



Meeting Minutes

09-10

Bond Committee Meeting-03

PROJECT	Measure B: Westlake Elementary School	MEETING DATE	9/23/2020
CLIENT	Santa Cruz City School	PREVIOUS MEETING	1/29/2020
		PROJECT #	17-007.0

WESTLAKE	ATTENDEES (ANTICIPATED) Clyde Curley Julie Nolte, Art Teacher Chrisa Burr, Pre-K & K: Teacher Kathy Griffith, Library, Teacher Jacob Bolotin, Parent Nicole Steel, Parent	PRESENT AT 01/29/20 MEETING Clyde Curley - Principal Kathy Griffith - Librarian Tim Madsen - Parent
DISTRICT	Trevor Miller Chris Garcia Jimmy Monreal	Chris Garcia
ARCHITECT	Mark Bartos	Mark Bartos Monica Landaverde Francisco Toca-Madrid Nathan Yuen

Bond Committee Meeting

DATE	SUBJECT/SUMMARY
Agenda 09/23/20	<i>This is the Second meeting of the Bond Committee Component of the Planning review Committee</i>
01	Introductions
02	Review Completed Projects
03	Ongoing and upcoming projects
04	New Building Scope
06	Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none">Priorities and ImplementationSchedule next meeting
MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING	
01/29/2020	Bond Committee Meeting

Slide 1: Title – Mark Bartos (MB) requested introductions around the table, and explained the process and the purpose of the Bond Committee Meeting, and asked for questions. No questions were asked. MB continued

DATE	SUBJECT/SUMMARY
	<p>explaining the main focus of the meeting was the main building and classroom space, which Clyde Curley (CC) agreed with, and added removing the portables. MB explained that the reason for presenting the new building now is because of the attendance boundary revision. CC elaborated on the background of the attendance boundary revision, however it does not change anything at Westlake. Chris Garcia (CG) added that if a family member attended Westlake, a sibling will also be able to attend. CC noted that according to conservative projections, Westlake is predicted to decrease by 25 students, and is not planning on reducing classrooms yet.</p>
	<p>Slide 2: Project Update – MB noted that the marquee sign is completed, and asked if it was working to the school’s satisfaction, to which CC said yes. MB noted that the campus re-roofing is complete, and the lift is complete, verifying with Monica Landaverde (ML). CC said he tested it himself. MB continued, saying that ML is working on the second lift at the lower end of the site; since it is similar to the upper lift, it should go more smoothly. MB asked CG about the card access security and data infrastructure improvements; CG said that Trevor Miller (tm) is working with DGI on the data infrastructure and will notify about the schedule. Once the data infrastructure is complete, facilities can start modernizing the card access security system. MB asked CC if he saw and liked the preview of the front gate, and CC replied that he did. MB said that TM asked for Bartos Architecture to examine the sewer lines and complete by the summer. Kathy Griffith (KG) asked about access to the campus using the access cards, which CG replied that the fence will be padlocked and all staff will have a key. MB requested clarification on whether the people gates will have card access. CC asked whether the furniture had been finalized at the district level. CG said that assistant superintendent Dorothy is in charge of the project; CC said that he’ll contact Dorothy. CC asked about the disposal procedures of the old furniture and the timeline for disposal. MB said the new furniture delivery was dependent on the modernizations and improvements.</p>
	<p>Slide 4: New Building Layout – MB described the layout of the new building’s plan, noting that the classrooms are based on the reader’s workshop programming booklet. CC reminded MB that classroom 7 is where a storage room would be, for a sound barrier since the music room is below. KG asked if the new building will include a gender neutral bathroom on the top floor; MB answered that single accommodation restrooms are the ones that are gender neutral. MB suggested that the gender neutral restroom on the lower floor can have a lock on it so anyone can use it, which CC approved. MB made the suggestion to include a conference room by CR7 for teacher collaboration and lunch breaks. KG asked about how grades were assigned to the floors; CC responded that the 4th and 5th graders would take the upper floor, and the 3rd graders would take the lower floor.</p>
	<p>Slide 3: New Building Rendering – KG asked why a flat roof, since flat roofs were prone to leaks; MB responded that the flat roof is manufacturer standard, and it helps with managing costs. KG asked about the warranty, and MB said that the architect and builder have responsibility.</p>
	<p>Slide 5: Modular Building Classroom – CC asked about putting heat pumps on the outside of the building; MB said that may be an injury risk to a passing student, and a noise problem. The second topic of contention was the placement of the wireless access point in the room, so the teachers can connect to the tv. CC had some concerns about audio/video connections to the TV; CG explained that while screen casting and app downloading are the preferred solutions, teachers are able to make the suggestion to apply traditional AV cables and it will be brought to committee.</p>
	<p>Slide 6: Modular Building Art Classroom – KG asked about the placement of the kiln; MB suggested if the finances allowed, to fence in an area for an art courtyard and keep the kiln outside so that it can be vented if it’s heated.</p>
	<p>Physical presentation: Playground Equipment - ML presented recommendations and mockups for different configurations of the playground structures. CC said that there will be a response once the children have taken the configurations to a vote.</p>
	<p>Slide 7: Bond Allocation to Projects – CG mentioned that HVAC upgrades were top priority. CC agreed, and added restrooms. CG suggested revisiting the size of classrooms, especially the art building. KG asked if money could be saved on the new building if it was split into two single-story buildings, due to the cost of the elevator and stairs. CC mentioned it would take up more ground space. CG asked when the new building might be finished; MB replied 2022-23.</p>
	<p>KG voted that progress is being made in the right direction.</p>

