



## MEETING REPORT

**PROJECT:** Bear Creek Elementary  
**PROJECT NO:** 09038.00  
**DATE:** November 30, 2009  
**ATTENDANCE:** see attached  
**SUBJECT: Design Advisory Team Meeting #6**

The purpose of this meeting was to review the Bond Scope of work and discuss Site Design goals and desires.

### Distributed items

Agenda, DAT Meeting Minutes, Power Point Presentation, EX003

### Community Comments/Presentation

1. The community presented a comparison of 4a to scheme 1a.
  - a. An analysis of the Community concerns and evaluation was provided to the DAT.
    - i. An attachment is provided with the meeting minutes distribution.
  - b. 79,000 difference in cost between scheme 1a and 4a as represented from the scheme summaries.
  - c. 1a could be modified to keep the entry and IMC as designed in 4a
    - i. Science and art could be located where the IMC was planned at the north parking lot.
2. Along with the scheme 1a the DAT goals and visions were reviewed.
  - a. West facing views for IMC.
  - b. Addresses the goal of considering the building massing for the neighbors.
  - c. Maintains benches and tables at the front entry.
  - d. Allows for the best west views from the IMC (if relocated). The gym in 4a may make the view and space feel confined.
  - e. The cost estimates and schemes evolved over time with changes occurring from DAT to DAT. This does not allow for apples to apples comparison.
3. Gym construction phasing
  - a. Hold gym classes outdoors.
  - b. Revise curriculum to allow for project phasing.
  - c. Utilize teacher parking lot or other hard surface play area.
  - d. Use cafeteria.
  - e. Portable classrooms.
  - f. The gym disruption is temporary.
4. Construction
  - a. The construction will be a temporary disruption to the kids.
  - b. DAT is concerned that the impact of losing gym for 2 semesters would impact the children.
5. Cost
  - a. Cost differences are not as dramatic as presented in prior DAT.
    - i. When compared from 3a, 4a, 4b, 5a
  - b. The costs associated with the estimates are \$85 for renovations and \$150 for additions.
    - i. (RTA)The additions could have variables which impact the cost of construction.
      - i.e fill, demolition and proximity of construction to the existing building.
    - ii.
  - c. Some costs of scheme 4a seem to have been left off of scheme 4a so the comparison of cost cannot be made.

- i. Community is concerned that all potential hidden costs are not shown in each cost estimate.
  - d. It is the communities concern that the DAT selection was based solely on the cost of construction.
  - e. It appears that the cost factors associated with 1a and 4a are close.
  - f. Would the cost difference of 1a from 4a affect the amount of renovation area?
    - i. The cost difference would need to come from a portion of the project. V/E areas to be selected with the help of the DAT.
  - g. (DAT) Is there a possibility that interest money from the bond money could be used? (Don Orr with BVSD provided the following information)
    - i. There are eligibility requirements for the surplus money.
    - ii. Staff at schools can apply for the money.
    - iii. Change in Scope or change in enrollment.
    - iv. Change in facility priority items.
    - v. The current issue could not be resolved in a timely manner to meet the project schedule.
    - vi. The money available is only 1.5 million dollars and will not be decided upon until the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of the project with no guarantees of where the money will be going.
  - h. DAT appeal process is processed through the DAT meetings as they are occurring now.
    - i. The appeals process is decided by the project management team.
    - ii. The school board handles issues of high priority.
  - i. Why were none of the schemes presented on budget?
    - i. (RTA) The project base bids are all on budget or under budget.
    - ii. (RTA) The alternate items which are a priority for the DAT are items which put the project over budget.
- 6. If there are any concerns that would make any DAT members wish to reconsider their vote then an email should be sent to Steve Schumacher by close of business on Tuesday December 1.
- 7. Would be length of construction change between the two schemes?
  - a. No.
- 8. Are there design cost implications if the design were to change?
  - a. Yes
  - b. Is the design team hourly or contract?
    - i. Contract.

## Meeting Minutes - Community Comments

1. No additional comments were given.

## DAT Goals and Visions – Review of previous comments

1. (Comment) No comments were given.
- 2.

## Budget

1. Concept Budget.
  - a. Sound control should be a high priority.
  - b. Fire sprinklers were talked about as becoming a part of the base bid
    - i. We will be discussing this issue with the Boulder Fire Marshall and a case will be made to not fire sprinkler the building.
    - ii. If sprinklers were added to the base bid the money would come from a portion of the project budget. No additional money will be provided.

## Site and Playgrounds

1. Budget.
  - a. The budget item identified in the bond is \$140,000.00.
2. Concept playground pros.
  - a. Hard surface play area is highly desirable.
    - i. wall ball.
    - ii. basketball
    - iii. tetherball – softer tetherballs as currently installed.

