



- iv. Lauren presented the engagement process with the site community including teachers, staff, students, and parents. The ideas discussed were very conceptual. Member Sinai asked for more detail about the survey questions. Lauren replied that questions were about programming, safety, comfort, connection with the campus, ability to use the facilities the way they were intended and if they felt welcome and included in the campus.
- v. Six items were identified via this process:
 - Welcoming campus
 - Clear programming to support immersion and STEM programs
 - Campus to reflect students and surrounding community
 - Variety of adaptable spatial experiences
 - Repair of deferred maintenance items
 - Refurbishment of outdoor spaces
- vi. Member Alper asked where the six priorities are identified in the conceptual cost budget. Executive Director Calise replied that the six items are as a result of the community engagement process.
- vii. A new entry and office sequence is being proposed with an enlarged administration area plus counseling and a family resource area. A new plaza near the sixth grade annex provides more gathering and teaching spaces that connect the interior spaces to the exterior. A new breezeway connects the cafeteria to the main campus and provides a variety of spaces for the sixth grade and the new yard provides diverse physical education spaces.
- viii. The new entry sequence gets students on to the campus in a more defined manner with more greenery. Member Sinai asked about the drawing showing the entry area lobby reception area which controls access on to campus. Lauren explained that the breezeway would stay and there would be a gate between entrance and circulation breezeway.
- ix. The proposed parent hub, community hub has space for parents, room for large and small meetings, and direct access to the library.
- x. The new student hub and lockers were priorities identified by the community. The proposal includes a 7th and 8th grade student hub in the main building and a second hub in the 6th grade annex. Member Saini asked if there would be student learning spaces in the 6th grade annex and if we have spoken with the other middle schools are fully utilizing their lockers.
- xi. The proposed site improvements create a diversity of spaces and promote a variety of physical activities. Member Sinai asked if girls had been included in the development of the spaces and uses. She also asked if the District is staffed appropriately to maintain the green spaces proposed.
- xii. Reallocation of the funding for the original Oxford campus to Longfellow would build out the full Longfellow campus as shown. Member Alper questioned the available funding the Board has approved. Member Saini asked if bike parking was going to be accommodated and encouraged it to be highlighted in the Board presentation. Member Sinai expressed concern about moving the Oxford money to Longfellow but understands the rationale and suggested a timeline of when/how to revisit the Oxford



campus' future. She indicated that given the 6-7 years it would take to rebuild Oxford, the reallocation seems appropriate. Member Alper is in favor of the reallocation but questioned whether it takes away anything from King and Willard.

- xiii. Executive Director Calise discussed the next steps: The budget and Architect contract would go to the Board for approval and the Schematic Design would come back to the Board with a Schematic level estimate. Member Sinai asked what would be done if we kept it at \$20 million and what would be done if we add an additional \$10 million.
- xiv. Discussion about short term projects, exterior painting of the building and drought resistant landscaping. John did not recommend proceeding with the short-term projects. Member Sinai questioned the phasing so we could see some visual impact to make the grounds look more appealing to the community and shared if not going to use the California side of the school for staging, why can't we do some landscaping.
- xv. We have had a discussion with Principal Furlan about whether he would prefer portables on the field versus swings inside the existing buildings and he indicated he would not want portables. Member Alper asked if the duration of construction would be shorter if Facilities only did the base project.
- xvi. Discussion about whether to take this to the Board as a consent item or whether they would like to have a slideshow. Member Sinai asked if members of the Site Steering committee members could be at Board meeting to vouch for the process. Member Alper asked if one steering committee member could be a panelist; and also a parent, someone from club de padre and Principal Furlan available. Plan should be for it to be on the action calendar on June 23rd. Lauren stated that it is their task to demonstrate the base project and then the ads give us the reimagination of the campus.

d. Design update: CEQA, survey and hazardous material testing are in process.

7. Next Meeting Date: June 23, 2021

8. Adjournment at 5:49 pm