

---

**Date**  
04/06/2016

**By**  
Tom Bauer

---

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Number</b>
Lincoln High School Master Plan Committee #5	Lincoln High School	15015

---

**MPC Members\***

Jerry Vincent, PPS OSM  
Erik Gerding, PPS OSM  
Ayana Horn, PPS OSM  
Chris Linn, Boora  
Abby Dacey, Boora  
Tom Bauer, Boora  
Caitlyn Aldersea, LHS MPC  
Erin Burke, LHS MPC  
Peyton Chapman, LHS MPC  
Larry Dully, LHS MPC  
Randall Edwards, LHS MPC  
Todd Etchieson, LHS MPC  
Gerald Gast, LHS MPC  
Mike Golub, LHS MPC

Tiffani Howard, LHS MPC  
**Mike Ioffe, LHS MPC**  
Eleni Kehagiaras, LHS MPC  
Akili Kelekele, LHS MPC  
**Amy Kohnstamm, LHS MPC**  
Eric Lenard, LHS MPC  
**Audrey Lingley, LHS MPC**  
Sara Matarazzo, LHS MPC  
Douglas Obletz, LHS MPC  
Tiffani Penson, LHS MPC  
**Charlotte Richardson, LHS MPC**  
**Jill Ross, LHS MPC**  
Trevor Todd, LHS MPC  
**Jason Trombley, LHS MPC**

**Mary Valeant, LHS MPC**  
**Mary Ann Walker, LHS MPC**  
Tom Walsh, LHS MPC  
Brianna Webb, LHS MPC  
Andrew Wilk, LHS MPC  
Steven Yang, LHS MPC  
Tracy Prince, LHS MPC  
**Timothy Moore (for Prince)**  
John Issacs, PPS  
Chris Russo, PPS  
Kim Fox-Middleton, PPS  
\*members in attendance noted in bold

---

**Distribution**  
All MPC members

---

**Objectives:** This was the fifth meeting of the Lincoln High School Master Plan Committee (MPC). The primary purpose of this meeting was to review four master plan options that reflect input from the master planning process to date. Input from MPC #4 and the Public Design Work Shop #2 was synthesized and refined by the full design team to create the four options. During this meeting, the MPC divided into four groups and spent time discussing and evaluating each option. Each group was asked to determine a preferred option, along with any further reactions or suggested modifications to the preferred option. There was consensus among the four groups that Option B is the preferred option. The design team will further test and develop this option as the basis for the master plan. An outline and primary contents the master plan deliverable will be presented at MPC #6.

**Target Audience:** Lincoln High School MPC members

---

## Minutes

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND UPDATES

- A. The goals of the meeting were presented. It was stated that the MPC would be asked to determine a preferred master plan direction from the options presented in order for the design team to maintain their schedule and process.
- B. An overview of the schedule and process was provided including a review of how the design team will interface with the School Board's Bond Committee.

### 2. MASTER PLAN OPTIONS

- A. An overview of the Public Design Workshop #2 was provided. It was noted that the workshop was very well attended. A hands-on exercise similar to the MPC #4 was conducted at the work shop.
- B. The most notable common themes from both MPC #4 and Public Design Work Shop #2 were reviewed as these were the primary design drivers behind the 4 master plan options.
- C. A review of the surrounding site conditions and zoning requirements was provided.
- D. An analysis of the on-site grade conditions, once the existing buildings are removed, was provided. Approximately 75% of the site will be at the same grade level.
- E. Options A, B, C and D were briefly presented; the graphics are included in this report. (An option E was cited as a renovation and addition to the existing building. This options, has, however, been taken off the table.) A very high level cost comparison was provided. It was noted that at this level of cost analysis, the costs for each of the building configurations is roughly the same. The primary variables come from the location of the proposed new building in terms of soil conditions and foundation costs, and secondly, the swing site implications. Three of the options enable the students to stay in the existing building until the new building is completed at the west end of the site. The fourth option shows a new building in the same location as the existing. In this scenario, it is assumed that a modular "village" to accommodate the school during construction would be placed where the current track and field is now, at considerable costs.

