



QUATTROCCHI KWOK
ARCHITECTS

February 7, 2018

Lincoln Middle School Measure I Bond Project

Site Committee Meeting #7

Lincoln Middle School @ 2:00 pm

Attendees (based on sign-in sheet):

Site Committee Members:

Kathy Servello	Teacher, Committee Member	kservello@alamedaunified.org
Joan Hulihan	Classified	jhulihan@alamedaunified.org
Michael Hans	Principal	mhans@alamedaunified.org
Susan Davis	Community Affairs	sdavis@alamedaunified.org
Mitzi Thompson	Teacher	mthompson@alamedaunified.org
Cindy Zecher	Classified – Office Manager	czecher@alamedaunified.org
Christine Weidler	Math Teacher	cweidler@alamedaunified.org
Kevin Baker	Assistant Principal, Committee Member	kbaker@alamedaunified.org
Tyra Ingram Cable	Music Teacher	tcable@alamedaunified.org
Shariq Khan	CBO- AUSD	skhan@alamedaunified.org
Robbie Lyng	Maintenance and Operations, AUSD	rlyng@alamedaunified.org
Nick Stephenson	QKA	nicks@qka.com
Balyn Pitman	QKA	balynp@qka.com

Community Members:

Elizabeth Scott	Teacher	Escott77@att.net
Will Green	Teacher	rgreen@alamedaunified.org
Leslye Alexander	Teacher	lalexander@alamedaunified.org
Amy Kesner	Teacher	akesner@alamedaunified.org
Whitney Gabriel	Parent	Wgabriel3@gmail.com
Tina O'Grady	Music Booster President	ogradygypsy@gmail.com
Mary Grace Basco	Parent	mgbasco@me.com
Jim Meyer	Parent	jimandbeth@geekdaily.org
Cassie Meyer	Orchestra Student	N/A
Julie Kemp	Office/parent	jkemp@alamedaunified.org
Karen Kemp	Band Student	Trombone.notes@icloud.com
Jessica Kemp	Student	jkemp3508@icloud.com
Claire Howell	Band Student	Clairehowell19456@gmail.com
Dr. Ron Cable	supporter	cableron@aol.com
Jennifer Howell	Parent	jhowell@alamedaunified.org
Peter Hill	Teacher	phill@alamedaunified.org
Karen Hayes	Teacher	khayes@alamedaunified.org
Monica Andersen	Para Educator	mandersen@alamedaunified.org
Raylene Sims	Teacher	rsims@alamedaunified.org
Bernadette Holmes		bholmeszzz@gmail.com
Lynn Landry	Parent (Band/Music)	mizlandry@me.com

Distribution:

Attendees		
Steve Allen	Teacher, Committee Member	sallen@alamedaunified.org
Mark Manes	Parent, Committee Member	sfbpmike@gmail.com
Jenny Hartigan	Teacher, Committee Member	jhartigan@alamedaunified.org
Mohan "Mo" Vemula	Edison Safety comm/parent, Committee Member	mkvemula@yahoo.com
Amy Fray	Teacher/Parent, Committee Member	afrary@alamedaunified.org

Tom Miro
Veronica Rylander
Melodi Dewey
Alicia Andrews

Teacher, Committee Member
Education Specialist, Committee Member
School Psychologist, Committee Member
Construction PM, AUSD

tmiro@alamedaunified.org
vrylander@alamedaunified.org
mdewey@alamedaunified.org
aandrews@alamedaunified.org

Discussion Item 1 – Opening and Agenda

1. Shariq opened the meeting explaining the process of measure bond I and why the school board brought us back for 7th meeting: to investigate additional, potentially unexplored options
2. Nick started by describing the master planning process & bond language as it relates to safety and security.
3. Nick reviewed Board of Trustees approved AUSD Design Standards for Safety and Security
 - Explained that these are the guidelines we were instructed to follow for this project
 - Explained that these guidelines prescribe that all AUSD schools should have a single point of entry to administration that is easily seen and identified as the entry point, and through which staff can easily see visitors – “eyes on the entrance”.
 - Explained this was committee meeting #7 for the Lincoln Middle School Measure I Bond project
4. Nick identified the goals of this meeting:
 - To review each option discussed with the committee during the prior 6 meetings, and to hear any and all comments regarding the previously discussed options.
 - To discuss any additional options or suggestions provided by this group, and to ensure everyone’s opinions and comments are heard and considered.
5. Cindy asked if Lincoln MS could get a new building?
 - Nick : given the balance of the modernization work required, there is not enough budget to cover the cost of a new building.
 - Group Member asked what is the budget?
 - Robbie said about 6.7 million overall project budget.
6. Group member asked if the music building and curriculum needs were ever discussed during the prior 6 meetings.
 - Nick explained that at meeting 5 and at the SD board meeting the music building was discussed
 - Nick further explained that there were programming conversations to ensure that the new music space properly accounted for the proper number of students, proper acoustics, storage, etc..