DATE	SUBJECT/SUMMARY
2/21/19	<p data-bbox="261 170 565 197">Bond Committee Meeting</p> <p data-bbox="261 218 1513 281">Since June 2017 a “Planning Review Committee” (PRC) has met eleven (11) times to provide guidance regarding the Westlake Elementary School campus master plan process and bond project implementation and prioritization.</p> <p data-bbox="261 302 1513 396">As a component of this collaborative process, a “Bond Committee” meeting was held on 22 May 2018. This summary represents the second convening of the Bond Committee component of the planning group. An open house was also held for all-comers to provide input in to the priorities and master 23 May 2018.</p> <p data-bbox="261 417 1513 512">Direction provided as a result of this (21 February 2019) Bond Committee Meeting supersedes the previous bond committee meeting of 22 May 2018. This meeting is the fourth in a series of meetings to revise and update the site master plan strategy, and priorities. In summary:</p> <ul data-bbox="321 533 1513 764" style="list-style-type: none"> • 03 December 2018: Collaborative team workshop • 13 December 2018: Collaborative team workshop • 27 January 2019: Collaborative team workshop • 21 February 2019 (Bond Committee Present) • As a result, the Bond Committee Confirmed that the current implementation/prioritizations as developed by the PRC is compliant with the 2016 pre-bond, Board approved master plan priorities and project/categories. <p data-bbox="261 785 1513 911">Following the Bond Committee meeting a supplemental walk in / open house opportunity was held on site wherein all comers were invited from the school to visit and to provide additional input, critique and comments regarding the current implementation/prioritization plan of action. No projects or needs were identified different from the Bond Committee and PRC committee Implementation plan.</p> <p data-bbox="261 932 1513 1016"><i>The committee confirmed understanding that as a bond facilities program proceeds, economic issues with affect priorities and new priorities will be identified over time. All priorities/projects will however be in compliance with the Board approved master plan and Voter approved election language.</i></p>

Implementation Matrix

Master Plan Priorities	Master Plan Projects/Categories	Implementation Plan	Current Implementation Plan
<i>Fall 2016</i>	<i>Fall 2016</i>	<i>Spring 2018</i>	<i>Spring 2019 (update Sept 2020)</i>
Remove Portable Classroom Buildings Technology Infrastructure Upgrades	Existing Building Renovations School Furnishings	Technology Infrastructure Parking	Technology Infrastructure Miscellaneous projects including: Marquee sign, Fencing (site safety), Accessible Lifts
Campus Security	HVAC System	New Upper Classroom Wing	Campus Re-roofing
Expand Play Fields/Hard Courts	Paint School	Modernize Upper Classroom Wing	2 Story Classroom. Located at upper field – at existing portable wing. <i>Revised to Single Story Building (9/23/20) meeting</i>
New Interior Finishes/Lighting/Cabinetry Replace Plumbing Fixtures	Re-Roof Existing School Landscape and Irrigation improvements Convert library to admin and move library	Modernize Lower Classroom Wing Modernize portion of Admin Building Kinder Wing (funding Dependent) Misc Site projects to be done during the above	Modernize Upper Classroom Wing (<i>funding Dependent</i>) Modernize Lower Classroom Wing (<i>funding dependent</i>) Modernize portion of Admin Building (<i>funding dependent</i>)
Install new campus wide HVAC system Relocate Student Drop Off Lane	Replace portable classrooms with permanent building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various Site Improvements as identified • Accessibility improvements • Playground Areas 	Playground Areas
Parking Improvements	Add lower parking / drop off	Kinder Wing (Funding Dependent)	Parking to be completed upon removal of existing lower portable wing.
Convert lower classroom to two story		Admin/Library (Funding Dependent)	

Note

The committee agrees that all projects are “funding dependent”, however those noted here as “funding dependent” are currently identified as likely to not have sufficient funds.