



Meeting Notes

Project: MSAD 75 High School

Date: April 6, 2016

Attendees: Bob Curtis, PDT, Lyndon Keck, PDT, Superintendent Brad Smith, Kim Totten, Chris Shaw, David Johnson Jr., David A. Johnson, Donna Brunette, John Hodge, Steve Dyer, Julie Booty, Jane Scease, Michael Chonko, Emily Robbins, Matthew Cook.

Purpose: Building Committee 16

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
Meeting Minutes 3/02/2016	1. Meeting notes from March 2, 2016 accepted as submitted.	
Public Comment	2. No public comment.	
Sub Committee Reports	<p>3. Updates from Subcommittee Meetings:</p> <p><u>Communications SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundraising strategies. <p><u>Technology and Learning Commons SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. Need a list of consultants and places to visit from PDT. <p><u>Athletics SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met on March 16, 2016. Lyndon gave priority list and updated cost information about State subsidized costs. Met again in late March to focus on synthetic turf. Heard a presentation from turf vendor and installer. Went on site visits to Mt. Blue Learning Center and Cony High School. Reviewed full athletic facility including storage and locker. Impressed with Cony Gym and its' support facilities. Spoke to staff about shortcomings. A discussion of the design and advantages of synthetic turf will be included in the next BC agenda. The SC will present pros and cons at May meeting. Athletic Director will speak about maintenance and replacement, benefits for PE and teams. <p><u>Combined Sustainability and Building Systems SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met on March 16, 2016. They hope to give design team specific direction to design team regarding energy use. 	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GBC “LEED” was discussed. PDT reported that last two school have exceeded energy standards in LEED by about 30%. Subcommittee target is 40 -50% better than code. • Expects energy use of new building to be about half of the current school. A tight, highly insulated building envelopes will be critical to good energy performance. PDT will provide specific recommendations on how this will be accomplished. • DOE has funded photovoltaics and geothermal at about 50% historically, with balance bought by the local SAU. Setting the energy goal will be important to the design team. Target lifespan is 50 to 100 years. April 13, 2016 SC meeting will include a presentation by Revision Energy on photo voltaic power and equipment purchase arrangements. • Chris Shaw is concerned that public statements about energy use match design approach. Baseline energy use data should be based on the wealth of energy use information that has been compiled for the high school building over many years. This data should be thoroughly reviewed and mined to assure accuracy and consensus for performance comparison purposes. Peculiarities of existing system design can skew energy use numbers. Be clear that BTU/sf is the metric, but this will need to be presented to the public in terms of dollars. • Brad asked for clarification about how energy performance is compared. Comparisons will be made in comparable units. Upfront costs and payback time will vary. It’s important to tell the story of a good investment with a good return over a short period. Geothermal will increase electrical cost but reduce gas cost. • Kim pointed out that infrastructure should be set up to be adapted for future improvements and upgrades. • Mike pointed out that buildings designed in different times have very different standards. Older buildings don’t have nearly as much fresh air, by system design, as modern buildings. Modern systems need to condition more fresh air. • LDK points out that the State Board appears to still be interested in geothermal. State has typically bought 50% of bore field costs and all of interior system components. <p><u>Student Advisory SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great March meeting. Mr. Palmer from Learning Commons led an activity to determine student priorities. Among these are comfort, food and technology. • Brad passed along the suggestion that students weigh in on sponsorship ideas and naming rights. 	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will meet again after April break. 	
<p>Update on MDOE Meetings</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. On April 1, 2016, PDT formally presented program to Scott Brown at 187 s.f./student. Brad provided the deed to the MIRA property. DOE has given the green light to begin design work. 5. PDT has begun diagramming and will bring two or three designs to May BC meeting. Designs will be based on the collegiate model in order to meet DOE 85% space utilization requirements. 6. Donna wants presentation of concepts to faculty group before May meeting to seek their input. Staff people are welcome to attend. 7. PDT will meet with user groups again and share the results with staff members. PDT will post boards to preview designs and make large presentations followed up by smaller group meeting with core, most interested people. Staff has been prepped for collegiate mode and 85% efficiency. Staff will be very curious about quantity of classrooms provided in advance of any meetings. 8. Steve Dyer asks for quick overview of collegiate model. Generally, most rooms are not assigned to a single teacher. This will reduce classroom number by about 20%. Classrooms will typically be shared by 2-3 teachers with planning and preparation happening elsewhere. This applies more to core subjects than to art, science and specialties. To compensate, State pays for teachers work rooms with office furniture, locked files, and work areas -- Human Resource rooms. Layout of these rooms varies with districts. Some use large open tables. Oxford Hills deliberately combines work areas to facilitate conversation between disciplines. The common idea is to facilitate collaboration while still providing personal space for teachers. 