

## MEETING MINUTES

FROM: Andrew Thies, Architect

DATE: February 28, 2024

SUBJECT: **SWSD – Design Steering Committee Mtg #4**

Held February 21, 2024

Integrus Project No. 22221.00

### Parties In Attendance:

James Baird

Val Brown

Tom Fallon

Valerie Heggenes

Doug Hofius

Marnie Jackson

Kymy Johnson

Erik Jokinen

Leo Langer

Carter McKnight

Darren Merritt

Dr. Jo Moccia

Lori O'Brien

John Patlon

Kayla Phillips

Dan Poolman

Pat Rawlins

Susie Richards

Tammi Sloan

Brook Willerford

Irene Stewart

Jeff Luedeman – INTEGRUS

Andrew Thies – INTEGRUS

Nick Hagen – Fora

Callie Roberts – Fora

Andy Rasmussen - Fora

The following is a record of the author's understanding of comments made and direction given, corrections should be directed to the author.

### **I. Overview of the Inclusive Playground Process and Progress:**

1. Discussion regarding accessible playgrounds compared to truly inclusive playgrounds.
2. The types of playground surfacing materials should be reviewed. Initial reaction to a poured in place rubber material seemed appropriate. Maintenance and longevity are major considerations.
3. A student user group survey should be conducted. Fora has experience implementing these surveys.
4. Engaging with students and families that will need the accessible, inclusive features of the playground should be part of the process.
5. Inclusivity should not be in conflict with providing high quality, challenging play equipment for students of varying

707 SW WASHINGTON ST  
SUITE 1200  
PORTLAND, OR 97205  
503.221.0150 | OFFICE  
503.295.0840 | FAX

117 S MAIN ST  
SUITE 100  
SEATTLE, WA 98104  
206.628.3137 | OFFICE  
206.628.3138 | FAX

10 S CEDAR ST  
SPOKANE, WA 99201  
PO BOX 1482 (99210)  
509.838.8681 | OFFICE  
509.838.2194 | FAX

abilities. Inclusive playgrounds are great playgrounds for everyone.

6. Focused user group progress meetings will share out presentations and notes ahead of DAT meetings to provide updates and a base of understanding on project progress.

**B. Athletic Field Presentation, Types, Materials, Benefits and Drawbacks:**

1. Review of three main athletic field types, sand based natural grass, top soil natural grass, and synthetic turf.
2. The current athletic fields are a top soil natural grass field that are in poor condition. Challenging to maintain. Uneven playing surface can be a hazard for users.
3. Natural grass fields require water, fertilizer and constant maintenance which have cost and environmental impacts. Sand based grass field require more water due to their capacity to drain more quickly.
4. Synthetic turf fields require little to no maintenance or watering. Initial upfront cost is higher and materials within the synthetic turf should be evaluated to meet the needs of the community.
5. MS/ HS Athletic Fields are in the headwaters of a salmon stream. Consider environmental impacts and materials closely.
6. Synthetic fields have good longevity of 8-10 years for the turf backing up.
7. Injury from impacts on synthetic fields are mitigated by the pad / impact attenuation layer. Some studies suggest they can be similar to natural grass.
8. Infill materials can be synthetic or more natural. School district and community prefer natural infill for environmental and health impacts.
9. The initial cost of a synthetic fields storm water detention system is high.
10. Synthetic fields may be “groomed” periodically to redistribute fill materials. Grooming equipment is 10-15k and can be attached to existing district owned vehicles.
11. Some High School athletics require synthetic turf fields to host playoff games.

12. Athletic Fields and the promise of synthetic turf fields which can be used year round were important topics for the community during the dialogue to pass the bond for funding.
13. Most important question is: What option is best for kids?
14. By the end of the conversation the general voiced consensus was that synthetic turf fields made the most sense for the project.

## C. **Design Update for Exterior Entries and Canopies**

1. The current condition of (3) entries at the public facing façade can be reduced to (2). (1) Entry at the south to serve Middle School, Athletics, and Special Events. (1) Entry at the north to serve High School, main office, visitors and late arrivals.
2. A strategy for the exterior areas at entries should be defined and communicated. Existing retaining walls and raised planted areas are not utilized. Consider opportunities in these areas.
3. Review items that should be identified for salvage, re-use, etc.
4. The design team should consider wayfinding when proposing materials. School colors, visible materials that denote “main entry”.
5. Maintenance and longevity of materials are a high priority.
6. At the proposed Middle School Entry design team to review existing separations and uses. Consider different scenarios for different programmatic needs.
7. While covered exterior waiting area is a positive amenity, when the weather is nice students often elect to sit out in the sun.
8. Student queueing happens at peak arrival times at exterior doors. Provide enough cover that students can wait below.
9. Bold accent colors (school colors) used intentionally may be an effective strategy.

Meeting Minutes – South Whidbey School District

Project No. 22221.00

Page 4

Attachments: Powerpoint from the meeting.

CC: file