowered to 4’
 - MQ indicated that this is too low to meet standards and will not adequately protect students from one easily jumping this lower fence.

- RL indicated that the fencing requirements have been set by the School Board. Lowering the fence height would reduce effectiveness and could be a liability concern
- JW indicated that a taller "Athletic Fence" may be appropriate between the parking lot and the play area.
- MQ asked if it would be okay to proceed with Option 2. The general consensus was yes.
- RL indicated that training in the use of and monitoring of the gates will be necessary to maintain security.
- MQ discussed the current visitor parking and main entry sequence to the office.
 - MQ proposed rerouting the entrance and adding a new sidewalk
 - The general consensus was that this was preferable to the existing condition

End of Meeting

- After the meeting MQ, Eddie VanSlambrouck (EV), RL & Monty Paterson (MP) reviewed the site in regards to the location of the proposed fencing.
 - There are issues with not only the park, but utility easements from Otis and the other street.
 - It appears the school's property line at Otis Street and the other street are INSIDE of the back of sidewalk, implying we have to hold our fences back from the sidewalk
 - MP indicated Alameda Public Works would approve installing the fence on city property (at back of sidewalk) if the district would be sure not to hit their utility crossings.
 - It was decided to locate the fencing at the backside of the sidewalk and have the fencing contractor be responsible for locating any utility lines.

Discussion Item No. 6 – Action Items:

- QKA will develop 3-4 options and present them at the next meeting.
- Distribution by email to attendees
- Next Meeting Date : TBD Early to Mid November