Discussion Item 2 – Meetings 1-6 Options Review, Lincoln MS Campus Safety and a Secure Perimeter

1. Nick explains options from meeting 1-6, showing slides from previous meetings that indicated pros & cons of each option as identified by the committee.
 - A group member asked if there were any discussions about relocating the music classrooms during the discussion of Option 1 & 2.
 - Nick indicted that relocating the music classroom did not become a point of discussion until option 3 was conceived, so it was not discussed during the development of option 1 or 2.
 - A group member asked how the option to move the music classroom come to be?
 - Nick explained that the option to move the music classroom was a collaborative reaction to the rejection of prior options, and to the direction from MOF and the Board that we need to provide a secure perimeter with the main entry point *at* the perimeter. The rejection of options 1, 2 and 3 led to a conversation about how to bring the entire administration staff to the perimeter. This led to the conversation about relocating admin. to where the Music Classroom currently is.
 - A group member said the news did not get out about the prior 6 meetings
 - Robbie pointed out that the news of the meetings was sent out by the principal

- Principal Mike Hans said the news was sent out & delivered in many ways and we did get both parents and staff members to attend the bulk of the meetings.
 - Though the meetings at the feeder schools were not well attended
 - Group member thought the meetings were for the site and did not apply to them
- Another group member commented that she felt that meeting 5 occurred on the last day of school last June, and as a result she felt it limited attendance.
- Group member – What are the alternatives? Can we discuss them?
 - Nick – Yes, that is the purpose of today’s meeting.
- Regarding the relocation of a special education classroom as a result of the music room relocation, a group member stated that she heard from a special needs parent that moving special needs students is hard on them, and attending these meetings is a hardship for special needs parents
 - Principal Hans let the group members know that the impact on the special needs students was part of the discussion process, and that he felt the location of their new classroom is better than the location they were previously in
 - The new location as presented at meeting #6 would work well for the special needs students as the new location would put them a short walk to the main entry with great visibility for the teachers and access to drop off and pick up
- An 8th grade Band student read to the group from a prepared statement she wrote for the meeting. Some points she made are listed below (paraphrased):
 - The proposed space for the music classroom is too small and not suitable for music
 - Some instruments require special storage conditions and she feared this was not considered when laying out the proposed space.
 - Moving instruments to the stage at the multi-use is complicated and takes time, which will be exacerbated by the new location.
- A group member commented that Option 3 (Intercom and Buzzer) seemed viable vs. option 1 & 2; why not pursued further?
 - Shariq explained that a buzzer at the entry gate as the sole approach to providing the secure entry point was deemed unsuccessful in achieving the objectives of the Safety and Security Committee, as the access it allows to visitors is too remote and far from the reception area of the administration building.
 - Robbie stated that reliability concerns about electronic devices makes them a poor option as a stand-alone measure.
- A Group member – the Drama Teacher - mentioned that the space adjacent to the existing music classroom in building B was until recently occupied by the Drama class, but during the most recent winter break the drama class was relocated, and the CEC class replaced them adjacent to music. She asked if this was that discussed in committee meeting?
 - Principal Hans said no, the move was independent of measure I modernization project.
- A Group member – the PE Teacher – stated that the proposed storage unit placed next to proposed music building would take up valuable blacktop area; can it be placed next to toilet building?
 - The Music Teacher said that would be too far away from the proposed music building
- Group member asked if the music could be moved to the existing administration location?
 - It was pointed out that moving the equipment is a huge undertaking.
 - The temperature of the proposed storage container is not suitable for instrument storage
 - Nick explained that the instruments would be stored in the classroom and the container was for uniforms, chairs etc. Please refer to SD board meeting notes.
- Group member asked why the option to capture all exterior doors within a fenced area was declined