9. At Mt. Ararat we have asked the DOE for 50 stations. Telephone call rooms for private/confidential conversations will be provided. Program calls for three private call rooms. 10. Is the cost of mobilization time, as teachers move from space to space, figured into equation? Lyndon to provide comparative classroom numbers for different schemes, including the cost premium for 1 to 1 vs. collegiate model classrooms. 11. Committee asked if a Human Resource room still welcomes students like a classroom would. Is there a loss in teacher/student conversation space? High Tech High in CA has transparent spaces used for tutoring as well as semi-confidential conversations. 12. Committee asked if loss of teachers' personal space might be a loss to the students. Classrooms are expressions of personalities. One-to-one classrooms can still be brought with local money, but the State required utilization percentage has been increasing. Does the public need to be 	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>informed of this approach before the project moves forward with specific designs?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. A member stated administration needs to be careful not to reduce interaction between teachers and students. 14. Convincing the State to account for potential for student population growth from students returning from charter schools would result in a larger school, since the State is very strict on ratios and utilization percentage. Brad has been very assertive in expressing this to the State. 15. The State has developed many strategies to increase efficiencies. Change from 80%-85% is new. DOE has been instructed to stay tight to enrollment projections. The design team has worked with the DOE to agree to a 750 student enrollment figure. 16. Donna mentioned the program contains a variety of spaces that could function as “advisory spaces” -- both student-to-student and student-to-faculty. The original school was designed around a shared-space model, which has fallen away as population has decreased and more space has become available in the building. 17. Community “buy-in” is important. Wants to make sure that the design not progress too far without community feedback. All concept plans will be posted publicly on the web page. 18. All schemes should accommodate expandability in case local funding is increased. This space should accommodate both long-term growth and possible space increases in local funding. 19. Google documents seems to have become unfriendly. People are having trouble accessing some files. 20. Shared classrooms can still be personalized to reflect teachers’ personalities. Will usually have two teaching walls for continuity and an individual work table for each teacher in the classroom. Walls won’t be sterile boxes. Teachers will be able to leave on-going assignments on walls and boards. Teacher desks tend to be more like tables with moveable files. PDT will share typical furnishings, typically a desk is provided for each teacher. White board paint, that allow an entire wall to be used as a marker board, is an option. 	
<p>Fundraising Possibilities</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 21. Naming rights and sponsorship policy is being developed by School Board to allow naming rights of spaces accessible to the public such as fields, gyms libraries, etc. 22. District has announced that a new Subcommittee is being formed for this purpose. Interested people are being sought by the District Office. Board will approve/assign members. Having key people with access to potential funders is important 	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
Performance Spaces/ Forums	<p>23. PDT presented the concept of a “forum” space as provided in two recent PDT school designs. The first high school forum in Maine was designed by PDT for Oxford Hills Comprehensive High School.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The space contains 350 seats with a semi-circular with small area behind lectern. • It was originally conceived as a “black box” theater for small musical or theater performances. Also useful for student government, class meetings, etc. No tablet arms. • Floor is all at one level. No behind stage space. Backs up to art room corridor. • Oxford Hill does not have an auditorium. <p>24. Mt. Blue Regional High School forum space has 188 seats with four sliding panels to separate back-stage area from floor, an excellent presentation space.</p> <p>25. String program is strong at Mt. Blue. School originally asked the State for three large music rooms for music program. State paid for half for forum since they also got a 600 seat auditorium.</p> <p>26. Farmington has numerous small community performance groups which use the forum.</p> <p>27. Forums are typically acoustically tuned by acoustical engineers.</p> <p>28. Theater seats are typically different sizes determined by sight lines.</p> <p>29. We project a 250 seat forum (1/3 student population) and 1,800 s.f. stage.</p> <p>30. Platforms and risers can be added or removed. Stages create separation that is not always welcome.</p> <p>31. Table and chair storage spaces are typically adjacent.</p> <p>32. The group would like to know from PDT what other types of similar spaces are being built at other high schools.</p> <p>33. Has performance community weighed in on this? PDT needs their input to customize spaces.</p> <p>34. Should seating be steeper and floor spaces smaller? Are proportions correct? Spaces are hard to photograph and need to be visit to be appreciated.</p> <p>35. Tablet arms may be a good idea, at least at seats close to presenter so the space could be used for as a classroom.</p> <p>36. Forum spaces can be used for pre-performance rehearsals to be staged at Orion PAC.</p> <p>37. The design team will present to the full State Board next Wednesday, April 13th at 1:00 p.m. with Donna. Presentation will begin with diagrams, not finished plans.</p>	
Further Discussion	<p>38. No further discussion. Meeting was adjourned.</p>	
Next BC Meeting	<p>39. May 4, 2016, MTA HS Learning Commons, 5:30 – 7:30 PM</p>	



Meeting Notes