



Meeting Notes

Project: MSAD 75 High School

Date: November 04, 2015

Attendees: MSAD 75 Building Committee;

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| John Hodge | Emily Robbins |
| Krista Chase | Matthew Cook |
| Steve Dyer | David Johnson |
| Donna Brunette | Kim Totten |
| Chris Shaw | Mike Chonko |
| Jane Scease | Brad Smith |
| Kathy Kahill, PDT Architects | |
| Lyndon Keck, PDT Architects | |
| Bob Curtis, PDT Architects | |

Purpose: Building Committee 11

| Topic/Time | Agenda/Notes | Action |
|--------------------------------|--|--------|
| Meeting Notes Approvals | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approval of Meeting Notes from 9/16/2015 and 10/7/2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notes were approved 2. John Hodge noted that there was one excused absence due to illness – Julie Booty | |
| Public | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No public Comment | |
| Subcommittee Reports | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Updates from Subcommittee meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each Building Committee representative for the Subcommittees gave brief summaries of work to-date. - It was suggested that the Sustainability Subcommittee consider recruiting a student member - It was also suggested that the Student Advisory Subcommittee could assist in recruiting student members for subcommittees that don't currently have one but should. - PDT requested that meeting notes from each of the Subcommittee meetings be posted on the Google Drive in the respective subcommittee folders for all Building Committee members to read / be familiar with (notes can be sent to Ryan Palmer for posting.) 5. Protocol for future subcommittee reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Committee discussed how best to support reports from subcommittees - Determined that 30 minutes would be allotted to Subcommittee Reports at every meeting with additional agenda items added by request from individual subcommittees | |



Meeting Notes

| Topic/Time | Agenda/Notes | Action |
|--|---|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [NOTE: the agenda goes out one week prior to the scheduled BC meeting, so agenda items from subcommittees should be received in advance of that.] - In March & April, the Building Committee may need to meet more than once a month to make sure all subcommittees have sufficient time to present and discuss their agenda items for decisions - John requested that all subcommittees presenting information to the BC be prepared, stay focused and keep the conversation on-task as much as possible in order to be respectful of everyone's time. <p>6. PDT discussed rough timeline goals for each committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - March / April was set for Building Systems and Sustainability and PE / Athletics | |
| <p>Update on Meeting with DOE</p> | <p>7. Update the Committee on meeting with Scott Brown</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New vs. Reno: Scott took the New Vs. Reno recommendation under advisement - Ed. Specs.: Scott was very impressed with the Ed Specs Donna presented and accepted them for review. He will contact Donna with any questions, concerns, or requests for additional information. - Site Test Fits: PDT explained the test fits done to-date and the recommendation to stay on the site. - PDT explained that the New vs. Reno report will be reviewed by Scott who will then take it to the Commissioner with a recommendation. The Commissioner then will take it to the State Board of Education. The SBoE will vote on it, and then, if the vote is positive, it is considered approved. - Steve Dyer asked about PDT's next contract to keep moving forward on the project. Lyndon explained that our contract is only through the Site Application as requested by Scott. The contract for the next phases of work including Programming and Concept Design are prepared and ready to send to Scott for approval. | |
| <p>VOTE on Ed. Specs.</p> | <p>8. Committee Commented on the Ed Specs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A comment was made that they are a vision and more philosophical than procedural which raised the question, how do these get translated into square footages and classroom counts? - PDT explained that the DOE has programmatic regulations for size and quantity of classrooms and other educational spaces. PDT's job is to take the Ed Specs and interpret them into classroom quantities and sizes, using the DOE regulations as a guideline. PDT will do a draft of | |



Meeting Notes

| Topic/Time | Agenda/Notes | Action |
|---|--|--------|
| | <p>space allocation based on regulations and the Ed Specs for Donna and Brad to review before it is presented to the DOE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PDT reiterated that the space allocation / programming conversation with the DOE is a multiple meeting / back-and-forth discussion. <p>9. Jane Scease made a motion to approve the Ed. Specs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steve Dyer seconded the motion - There was unanimous vote of those present to approve the Ed Specs and recommend them to the School Board for consideration on November 18. | |
| <p>Comments to Pros & Cons of Test Fit Options</p> | <p>10. Committee comments and feedback on Test Fits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was pointed out that the Committee has not formally voted to only pursue site plans that allow students to remain in the existing building during construction. Suggestion was made to go through all the test fits and then consider a vote to solidify consensus - Test Fit #1: committee discussed the state of the current fields and track – they are at the end of their lifespan and the state might pay to rebuild (even in place) due to age. - Test Fit #2: Con – produces a very tight construction site with potential noise and disruption being significant. Con – Service Area is the first visual of the school upon approach. Con – Temporary staff parking could be problematic - Test Fit #4: Con – concerns about the roadway during winter. Pro – closeness and connection to the pond - Test Fit #5: Con - Field House usage for classes or in conjunction with the gym and the lockers is problematic. Con – may not take best advantage of site features. Con – parking in front of the building. Con – proximity to bus garage and adjacent property that could be developed later. Con – distance between parking and the athletic fields might be considered far. - Test Fit #6: Con – Chris is concerned about a 3-story concept for maintenance and cost of elevator. <p>11. PDT presented Test Fit #5.1 and pointed out that we are unable to fit a fat track and competition soccer field AND keep the Field House on the west side of the proposed road, given site constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion ensued of separating soccer and football fields - PDT pointed out that you get the most bang for your buck with synthetic turf, bleachers, and lighting if you can maintain a combined competition field with a fat track. - Jane expressed concern that the Field House is dictating decisions that maybe should be made based on other information. - PDT asked the PE / Athletics Subcommittee to address the Field House in their next meeting | |



Meeting Notes

| Topic/Time | Agenda/Notes | Action |
|---|---|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lyndon explained that in the past high schools have gotten money from the state for additional athletic space such as wrestling rooms, work-out rooms etc.) but does not want the Committee to assume that the state would participate in restoration or upgrading of the Field House PLUS a new gym. - Chris reiterated his desire for a second gym that does not have a wood floor due to wear and maintenance - Jane expressed concern about policy issues associated with a competition only gym - Jane requested more information about how the Field House is currently used by the community and by whom in the community. - PDT suggested that the Building Committee needs to understand the cost to maintain the gym in comparison with the cost to invest in and maintain the Field House - PDT pointed out that the Field House is another limitation on a site already fairly limited by natural environmental features - It was suggested that perhaps the road could pass east of the fields rather than between the fields and the pond <p>12. PDT will expand test fit diagrams to include the whole campus – especially for presentation to the communities</p> <p>13. Steve Dyer moved to take a vote to recommend moving forward with a straw poll to stay on the site with the stipulation that only test fits that allow students to stay in the existing building during construction be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David Johnson seconded - Motion received unanimous support of those present. | |
| <p>Agenda Items for next meeting</p> | <p>14. Update on the ACOE & Vernal Pool jurisdiction has been moved to the next meeting due to time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - John requested that it be at the top of the agenda so it doesn't get missed. | |
| | <p>15. Upcoming Building Committee Meetings @ MTA HS Learning Commons 5:30 – 7:30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 2, 2015 | |