### 3. INTERACTIVE EXERCISE

- A. The MPC divided into four groups and spent time discussing and evaluating each option. Each group was asked to determine a preferred option, along with any further reactions or suggested modifications to the preferred option. There was consensus among the four groups that Option B is the preferred option.
- B. The following are comments from each of the four groups:
  1. Group 1 (Todd, Eric, Peyton, Mike, Jill): don't like D. Liked B. Compelling for voters – efficiency – space and environmental. Stand-alone performing arts and athletics is good from an access and use perspective. Provides a way for future expansion, whatever it is, would be best integrated into campus. Safer if expansion includes little kids if they are nearer to high school rather than to freeway.
  2. Group 2 (Larry, Gerry, Sara, Eleni): B was 1<sup>st</sup> choice. Liked openness to Salmon Street. Echoed what others said about positives with B.
  3. Group 3 (Tom, Amy, Tim, Brianna): Athletics and Performing arts to have their own identity, separate space. Future space connectivity. Location of future space can be well used in the interim. Liked having the field pushed all the way down to the east so you had maximum foot print on west end. Liked central courtyard, also liked internal plaza. Liked the PRICE POINT. Felt that would be important for voters.
  4. Group 4 (Trevor, Andrew, Mary, John): 1<sup>st</sup> choice was B – liked the amphitheater park space. Liked the entry plaza. Talked about moving athletic facility onto Salmon. Wanted to

# BORA

---

- acquire more land. Instead of putting track at bottom you could put it up some # of feet and get some parking underneath.
5. Chris asked about a low-rise vs high rise structure/ Strong preference either way? Low-rise seems suburban. Let's do height. And stout footprint takes up too much space in such a tight space. Low is too inward looking. First step in paradigm shift, especially if future elementary school is built on this site. Wider, lower model blocks sight lines. No one liked that.
  6. Higher space needs to ensure that design encourages community and that we don't lose that connectivity that the school has now.
  7. Gerry - 4-story isn't a low-rise. Concerns about keeping sense of community if building is too tall.
  8. Larry – track and field should not be too much below street level, a safety concern? Is it feasible to do a tall elementary school?
  9. Carole – retaining walls along east end of site – opportunity for terraced seating.
  10. Timothy – north facing spaces, beneath bleachers, could be great for art, maker spaces; continuing-ed. in the evening.
  11. Peyton, through street with surface parking along south edge of site is a great improvement over the existing parking "pit" feeling.
  12. Chris – the suggested massing in the master plan options is flexible for now – this will be further considered when the building design process begins after the bond passes.
  13. Andrew – interested in the inherent efficiency factors between a low and high-rise school.
  14. Abby talked about how elevators and stairs can be designed to encourage community. Think strategically about where you have main components of school so that students are coalescing in certain places. Helps mitigate against height issue and not seeing each other.
  15. "3-story building with no thoughtful design purpose is worse than 8 stories that are well considered"
  16. (Student) Mike – everyone at Lincoln eventually has to come outside, which will be why courtyard and outside space is so important for helping to keep community strong.
  17. Workspace designs (Google, co-working space, etc.) offers guidelines for how to design collaborative spaces & helps prepare kids for future work spaces for kids. Height and space can help accomplish that.
  18. Can "activate" public edges of school with the field & track. Urban space is a great vehicle for connecting space in an urban context (Amy K). Don't need to have building fronts.
  19. There is no other open space this big that in this part of town. Field is active, vibrant and cool. Important to keep that in new plan.
  20. Parking – two schemes had long spine of parking – could be walkways and multi-use, not just parking.
  21. One thing they liked about C was lifting up the track and have parking underneath.
  22. Chris said Bora would pursue Option B as preferred option. Still need to resolve parking issues, based on code, etc. Will possibly affect level of field and costs.
  23. Clustering of building in open space.
  24. Tall building is a good thing.
  25. Entry plaza is important.
  26. South connection through the site is an important consideration.
  27. Athletics on Salmon instead?
  28. Could we put underground parking in the current basement footprint (in art department)? Would that save \$\$? Might be attractive option for bond measure.

# BORA

---

## 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

### Attachments

1. MPC5\_photos of group activity: combinations of optional program
2. MPC5\_graphics presented including 4 master plan options
3. MPC5\_photos of score cards evaluating each option

### Next Planned Meeting

MPC Meeting #6  
05/04/16, 4:00pm, LHS

The foregoing is the writer's interpretation of the issues discussed. Please report any discrepancies or omissions to Bora within three business days of receipt of this document.

**END OF MEETING MINUTES**