



## Meeting Notes

**Project:** MSAD 75 High School

**Date:** May 4, 2016

**Attendees:** Lyndon Keck/PDT, Alan Kuniholm/PDT, Brad Smith, Superintendent/MSAD #75, Donna Brunette, Principal/Mt. Ararat HS, Linda Hall/Chair, MSAD #75 Board, Mark Bergeron/Parent, Steve Dyer/BC, John Hodge/BC, Emily Robbins/Student Rep., Krista Chase/School Counselor, Faculty Rep., Julie Booty/BC-CC, Jane Scease/MSAD #75 Board, Chris Shaw, BC/Director of Facilities, Matthew Cook/Faculty Rep., Brad Totten/Sustainability & Const. Sys. SC, David Hammond/PE & Athletics SC, Michael Chonko/Building Committee, David Johnson Jr., Groundskeeper/District Employee

**Purpose:** Building Committee 17

These notes were taken by Lyndon Keck and Alan Kuniholm to the best of their ability. Should you have any questions please notify us within three (3) working days.

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
<b>Meeting Minutes 4/06/2016</b>	1. Meeting notes from April 6, 2016 were approved by consensus.	
<b>Public Comment</b>	2. Linda Hall, Chair of the MSAD 75 Board of Directors, spoke about shared classrooms and common faculty workrooms. She said sharing of classrooms and shared faculty/human resource area is something she experienced as a teacher at three different schools. She said the success of such an arrangement depends entirely on the culture of the school and the attitude of the staff and administration. She said it can work and she's seen it work.	
<b>Sub Committee Reports</b>	3. The following issues were discussed.  <u>Communications SC:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Julie reported out of the Communication Subcommittee, more specifically regarding a news article for the Mid-coast Forecaster.</li> </ul> <u>Technology SC:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jane reported the Technology Subcommittee had taken no action and had nothing to report.</li> </ul> <u>Athletics SC:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Athletic Subcommittee reported out with representatives Krista and Matt. They made a presentation about the benefits and strengths of having a turf field as the main competition field. They had a twelve slide Powerpoint presentation.</li> </ul>	



## Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee had numerous questions about the construction costs, longevity and replacement.</li> <li>• There was discussion about whether or not a reserve fund or sinking fund could be legally established that would allow money to be put in every year for play surface replacement after 10-12 years.</li> <li>• A question was asked as to what the replacement cost was. Krista and Matt said using today's cost replacement tends to be \$250,000-\$350,000.</li> <li>• John Hodge asked the Building Committee if there were any objections to letting the Athletic Subcommittee go forward to the Fundraising Subcommittee requesting the Athletic Subcommittee and individuals within the four towns be allowed to raise money for a turf field.</li> <li>• There was a motion to let the Building Committee endorse the inclusion of turf field in the project pending funding availability. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.</li> <li>• There was a question asked about the timeline deadline for consideration of the turf field. Lyndon explained there were actually two timeline triggers. The first is that if money was going to be raised and if the turf field was going to be included in the project at the time of referendum that it would need to be included in the description of the referendum language. A commitment to raise the money would need to be made prior to referendum.</li> </ul> <p>Lyndon explained the second trigger was really about three years away. The second trigger would allow the SAD #75 Directors to put out a second referendum to the voters if it took them three years to raise the money for a field. The second referendum would ask the voters if they would accept the donation of a turf field with the obligations of maintenance and operation.</p> <p>Alan pointed out that turf field would get the students back on their competition field sooner.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Board of Directors and Building Committee really have another three to three and a half years to raise money before the field would be ready to be built.</p>	



## Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p data-bbox="477 464 976 495"><u>Sustainability &amp; Construction Systems SC:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="526 537 1365 1199" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="526 537 1365 947">• The Subcommittee reported out. The report was made by Chris Shaw who explained the Committees had invited a solar installer to come and explain power purchase agreements for solar photovoltaics. A power purchase agreement allows a private investment group to pay for the purchase and installation of photovoltaics at Mt. Ararat High School. They then sell power back to MSAD #75 at a discount below CMP's power cost. The investor group uses tax incentives for alternative energy. These tax incentives are used up after 6-7 year at which point MSAD #75 will be given the option of purchasing the inverters and all the photovoltaics or they can continue to buy electricity from the development group.</li> <li data-bbox="526 995 1365 1094">• There was a question asked about the life cycle of the solar components. Chris explained the inverter's life cycle is about 20 years and the solar panels about 40 years.</li> <li data-bbox="526 1142 1365 1199">• Committee members talked about the advantages of PPA because there is less risk for MSAD #75 with such an arrangement.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="477 1241 727 1272"><u>Student Advisory SC:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="526 1314 1365 1860" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="526 1314 1365 1860">• Emily reported out the following feedback:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="623 1377 1365 1556">○ <u>Outside</u> (in order of priorities) – Turf field (tops the list), good concessions at all fields, sound system at all game fields, smooth walking and running trails, central water access (fountains and to fill up buckets), bigger and better bathrooms, aluminum bleachers, up-to-date equipment, lights on and around the field, and power at all game fields.</li> <li data-bbox="623 1587 1365 1860">○ <u>Inside</u> – Bigger gym with lots of bleachers and wood gym floor (top priority), bigger weight room with good equipment, more bathrooms in the locker rooms, more storage, no awkward locker rooms (private changing rooms, closed in showers), concessions with the ability to cook lots of food, vented, and close to gym, place for student athletes to store gear, separate locker rooms for PE and teams, updated, nicer training room outside entrance to gym, and swimming pool.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



## Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Lyndon explained Alan would be sharing the design work at PDT. It was not the mission of tonight's meeting to select a conceptual plan but rather to look at relationships of component parts and talk about big picture ideas such as where is the front door, what is relationship of the building to the competition field, where is parking, where are the service and deliveries located, etc.</li> <li>5. Lyndon passed out a cost comparison for additional classrooms versus the collegiate model configuration. It showed there will be forty-seven (47) teachers and thirty-seven (37) classrooms. Lyndon calculated the construction cost for ten (10) additional classrooms would be \$2,419,200. The total project cost, including soft costs, for ten (10) additional classrooms would be \$3,024,000.</li> <li>6. Lyndon calculated the construction only costs for faculty rooms for fifty (50) teachers plus three (3) telephone call rooms to be \$801,360. The project cost would be \$1,001,700.</li> <li>7. The delta or total net additional cost to provide one classroom for every teacher, if you then eliminate the faculty rooms, would be \$2,022,300.</li> <li>8. A question was asked why the classrooms were so expensive when additional classrooms had been added for much lower costs at the recently built elementary school. Lyndon explained he used the construction costs received last week for Sanford High School. The costs for building and pad only, with no site work, was \$197/s.f. for a 360,000 s.f. building which is more than double the size of Mt. Ararat. Lyndon provided a 5% escalation for inflation and a 5% increase for a smaller school. He used construction cost of \$216/s.f. for this comparison and project cost of \$270/s.f.</li> <li>9. Alan presented five (5) conceptual floor plans, three (3) of which were new and the Committee had never seen before. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme 5 – Is organized around a north-south main street with some of the major central elements like the learning commons, the forum, and the dining commons. The student parking lot stays pretty much where it is now. Staff/visitor parking and bus and car drop-off areas are centralized around the main entry on the end of main street furthest from the pond. The athletic complex is located nearest</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	



## Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>the pond and student parking and competition field. Service and kitchen is also located just off the student parking closest to the pond. Eagles Way is a single drive and does not penetrate the tree line. An attempt has been made to save the trees adjacent to the baseball field and student parking. Classrooms are arranged in an east-west orientation to maximize daylight opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme 5.2 – Flips main street and locates a classroom wing that parallels the pond. The entire school in this scheme moves closer to the competition field. Student parking is located to the south of the building closest to the entry along Eagles Way. Service comes around the back of the building to be located near the center of the school where the dining commons is. Eagles Way is split allowing for better site circulation. Classroom orientation is not directly east west and has less daylight efficiency than Scheme 5. Main entry is along main street with entry to gym and administrative offices. Administrative offices have great visibility of all arrivals and departures.</li> <li>• Scheme 7 – Creates a south facing entry to the parking lots, bus and car drop-off areas. Larger spaces for art, music, wellness, and dining commons all face north and create exterior space with the pond and views to the competition field. Classroom houses are integrated (have science in both) and face east west maximizing daylight. Eagles Way is also split on this scheme. Service is directly off Eagles Way. Less visibility from administrative area to the competition field and student traffic to and from. Athletic areas can be easily separated from the rest of the facility for weekend and after hour use.</li> <li>• Scheme 8 – Is similar to Scheme 5 in that main street runs north-south. On this scheme the classroom houses are flipped to the east side of the plan facing Eagles Way and the competition field. The classroom houses are further integrated by having the learning commons and forum integrated into each house. The learning commons is open for both floors with daylighting through skylights above. On the southern end of main street is the administrative offices; the main entry faces east to bus drop-off and staff parking. Service to the kitchen is off the back of the school with the dining commons facing the pond along with the fitness center. Art and music face west. Special education forms a bridge connecting the two classroom houses. Faculty offices are on the second floor running between the two houses as well. Science is integrated. Classrooms are oriented for daylighting. Athletic program is located adjacent to the main entry and is furthest from the play fields but adjacent to student parking.</li> <li>• Scheme 9 – Integrates both classroom houses into one house with art, the forum, and the learning commons. Mainstreet runs east-west and has a main entry facing south to the parking lots and drop-off</li> </ul>	



## Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>areas. Special Education and administrative offices form a connector to the gym and dining area of the building. The dining commons is adjacent to the main entry and gym. Service is directly off Eagles Way. Classroom orientation for daylighting is less efficient. Athletic programs are the closest to the competition field as compared to the other schemes. This is the simplest envelope.</p> <p>10. After presenting the various floor plans the Building Committee talked about big picture issues which included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should science rooms be all together in one area or can they be separated among the houses?</li> <li>• How will we handle building expansion? Where should it be?</li> <li>• What kinds of possible future arrangements can there be for the houses in terms of their organization? Will they will be academies, four small 9-12 learning communities or departmental organization?</li> <li>• Where is the best location for service?</li> <li>• Where is the front door and what is its relationship to arrival on the campus?</li> <li>• How does the bus loop work? What is the best arrangement?</li> <li>• What is the orientation of the Learning Common? Should it be orientated toward the pond and natural environment?</li> <li>• What is it going to feel like walking in the front door? Where will students be allowed to gather and congregate?</li> <li>• How can the school be broken into security zones for after school use?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Further Discussion</b></p>	<p>11. No further discussion. Meeting was adjourned.</p>	
<p><b>Next BC Meeting</b></p>	<p>12. June 1, 2016, MTA HS Learning Commons, 5:30 – 7:30 PM</p> <p>May 18, 2016, MTA HS Room 201, 4:30 – 7:30 PM to review Schemes 5, 5.2, 7, 8 and 9.</p>	