QUATTROCCHI KWOK
ARCHITECTS

MEETING RECORD

2112.00- B6

02 May 2023 11AM Via Zoom

Alameda High School Swim Center Replacement Project

Meeting #3 – User Group Design Meeting

Current Attendees:

Robbie Lyng, AUSD
Shariq Khan, AUSD CBO
Bernadette Gard, AUSD Facilities
Ruth Boyd, AUSD Bond Construction Project Manager
Pedro Mora, AUSD Construction Project Manager
James Tu, AUSD
Brian Addicott, AUSD Facilities Maintenance Manager
Lani Molina, Athletic Director, Alameda High School
Stacy Thomas, Recreation & Parks, City of Alameda
David Leimsieder, Acting Director for the City of Alameda Recreation and Park Department
Mark Quattrocchi, QKA
Joel Williams, QKA
Bryan Chubb, QKA
Dennis Berkshire, Aquatic Design Group (ADG)

Discussion Points

- Mark & Robbie discussed price increases for all construction. Mark mentioned a recent project came in 15% higher than expected. Dennis stated he's seen the latest prices have stabilized.

- Joel: summarized updates to the design.
- Joel Question: We're showing male and female changing rooms w/ enclosed changing stalls. Does the district want gender neutral rooms? We have a "family" changing room.

- Dennis questions:
  - separation from the pool area and enclosure area. Any desire for specific separation?
    - Stacy: low fence would be our preference
  - Deck storage locations, do those look like preferred locations?

- Dennis ran through the list of items to be stored on the pool deck, including the needed square footage. Also specified those items that must be stored indoors rather than outdoors.

- Stacy offered to make sure and include an AED.

- Robbie had a question about the code analysis that lists loading. Dennis responded, we need to coordinate that between Arch & Aquatic but we do need to know how many competitors and spectators are expected to be needed so we can provide enough bleachers. Dennis ran some quick math and said at the moment we're showing bleachers w/ 200-person capacity.

- Stacy, can the fencing be a rolling open style so more bleachers or chairs can be rolled onto/off the pool deck more easily. Especially for single large events that may not happen often.
- Dennis: yes that's a good idea.

- Dave Leimsieder: If we put off the pool building work due to budget, how do we also provide the new, expanded size area for the pool equipment?
- Dennis: It's true, there will have to be at least a small amount of building related work regardless of the final scope chosen.

- Lani clarified, NCS contest hosting possible but not a full NCS swim meet. Those are really huge and we know we wouldn't have that capacity.
- Dennis: We can get ourselves to 250 occupant pool deck and bleachers quite easily w/ this deck design and square footages we're showing.

- Joel reminded everyone that the previous meeting decided on exterior lockers.
- Lani and Brian A agreed that exterior lockers are preferred.

- Mark: What height of lockers are preferred? Our thought was they would be a bit higher to provide a small sense of privacy at the showers.
- Brian A: Yes that sounds good. 5 or 6 feet sounds good. Lani agreed.

- Lani: No lockers to be used by any of the athletes.

- Shariq clarified: are we talking about a pay to use type lockers?
- Lani: yes, that makes the most sense.

- Mark & Stacy proposed having fencing between the competition vs swimming pools.
- Dennis proposed the fence being low, and full length, w/ double gates at each end.
- Lani prefers no fence. Mark proposed it being a removeable fence.
- Stacy clarified the several issues that make it less desirable if there is no separation between the 2 areas. Especially because they could have community use happening on one side and school/competition use on the other side at the same time.

- Joel asked if moving the swimming pool more into the corner to help with the exiting issues?
- Mark reminded that a permanent fence and gates makes our exiting challenges much more complicated. The number of required exits increases and all gates would need panic hardware, btw.

- Stacy said having moveable barriers would be better than that. Not desirable to move the pool like that. Having permanent fencing would too negatively impact the flexibility they're looking for with the new pool design.

- Joel and Brian A discussed specifically the expansion of the pool deck into the current excessive space at the tennis courts. Mark added there is a backboard between the 2 spaces now, and this would be expensive to rebuild and are not planning to do this. Just replace w/ chain link.
- Brian, Lani, Stacy agreed that should be fine.
- Mark followed up asking if there was any community members to run tennis court issues by?

- Lani did not support deleting one of the courts.

- Mark: Screening on the new chain link between tennis and pool deck? Stacy and Brian agreed, need screening on the chain link. Stacy requested fence to be tall between. Mark responded yes, will be tennis court height.
- Mark followed up, do you want screening on the street side fencing? Lani and Stacy agreed yes, needed. And also tall to protect against climbing. Mark agreed though reminded that any fence can be climbed but taller does help.

- Robbie, the question regarding cost of moving the fencing that is between tennis and pools is a lot of money. If we don't need the 6th tennis court, it would save a lot of money just having the 5 courts.
- Lani, we definitely need 6. Due to quantity of kids competing, 6 is already the bare minimum.

- Shariq, regarding the question of turning the 6th court horizontally and that being a problem b/c it makes it different from the others. Well, the current layout already shows that court as separate so don't see an issue w/ it and it gives more space for softball. Robbie offered that it would be more expensive though.

- Dennis asked if the Musco lights might serve double duty for tennis court lighting so the court number could be reduced to 5?
- Mark and Joel said it's worth asking Musco.

- Lani asked where the scoreboards

- Lani asked what the depth of the practice pool is. Dennis said that's up to the user's preference b/c we can make it the depth you want. But it is shallower than can be used for polo.

- Lani mentioned if it's not deep enough to provide multiple teams to warm up in then it's not useful for her. Stacy said it's for the community users. She would prefer a single larger pool instead of 2 pools if that helped the budget. That would be her preference anyway.

- Mark mentioned family changing room could be called gender neutral. Mark warned if things are all gendered this could become a political issue later w/ the money that's being spent to make upgrades here. Stacy agreed she'd rather call family changing as gender neutral but keep gendered rooms on ea side.
- Discussion w/ Dave, Lani, Mark, Dennis, Stacy, and Joel about the issues around this topic and whether the city would have a different preference. Joel reminded that we have changing stalls so each user has a private space. Also, that we still need additional toilet fixtures so we're using the Atrium and those are gendered. Mark mentioned if the changing rooms all went non-gendered, we would delete the urinals.
- Robbie mentioned he was sure it would come up at the board meeting.

- Mark asked if the trophy display was needed instead of storage that might be much more desired by the users?
- Robbie agreed yes, make it a counter w/ storage below and above but maybe a bit of trophy display up high.

Next Steps

- Design team is completing the SD deliverables and will send to estimator.
- QKA to send SD deliverables and SD estimate to this group for comments, before everything goes to the board for approval.

Next Meeting

- TBD

NOTE: These notes represent a summary of the meeting. Any corrections must be submitted in writing within 3 days of receipt of these minutes.