



July 18, 2008

**WOODROW WILSON HIGH SCHOOL
WMC CONCEPT MEETING**

Grimm and Parker Job No. 20749/075

Held on 07/09/08 at 8:30 AM at Woodrow Wilson High School

<u>ATTENDEES:</u>	<u>COMPANY</u>	<u>E-MAIL</u>
<u>WMC</u>		
Jack Koczela	WMC	jack@koczela.net
John Howe	WMC	john.howe@dc.gov
Mary Froning	Wilson LSRT/WMC	maryfroning@compuserve.com
Pamela Lipscomb Gardner	WMC	pamela.gardner@dc.gov
Ginny Callanen	WMC	vacallanen@rcn.com
Gloria J. Gibson	WMC	gjarey@hotmail.com
Eric Martel	WMC	shmartel@starpower.net
Alex Wilson	WMC	alex.wilson@dc.gov
<u>Community</u>		
Jeff Schutz	WWHS staff	Jeffery.schultz@dc.gov
Nancy Huvendick	21CF	nhuvendick@21csf.org
Lucrella Lavudi	Parent (Hunt Laudi Studio)	llaudi@huntlaudistudio.com
<u>DC Government</u>		
Will Mangrum	OPEFM	wmangrum@facilityplanners.com
Anthony deGuzman	DCPS	Anthony.deguzman@dc.gov
<u>Architects</u>		
John Hill	Grimm + Parker Architects	jhill@gparch.com
Dave Prevette	Grimm + Parker Architects	dprevette@gparch.com
Kari Glassmire	Grimm + Parker Architects	kglassmire@gparch.com
Paul Bradshaw	Grimm and Parker Architects	pbradshaw@gparch.com
<u>DISTRIBUTION:</u>		
All Attendees		
Anthony Evans	WMC	anthonyevans@anthonyevans.com
Paul Klee	Grimm + Parker Architects	pklee@gparch.com
Ajibade DaSilva	WMC	adso_hms@yahoo.com
Jaime Merlos	WMC	Jaime.Merlos@dc.gov
Matthew Frumin	WMC	Mfrumin@ndi.org

MEETING PURPOSE:

1. Review/discussion of concept approaches to entry sequence and Main Avenue location, Schemes A and B.

PRESENTATION:

1. Project Review

G+P provided a summary of meetings held and completed work effort on the project to date. Buildable areas on the site and parking approaches were reviewed.

At the meeting of 06/25/2008 held with the WMC it was the Board's recommendation that of the four concepts presented for entry approaches to the building and the location of the Main avenue within that options A and B had the most merit and should be developed further. The concept options presented at this meeting were based on these options and incorporate other comments received at the 06/25/08 meeting. The discussion focused on the main entry location and conceptual renderings of possible approaches to the building architecture at the entries. Concepts presented represent works in progress and evaluation tools and are not reflective of a final design solution. Major items of discussion were as presented following.

2. Academy Organization

A refinement of the possible arrangement for the organization of core academic spaces within the building was presented. The diagram represents the organization of the entire campus and is based on scheme A. The scheme assumes an academy based model for the school, but also illustrates the flexibility that will allow for a department based model if that direction taken in the future. The scheme provides for area on each floor, illustrated in yellow in the diagram, to serve as academy offices and faculty planning areas. These areas could be converted to teacher planning spaces in a departmental model. 9th and 10th grade academies are located adjacent to, but separate from, the rest of the academic spaces. AAA academy is located adjacent to the PE wing of the campus. Science classrooms are grouped on two floors and are stacked. They are located adjacent to the 9th and 10th grade academies for easy access from these spaces and are fully integrated into the SiMaTech Academy. Stacking of the science classrooms is economical since it minimizes horizontal plumbing runs. Technology labs (project Lead the Way) are located on the ground and first floors.

3. Concept Diagrams

A. Scheme A – Main entry centralized on Core Academic building

Highlights of scheme A presented are:

- More formal arrangement with Main entrance centered on the Core academic Building.
- Main Avenue connecting campus on inside edge "field side".
- Clear axial plan relationship between Entry Plaza, Main Entry and Interior Courtyard.
- Bridge at main entry eliminates need for stairs and ramps
- Main entry is on same level as 1st floor corridor of academic building. (0.0')
- Entry addition has two levels of administration/ guidance and health suites.
- Media center is located on the north side of the core academic building with grade level access to the exterior.
- Two levels of academic classrooms for 9th and 10th grade academies are above the media center
- Main Avenue on Field side allows views across campus increasing sense of community.
- Separate 9th/10th Grade entry.