- Nick explained that it was not acceptable to the committee; QKA was directed to try to bring those entries into the secured fenced in perimeter
- 2. Nick asked the group to focus on how to create a secure perimeter.
 - Group member suggested a bridge and lift system to the existing administration
 - Nick drew the bridge idea and described the needs of a lift/stairs on each side with the potential area required to make it work.
 - This concept could take \$2 million to build
 - Group member asked why we need lifts; can't the gates be used as accessible entrance?
 - Code requires equal access with no special conditions
 - Group member proposed using the \$2 million to relocate the administration on other safety and security items.
 - Some items included covered walkways, existing band room not adequate, media center repair, a cool secure gate
 - Multi-use upgrades were proposed like; lighting, sound, stage, P.E. lockers showers moved, water stations, toilets, P.E. all weather field
 - Nick - Please provide list to include with meeting notes [List not received at time of publishing of these notes]
 - Robbie talked to the group about the full needs of all the schools in the district and how this requires a large sum of money, but we are required by the school board and the voters of Measure I to accomplish safety and security for all sites.
 - A group member asked if kids needed access around the existing administration in option 1?
 - Another group member said yes it was vital as it is part of the student traffic during school
 - Group member suggested allowing the fence to follow the curve of the drop off
 - Nick offered that the visitors will still enter the site unattended with full access to site
- 3. Cindy offered to explain her idea for fencing at the main entry
 - Using option 1 and providing a gate at front of the existing administration entry. People would be buzzed in from there. About a 10'-0" gap between the building and gate to allow students to freely flow through the front of the existing administration during school
 - A group member suggested the idea of the nurse's office could become the new entry for the existing administration?
 - Cindy offered that we are not modifying the existing administration and the nurse's office does not provide an over view of that area anyway
 - Robbie asked if the current swing of the doors at the existing administration would cause a flow issue for students in Cindy's plan?
 - The group did not believe the door swings to be an issue with a 10'-0" width
 - Cindy pointed out that a double gate would be needed next to woodshop
 - At this point the group discussed gate locations and exiting issues with the layout
 - Cindy suggested the gates could be unlocked in an emergency to allow for exiting
- A group member inquired about opening the corner of the existing administration closest to entry with windows or a camera?
 - Robbie said cameras are only for monitoring
- Nick asked Principal Hans to talk to student flow on site as it pertains to Cindy's idea
 - Principal Hans believed Cindy's idea could work with 10'-0" walk but requires further review
- Cindy said she commented at an earlier meeting that option 1 fence looks like a prison but now that she has seen a better application of the option it's more acceptable.
 - Cindy's pointed out that maybe in 10-15 years a new bond could pass to address the fence issue
 - Cindy believed she could get a consensus on her idea from the teachers

- A group member said that Cindy's idea (option 1) looks to meet code as long as the rear pathway is secure.
 - Another group member said they were talking to other teachers that would like Cindy's idea (option 1) or nothing
- 4. The group discussion turned to reconfiguring the existing music & CEC entries to limit fencing
 - One suggestion was to remove the ramp behind the stage but was not excepted as the drama & music departments need the ramp to access the back of the stage
 - A group member asked if the hall behind existing administration could be opened for students?
 - A group member asked if the fencing in Cindy's option would run all the way to the existing administration and how tall would the fence be?
 - Nick said yes the fencing would need to control the entry to administration and the fence would be 6'-0" tall typical
 - A group member said the music will still need the door to the parking area
 - A group member suggested maybe two options with and without moved exits at music & CEC
 - Cindy suggested that music can enter/exit through the multi-use room, but a new door would need to be added to the CEC room 605 onto the courtyard .
 - Nick asked what does the group think about this idea?
 - The Music teacher would like wider doors at the music parking lot side
 - A group member added that would eliminate the fence at the parking side
 - The group seemed in agreement with the idea of relocating the exits at the CEC & music to limit the amount of security fencing at the parking lot side
- 5. Nick asked the group if they thought Cindy's idea with the 10'-0" walk meets the safety requirements?
 - Shariq asked if it would meet the safety and security mandate?
 - Nick responded that at this time it looks like it does, yes; but even with the ornamental fencing it is not very esthetically pleasing?
 - A group member believed that the fencing could look ok
 - A group member asked that if we go with Cindy's idea will the extra money go to canopies and other items?
 - Robbie explained that canopies are expensive with potential soils conditions and we need to look at other items like windows, tech requirements, roof issues, electrical items, etc. to provide an informed list of items.
- 6. A group member brought up the issue of power requirements at the school; using extension cords across classrooms, location of outlets as examples; will these be covered in the bond?
 - Robbie said MOF is working on these issues
 - Shariq said data drops are included in the bond work, but not power yet

Discussion Item 2 – Measure I Bond Project Next Steps

1. Robbie asked QKA about time line?
 - Nick offered a tentative ± 2 weeks to provide proposal sketches
 - Shariq said must be posted by 2/21
2. Committee member asked about next meeting time
 - Shariq explained that if Cindy's idea works with code we should not need to meet again. We can just go to the board with an updated SD plan and comeback to the committee with SD approval
 - Group member suggested a 1 hour meeting 2/15 or 2/19
3. Nick explained that QKA will need to verify Cindy's idea meets code and district safety standards
 - Nick said we may suggest additional gates and this maybe less expensive but we will not have time to do a cost estimate

- The group believes QKA can create an acceptable plan
- 4. Next step is to submit the Schematic Design Package to School Board for Approval
- 5. Begin Design Development
 - Robbie requested the group to please plan on attending any DD meetings in future
 - Nick said that DD meetings with groups may be required for clarity
- 6. Construction currently anticipated to begin summer of 2018 with Window repair work, and summer 2019 for balance of work.

Next Meeting: TBD

These notes were recorded by QKA and shall be considered an accurate account of the meeting unless written clarifications are received within five (5) days of receipt of this document.

End of Notes