19 South Tejon Street, Suite 300 - Colorado Springs, CO 80903 - Tel: 719-471-7566 Fax: 719-471-1174

*“Service by Design”*

- b. 4 square.
  - c. Big Play structure.
  - d. Large open field.
  - e. Kindergarten playground is entirely fenced.
  - f. Large playground is not fenced in.
  - g. Some Shade.
  - h. Pea gravel.
    - i. allows for creative play.
  - i. Kindergarten swings.
  - j. Kindergarten trees.
3. Concept playground con's.
- a. Hard to monitor kids who wander to the south west bridge.
  - b. Digging area is too small.
  - c. Wood fiber chips blow away.
  - d. Gravel gets on walkways.
  - e. Volleyball not used.
  - f. Kindergarten playground.
    - i. stage-coach.
    - ii. too many woodchips.
    - iii. too much blacktop.
    - iv. not enough grass.
    - v. berm.
    - vi. balls go over fence.
    - vii. drainage at north corner.
    - viii. Sand box is not deep enough.
    - ix. Blacktop under trees.
  - g. Access points and safety.
  - h. Mud under tables.
  - i. The Pit.
    - i. Visibility.
    - ii. kids climb on rocks.
    - iii. opening should be on the west.
    - iv. kids sled on the hill.
      - a. good in winter.
      - b. bad in the mud.
    - v. should be removed and a new terrace facing west installed.
    - vi. boulders should be re-used.
  - j. YMCA entrance to cafeteria
4. Baseball field.
- i. Kent has contacted South Boulder Little league and they have expressed desire to enter into a maintenance agreement with the district to maintain the field.
5. Items not shown.
- i. Goofy goals are not shown.
6. Site staging.
- i. A couple areas were discussed with the contractor.
  - ii. Staff parking lot, hard surface area near wall ball, and the south east corner of the playfield were options discussed with the contractor.
2. Site goals.
- a. Boulders as play structures – emphasize natural playscapes.
  - b. Utilize grading and excess fill for site features rather than expensive play structures.
  - c. Remove pit and provide appropriate terraced area.
3. Kindergarten ideas and goals.
- a. Earthforms.
  - b. Turf areas integrated into the play area (fingers of green).
  - c. Consolidate play structures together.
  - d. Finger together irrigated and non-irrigated areas.
  - e. Lines of water – 1" deep fed from downspout.
  - f. Paving patterns in concrete.
  - g. Color.

- h. Rock textures – polished vs natural cleft.
  - i. Storage area outside.
    - i. Balls/sand equipment.
  - j. Water access in several areas.
    - i. Wet down sandbox .
  - k. Plant area for children to play in.
  - l. Shelter.
  - m. Performance area.
  - n. Change in surfaces.
  - o. Benches built around the tree.
4. Primary playground ideas and goals.
- a. 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade.
    - i. Climbing structures.
    - ii. Spinning structures.
    - iii. Force and motion (science integration).
    - iv. Swingset with different length chains.
    - v. Multifunctional equipment.
    - vi. Group Play.
  - b. 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>.
    - i. Climbing.
    - ii. Running.
    - iii. Digging.
    - iv. Imaginative play area.
  - c. All areas
    - i. Groups of elements.
      - a. Trees.
      - b. Play areas.
7. Irrigation strategy.
- a. A strategy for irrigation should be developed so that water use is minimized and that important items such as the playfield remain irrigated in drought conditions.
5. Community gardens.
- a. Hose bib should be provided for watering.
  - b. Soil prep and garden perimeter will be established as a part of the project.
  - c. Planting beds and other layout will be performed by the community.
6. High priorities.
- a. Natural play areas.
  - b. Digging.
  - c. Water.
  - d. Play equipment is not a high priority.
7. Intriguing play surfaces.
- a. Kompan makes modern imaginative play surfaces. [www.kompan.us/sw29431.asp](http://www.kompan.us/sw29431.asp)
8. Images
- a. Images of play areas and inspirational images were shown and distributed by the DAT members.
  - b. Images supplied by the DAT are attached to the meeting minutes distribution.

## Next Meeting

- 1. To Be Determined

Attachments: Attendance Record, Images supplied by DAT members, Community Analysis, Scheme summary.

CC: Doug Abernethy (RTA), Michael Riggs (RTA), Steve Schumacher (BVSD), Kent Cruger (BC), Jerry Bivens (Envision), Virgil Fleeman (CEI), David Heinrich (JVA), DAT members, Susan Cousins (BVSD)

REPORTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Michael Riggs, AIA

Printed Name

19 South Tejon Street, Suite 300 - Colorado Springs, CO 80903 - Tel: 719-471-7566 Fax: 719-471-1174

*“Service by Design”*