

## ***Design and Construction Advisory Committee***

---

### **Meeting #5 - Juanita High School Concept Design Review**

**June 27, 2016**

**Attendees:**

- Committee: Eric Campbell, Jay Halleran, Lee Kilcup, Gid Palmer
- LWSD Staff: Forrest Miller, Dan Chandler, Pat Sprague, Stacy Shewell
- Architect: Rebecca Baibak
- General Contractor: Bryan Gormley

**Agenda:**

Second Presentation of Concept Design Options:

Juanita High School Rebuild and Enlarge project

Presentation of Schedule Options:

Juanita High School Rebuild and Enlarge project

Committee Feedback on Schematic Design and Schedule Options

**Outcomes:**

- Entire committee agreement that the 'Q' scheme best satisfies the decision making filters for this project
- Entire committee agreement that the full relocation build model is best for this project

**Action Items for the Lake Washington School District:**

- Sun/shade studies on the 'Q' scheme courtyard
- Evaluation of 'sweet spot' for floor to floor height
- Provide a better story around the decision to use full build vs phase build model (see attached)
- Investigate accelerating the project schedule

**Committee discussion, observations and comments:**

Architect provided an overview of design investigation to date sharing two main design concepts that have emerged from the process, the 'Q' and 'E' schemes. Contractor provided constructability analysis on each scheme, and updated data regarding phased vs. not phased build.

Discussion on the schemes was as follows:

- Committee asked about building height regulations and if a 2 or 4 story scheme might be more efficient on the site

## ***Design and Construction Advisory Committee***

---

### **Meeting #5 - Juanita High School Concept Design Review**

- Response – 2 stories drives building with that are not compatible with daylighting requirements, 4 story raises concerns regarding: neighbors; student/staff circulation – i.e. transition time; and, also fourth floor thermal comfort.
- Question about optimal floor to floor height
  - Response – Generally 14’ is what is in current concept, this will continue to be investigated as design progresses
- Inquiry about pushing the theater into the building volume
  - Responses – ceiling height is driving the space to be located outside of the overall building volume
- Question about whether the courtyard would ever get sun
  - Response – we will do sun/shade studies to understand the sun angles better

Discussion on phasing was as follows:

- The committee discussed the potential risks and inefficiencies associated with a phased build and asked to have numbers associated with it to tell the story.
- The committee also discussed the ‘human impact’ or disruption factors associated with phase build vs. full relocation, siting that full re-location would be better for everyone
- The committee asked the team to tell a better story

Additional discussion:

- Inquiry about options to opening the building.
  - Response: The team will analyze and report back
- The committee discussed opportunity for accelerating the schedule
  - Encouraged the team to consider bid alternates based on schedule options
  - Be sure to tell the right story around schedule, and make decisions based on what is best for the students
  - Question about whether the project could start a year earlier
  - Goal is to get it done as quickly as possible with the least impact to students/staff (i.e. educational delivery)
- Question = if anyone had thought about the ‘portable camp’, stating that it should be done well given the amount of time students, staff, and faculty will spend there
  - Response: team will continue to evaluate options and keep this in mind
- Committee emphasized the importance of telling a story relating project decisions/choices to the experience of those will be impacted by the project