Challenges

- Circulation access from Main entry to the Avenue is not direct.
- Entry is focused on Fort Reno Park and not the natural approach to the building of most users from the Metro to the south and in a westerly direction along Chesapeake Street from busses.

B. Scheme B. – Main Entry on side of Core Academic building

Highlights of scheme B are:

- Less formal approach to the Main Entry.

- Main entry is clearly visible to pedestrians approaching from the Metro.
- Direct connections between entries to Main Avenue. Connections are at same elevation as the avenue (-11.0')
- Direct link between Main Entry and the Avenue.
- Main Avenue on Field side allows views across campus increasing sense of community.
- Separate entry for 9th/ 10th grade academies
- Direct connections between entries to Main Avenue. Connections are at same elevation as the avenue (-11.0')
- Administration/guidance/health accessed directly off of Entry corridor
- Media center housed in 1-1/2 level addition centered on west face of core academic building with direct access to exterior for public access.
- Opportunities for outdoor plaza at media center for outdoor learning at media center.

Challenges

- No direct connection between main entry and Academic core interior courtyard.

DISCUSSION:

1. Schemes

- i. Group consensus was that scheme B was preferred.
- ii. Concern with Scheme A that there was not a clear separation between pedestrian and vehicular traffic entering the underground and surface level parking at the main entry. At Scheme B there is a similar issue with pedestrian route across the site to Alice Deal Middle School.
- iii. Consideration needs to be given to the fact that 50% of students arriving by bus arrive on the Chesapeake Street side of the school. It was discussed if this presented a drawback to scheme B where the main entry is on the Fort Drive side. It was noted that although the main entry is on Fort Drive the secondary entrance off of Chesapeake Street will be significant enough in scale to be recognized as the second entry as has been discussed in prior meetings.
- iv. Both schemes work functionally for the media center. Schemes address the concern that the center be located to allow for development of exterior entry to the media center for community access. Location of the media center on the center access in scheme B places media center in a central location in the academic core celebrating its importance to the school and community. This was seen as an advantage over Scheme A.
- v. Group liked the potential for development of outdoor teaching spaces linked to the media center.
- vi. It was noted that regardless of Scheme selected that at least two entries are required to provide adequate spaces for queuing and security processing during morning arrival to the school. Both schemes allow for multiple entries. The identification of the second arrival entrance is stronger in scheme B.
- vii. Internally the Scheme A entry does not connect directly to the Avenue on the field side, whereas Scheme B allows direct connection from both entries.
- viii. The schematic elevation of Scheme A respects the architecture of the existing building and the central axis, recalling the original entry on Nebraska. There were concerns that, as shown, there was the possible loss of windows to third floor classrooms on that face of the building.

- ix. As discussed in previous meetings consensus was that scheme B responds well to the arrival paths of pedestrians from the metro to the South and from Chesapeake Street.
 - x. Schematic elevation for scheme B was termed “academically welcoming” to students as well as being inviting to the community. The architecture of the core academic building was respected and elements of the architecture of other structures was recalled. The height of the media center clearly allows for the retention of the third floor classroom windows.
 - xi. Development of elevations and outdoor spaces should take into consideration the urban context. Make an urban statement.
2. Parking
- i. WMC group felt that 200 parking spaces would be sufficient to give flexibility for parking for staff, students and visitors. Design of parking needs to consider how it might be used by visitors to the Aquatic Center. It had been suggested in previous meetings that if parking were constructed under the field that consideration might be given to a leasing arrangement with Metro. At this time such an arrangement is not a prime focus for WWHS.
3. General comments
- i. There should be direct grade level access to the track and field from locker rooms and food service for concessions at the stadium.- This will be taken into consideration in the concept plan development.
 - ii. Don’t design structures based on one model of teaching. Design needs to be flexible to respond to changing teaching methodologies. – The concept approach recognizes this and organization of the academic sections of the building will allow for the desired flexibility.
 - iii. In design development, carefully review for trouble spots- dead end, hidden spaces etc. – This will be done as project proceeds into schematic and design development.
 - iv. Architects requested confirmation for the science department on the preferred approach to organization of science labs and classrooms ie; separate labs with shared classrooms vs combined lab/ lecture rooms.

Next Steps

- 1. G+P directed to proceed with concept plan development of scheme B.
- 2. Next meeting of the WMC Board to review the project is scheduled for 8.30am on July 23 2008.

If your understanding of the items in this meeting is different from the listed above, please do not hesitate to call.