



QUATTROCCHI KWOK
ARCHITECTS

June 10, 2016

Alameda USD – Districtwide Fencing Projects

Donald Lum ES – Site Committee Meeting Notes for Fencing and Gates

Attendees:

See attached sign-in sheet

Notes:

1) Introductions, Roles and Responsibilities:

- a) Nick explained goal for the meeting was to get committee feedback on how to improve the perimeter security of the school.
 - Discussed goal of a single point of entry into campus between morning drop off and afternoon pick up.
 - Discussed goal to maintain community access afterhours, with potential to secure certain “inner core” areas.
- b) Nick introduced the Design Standards established by the AUSD Committee for Safety and Security Design Standards, and explained the standards for fencing design, height, and locations.
- c) A committee member asked what he goals are for this project. Answer provide: Keep children safe, clearly direct visitors to primary entry point, reduce incidence of intruders or trespasser on campus during school hours.
- d) It was pointed out by a committee member that some of the student population are “runners” (away from supervising staff, oftentimes toward off campus destinations) and thus fencing would help keep them safe. They have had 7 incidences of runners this year.
- e) One committee member indicated that he is not in favor of fencing. Others expressed that he campus is too open and trespassing is an issue.

Site specific comments:

- 2) It was requested that the black top remain accessible to public after school hours and on weekends.
- 3) Along North Property line – Otis Drive – Primary Street Frontage:
 - a) Committee requested that if fence is installed that it be along the back of the sidewalk, not up near the buildings.
 - b) As primary street frontage this would be ornamental fencing.
 - c) It was pointed out that the master plan indicates that administration is to be relocated so that it is centrally located and fronts on the main drop off loop at Otis Drive. This could be the Primary entry point for the new fencing.
 - d) Committee acknowledged the difficulty of fencing along the drop-off drive ways.
- 4) Along West Property line – Rittler Park:

- a) It was explained that the District Safety and Security Standards call for 6' tall chain link fencing at general perimeter property lines such as this.
- 5) Along South Property Line – Wood MS Baseball Fields:
 - a) The existing fence is 2 to 3 feet tall depending on which side you stand on. It was explained that this fence would be replaced with a 6' tall chain-link fence.
 - b) A committee member indicated that people walk along this property line to go back and forth between the Sandcreek neighborhood, and the mall beyond, to Grand Ave and beyond. It was requested that the new fencing provide for this pedestrian path of travel to occur between the baseball field and the Lum black top, rather than across the black top as currently occurs. It was discussed and requested that a secure perimeter be created between this pedestrian path of travel and Lum ES.
 - 6) Along East Property Line – Sandcreek Way and residences:
 - a) The committee indicated that the existing residential fencing along this property line is adequate. No new fencing required along the residential fence line.
 - b) A gate would need to be installed at eth walk-through that leads to Kitty Hawk Place.
 - c) New ornamental fencing would begin ath the north end of the bike cage.
 - d) Maintain visitor parking access.
 - e) Extend fencing between grass and back of sidewalk to intersection of Sandcreek way and Otis Dr.
 - 7) Inner-core fencing:
 - a) Committee requested that if gates at perimeter are lockable and new higher fencing is installed at perimeter that inner core fencing may not be necessary.
 - b) The one place they may request inner core fencing is between the black top and the outdoor eating area just west of the MPR.
 - c) It was suggested by a committee member that the inner core fencing be done as a second phase so that they can see if the perimeter fencing solves any issues and renders inner core fencing unnecessary.
 - 8) Next Steps:
 - a) A schematic fencing design will be developed and presented to the AUSD MOF office.
 - The committee asked if a 3D rendering could be provided to help them visualize the new fencing. It was indicated that this is not in the current budget but that the MOF department could explore if this is a possibility.
 - b) Notes from meeting should be made available on the District Website.

End of notes