



Meeting Notes

Project: MSAD 75 High School
 Date: March 2nd, 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
 Purpose: Building Committee 15

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
Meeting Minutes 1/6/2016	1. Meeting notes from February 3 rd , accepted as submitted.	
Public Comment	2. No public comment.	
Sub Committee Reports	<p>3. Updates from sub-committee meetings: <u>Communications SC</u> – Met on 2/10 to fine-tune and prioritize their recommendations. Next meeting scheduled for 3/16. Considering visits to other facilities <u>Technology and Learning Commons SC</u>– Members were asked for top 10 attributes. These appear in their meeting notes. General goals for the LC: the space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • serves the mission of district • contains a variety of spaces with functionality and flexibility • curriculum connected, • strategically sited within the building, • natural light • aesthetics • acoustics • separate bathrooms • celebrate community • integrated storage spaces. <p>4. Tech SC will be on hiatus until asked for further development. Lyndon suggests that the Tech SC recommend specific technology with the help of a Tech Consultant, funded by the DOE. This consultant can work with either the BC, the Tech SC or both. Lyndon expects \$8,000-\$10,000 worth of technology consulting may be required before the referendum and about \$20,000 after referendum. A tech consultant can provide important insight into emerging technologies. Lyndon suggests visiting other schools to see the spectrum of technologies and philosophies used in LCs and general technology programs. Lyndon will provide a list of possible consultants to</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>Brad for BC review and a sample RFP. Consultant should have experience working with high school facilities.</p> <p>5. District will check their requirements for contracting/advertising this position. Goal is to provide objectivity and full choice of products and technologies independent of a single brand or manufacturer. State generally contributes 3% of building cost for technology and 6% of building cost for furniture. Infrastructure/backbone is included in the building cost. Other schools have generally been able to work within the 3% limit. Cost of technology is generally dropping every year.</p> <p>6. <u>Sustainability and Building Systems SC</u> – Met on 2/9 and 2/22. Sustainability and Building Systems have been meeting together. The SC intends to have input early in the design process and is working on refinements to the OPR. Working to identify specific items or systems that may be above and beyond State funding.</p> <p>7. PDT is helping form basic goals and “stretch goals” for building performance. Looking for “guiding criteria” that still leaves room for design flexibility. Looking at water use reduction goals. Intent is to push the envelope to get a 50-100 year building. Group has shied away from a specific recommendation for geothermal systems but has identified a low temperature distribution system as a desired component with the goal of making building adaptable for unforeseen future technologies.</p> <p>8. Lyndon raised the option of power purchase agreements for solar PV. Mike is working to get Revision Energy to attend a future meeting to discuss this. Sub Com will probably recommend use of PV, extent to be determined, but will make sure roof structure and layout is ready to support PVs in future.</p> <p>Are there grants? Yes, but competition is fierce. Will State tie support of PV to educational or just efficiency? Generally, additional funds from the State for PV as an educational tool have only been made to tech centers. Jane suggests exploring private funding sources of energy improvements.</p> <p>9. <u>Student Advisory SC</u> – no report.</p> <p>10. <u>Fundraising</u> – Policy discussion and development are ongoing. Committee has reviewed policies from numerous schools and has come up with a draft to present to the School Board. Generally, selling naming rights will be considered only for areas regularly visited by the public. SB needs the ability to rename or revoke rights. Want to set the price tag appropriately for large sponsorships. A variety of levels of sponsorship should be provided, including opportunities for individuals or families of limited</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>financial resources like bricks, benches or stones. All sponsorships must be well integrated with the mission and design of the school. Establishing a clear, transparent process is important.</p> <p>11. A Capital Campaign is a separate undertaking from development of sponsorship policy. The group discussed the merit of hiring professional fundraisers. Some members felt that professional fundraisers would be very helpful, others objected to spending donations on professional fees. Fundraising should not be perceived as “double dipping” -- increasing tax bills as well as soliciting donations. Only people specifically and clearly authorized by the District should be allowed to raise funds. Public schools typically tap local civic leaders to orchestrate fundraising efforts, not professional fundraisers. Lyndon suggested minimum of 9-12 months are typically required. DOE has warned that a November referendum is becoming more unlikely.</p> <p>John Hodge wants to make sure that we’ve doing everything we can, independent of State to hit the November referendum date. DOE will want to know specific details and see substantial documentation of pledged support and will want language in the referendum that states expected donations and operating costs.</p> <p>Big donors typically take a long time to decide. Freeport is raising money for athletic field and has tapped two local, retired business men to lead their efforts. They plan to take 8 months. DOE won’t allow you to change the nature of the construction while underway.</p>	
Performing Arts Space	<p>12. Donna noted that there has been much informal discussion with MTA HS drama/theater faculty about incorporating a theater component in the new school. The goal would be cooperative with Orion, not competitive. For this to move forward, written documentation stating what space is needed for theater and how it would be differentiated from Orion is required. The group questioned why this topic was not raised much earlier in the process in teacher meetings and educational visioning. LDK noted that the project already includes a performance forum with seating for 250. He will share examples of forums incorporated in other Maine high schools. The goal is to provide spaces in a variety of scales from small performances to larger performances.</p> <p>13. Construction of new performance spaces may require rental agreements with the Orion Center to be revisited. Orion policies are set by an independent group, although it is overseen and owned by the District.</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	Opportunities for performance in the new MTA HS may spur new groups and activities to participate in the District.	
Next BC Meeting	14. April 6, 2016, MTA HS Learning Commons, 5:30 – 7:30 PM	