



Meeting Notes

Project: MSAD 75 High School

Date: October 07, 2015

Attendees: MSAD 75 Building Committee:

John Hodge	David A. Johnson
Jane Scease	Brad Smith
Julie Booty	Chris Shaw
Matthew Cook	Michael Chonko
Emily Robbins	

Public:

Brandy Robertson	Joanne McRogers
Don Gray	Rouseau

Kathy Kahill, PDT Architects

Bob Curtis, PDT Architects

Purpose: Building Committee 10

Topic/Time	Agenda/Notes	Action
2 Mins.	1. Approval of Meeting Notes from 9/16/2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notes could not be approved because they had not been uploaded to the Google Drive. - PDT will upload and will add to agenda for November 	
3 Mins.	2. Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None 	
10 Min.	3. Elect a new co-chair. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Julie Booty and David Johnson were nominated - Julie Booty recused herself - David Johnson is the new co-chair / vice-chair of the Building Committee 	
Maine DEP Meeting (10 Mins)	4. PDT updated the Committee on the meeting with the MDEP representative on site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MDEP will consider the High School site application separate from the MS application - MDEP is willing to waive the wetlands adjacent to the pond as part of the WOSS and just classify it as forested wetlands, which means they can be impacted as part of the total site impact - MDEP will regulate the manmade ditches around the drive loop. - Expect to receive a letter from MDEP confirming this information; team will then meet with Army Corps of Engineers to establish their interpretation of allowable impact on site. 	



Meeting Notes

Topic/Time	Agenda/Notes	Action
Update on Community Meetings (30 Min)	5. PDT presented a summary of the four community meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PDT presented a “Top Ten” list of comments heard repeatedly at the meetings. - PDT also handed out meeting notes from each of the four meetings for review by the committee - PDT will get these meeting notes posted to the project website. 	
Ed Specs Update (30 min)	6. Donna will provide an update on the Ed Specs document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified (16) Design Themes that were frequent in the user group and town meeting notes PDT provided - Used these Design Themes as guidance for the format of the document and the structure for answering each of the DOE questions - Donna went through the Design Themes and explained them a bit. - Committee agreed to review the document and be prepared to vote on recommendation to the School Board at the next Building Committee meeting. - Group discussed sending a draft up to Scott Brown’s office now so that he and his office have time to ask any questions prior to receiving School Board’s recommendation. 	
New vs. Reno Report (30 min)	7. Comments and Questions from the Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David stated that he’s heard from a lot of public and no one wants to renovate the existing building; supports new construction - Emily supports new construction, as it will be a smoother process - Matt supports new construction because the pros outweigh the cons - Julie supports new construction because of the price point and the strong desire not to displace the students (echoed by the public) - Jane supports new construction for reasons previously stated - Donna supports new, but is concerned about where a new building will be on site and how that will affect the students; would prefer that the students all stay in one location rather than be split up during construction - Mike supports new, stating that the building has always had issues and is concerned that the list of things they wish they had been able to do will be longer with a renovation project than with a new construction project - Chris supports new and expressed concerns that the public have confidence in the process and that the premiums are accurately understood. He also reiterated that he wants to save the field house, though not at the expense of a new gym. - Brad supports new construction. Commented that the New v. Reno report is thorough and shows the limitations of the current building. Brad stated that the limitations of staying with the current building are a huge disadvantage. - John supports new construction, stating that his experience with renovations is that they are more expensive and difficult than anticipated due 	



Meeting Notes

Topic/Time	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>to unknown conditions, limitations, etc. And also expressed that HS is a very significant experience for young adults; affecting that experience negatively due to construction is not an acceptable path for him.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Motion to take a vote resulted in a unanimous decision to recommend New Construction to the School Board. 	
<p>Site Test Fits (15 in)</p>	<p>8. PDT presented Test Fit #6</p> <p>9. Kathy presented PDT's list of "Pros" and "Cons" for each test fit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Committee members were each given a packet of the test fits with pros and cons listed - <i>PDT requested that the committee review these before the next meeting and provide feedback on additional pros and cons for the test fits</i> 	
	<p>10. Upcoming Building Committee Meetings @ MTA HS Learning Commons 5:30 – 7:30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 4, 2015 • Include time for the subcommittee reports at the next meeting 	