

LMS Alternatives Design Meeting, February 6, 2008

Date: Feb 6, 2008

Time: 10:00AM

Location: 6500 Arapahoe Road, Boulder

Attendees: Peter Stewart, Greg McMenamin, Heather Lewis from the community, Susan Cousins, Dave Compton, and Don Orr from the district, and Adele Wilson, Peggy Kinsey, Dax Diaz, Scott Bruce and Mario (I apologize for not getting a last name) from design and estimating team.

Discussions of:

Preservation Scheme A: Preserves building with additions to the north and west.

Preservation Scheme B: Retains only east building façade, interior is renovated, addition to the south.

Meeting Notes:

We first discussed some of the pros and cons of each scheme:

- **Security Concerns of Administration Adjacencies & Entrance in Each Scheme:** A possible solution is to add a glass vestibule to the front of the building, but this is not as good for preservation of the building.
- **Accessibility Concerns Scheme B:** May be addressed with some reworking of the site and the entry door.
- **Relocation of Utilities in Scheme B:** Is possible. Additional deepening of the drainage basin may be required.
- Scheme A is more expensive than Scheme B because of phasing and renovation of space that does not give a net gain to the program (for example, the existing basement). However, Scheme A is a better preservation effort. For the record, we did not intend to criticize Scheme B, because saving the façade would be better than not saving it, but we all agree that Scheme A is the better preservation approach that would be more likely to be “fundable” from preservation grant sources.
- We discussed importance of integrating the design approach of new additions with the old structure, particularly in Scheme B, where three different building time periods would be reflected in the façade of the building.
- **Ed spec with each Scheme:** Each scheme could meet the requirements of the ed spec in regard to size and programmatic elements, but some adjacency relationships may be compromised.

- We did ask whether the fire lane could be combined with the athletic field. It cannot.

We also suggested that there are other schemes that could be considered and that the two presented do not represent an in-depth study. Other possibilities may include:

- **Expanding further behind the building on the southwest corner:** This would require acquiring land from the City of Louisville, and swinging the road around the back of the building to maintain the fire lane. Some grading challenges would need to be overcome. A benefit of this scheme is that it creates one new addition instead of two additions, which is one of the detriments of Scheme A.
- **Taking over the staff parking area with the new addition, and minimizing changes to the existing building:** This would require moving staff parking to the west of the drainage basin along the fire road. Some grading challenges would need to be overcome, and an effort would need to be made to get lighting into existing classrooms. There was some expressed concern about adjacencies, but without exploration, these concerns are not clear. Benefits may include:
 - Decreasing the linear length of the building.
 - A good effort to preserve the existing building.
 - Presenting only two building time periods on the main façade instead of three (1939 and present).
 - One new addition instead of two simplifies phasing.
- **Encapsulating the existing building façade within the new building:** Apparently this was explored during the DAT design process, but this is a considerable compromise to a preservation effort, and does not create good interior flow.

Reasons for discussing other schemes:

- To demonstrate that other schemes could be developed that may improve upon current design solutions, if there were direction to do this.
- To ask the DAT to “think outside the box” and not be overly critical of Schemes A and B, knowing that, while there are challenges to overcome, preserving the existing building *IS* possible.
- In particular, the possible scheme that would take over the staff parking may be quite desirable to consider, even if there is not adequate time before Monday to draw or price it.

Pricing:

- The district, Slater Paul, and Adolfson & Peterson maintain that, even if preservation had been a mandate for the project, it would not have been possible to preserve the existing building without making further compromises to the

building educational program, unless additional funds had been procured. We discussed the reasons for this conclusion at great length, because in some cases, preservation of an existing building can be a cost effective solution, and many school districts around the country have effectively preserved school buildings. The two reasons that the design and estimating team give for why this building is different from some other projects are as follows:

- This building site has more than a typical number of constraints.
- The type of construction of the existing building does not lend itself to renovation. Challenges include:
 1. Load bearing masonry walls
 2. Rooms that are too small
 3. Spaces that must be brought up to code that cannot contribute to the educational program (such as the basement).
- Without being an integral part of the design process, Peter, Greg and I could not comment on whether we agreed with this conclusion.
- We discussed alternate schemes and whether there would be a possible cost savings if more design solutions were explored. The design and estimating team believes that the scheme that Peter suggested, which was the one that takes over the staff parking, may be less expensive than Scheme A and more expensive than Scheme B, but in any case, it would be in the ballpark of the estimates that the two schemes will receive.
- We asked that the pricing be done thoughtfully and with respect for the large number of people who are concerned about these preservation issues. Adolphson Peterson explained that the pricing was to be done to the same level of detail as other price estimating on the job, including subcontractor input, and that retroactive issues, such as redraw costs and inflation, would be separated out so that the “cost” of preserving the building would be more truly reflected.

Public process:

- Don Orr explained that the public would be allowed to comment at the DAT meeting on Monday, but that the meeting would begin with an overview of the scenarios and an explanation of the cost analyses.
- We thanked the team for taking the time to meet with us today, and for taking the concerns of the citizens seriously. We asked them not to dismiss the alternatives on the basis of budget. That should be a decision for the community to address.