



Meeting Notes

Project: MSAD 75 High School

Date: May 18, 2016

Attendees: Lyndon Keck/PDT, Alan Kuniholm/PDT, Brad Smith, Superintendent/MSAD #75, Donna Brunette, Principal/Mt. Ararat HS, David Johnson, Sr./BC-AC, Linda Hall/Chair, MSAD #75 Board, 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, Kim Totten, BC/MSAD #75 Board, Michael Chonko/Building Committee, David Johnson Jr., /District Employee

Purpose: Building Committee 18

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
	1. David Johnson, Sr., the vice chair of the Building Committee, ran the meeting	
Meeting Minutes 5/04/2016	2. Meeting notes to the May 4, 2016 meeting were approved unanimously with the exception of one abstention by Kim who was not present at the May 4 th Building Committee meeting.	
Sub Committee Reports	<p>3. David Johnson, Sr. asked for reports from the various subcommittees.</p> <p><u>Technology SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing to report. <p><u>Athletics SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report was made by David Johnson, Jr. He stated they had recently had a small group meeting and were trying to set their priority for items both outside and inside of the school which could include possible cost estimates for item which would not be approved by the Department of Education. <p><u>Communications SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee had posted communications requesting community members in all four towns' review the first generation of building test fits and make comments on the web page or directly to the Communications Subcommittee. The Communications Subcommittee also talked about posting information about fundraising and explained three people had expressed interest in participating in the fundraising effort. They stated they understood they had as much as three years to complete fundraising for a turf 	



Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>field that would require another referendum question for the voters. The three names of people interested in helping with fundraising will go to the full RSU Board for appointment.</p> <p><u>Student Advisory SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No meeting yet but one is planned for the near future. <p><u>Sustainability & Building Systems SC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Subcommittee met on May 9, 2016 and continued their discussion of photovoltaic. Mike Chonko noted the Subcommittee had concluded that based on the amount of square footage available on the rooftop the maximum amount they could expect for photovoltaic contribution to the electrical system would be 20%-30%. If the District were going to attempt net zero it would require ground mounted PV's or adjacent building PV's. The Subcommittee will be recommending to the full Board and Building Committee that the School Department consider entering into a PPA agreement to purchase power from a third party who would own the photovoltaics for the first 7-10 years. The Sustainability Committee has established energy goals. It is going to ask PDT and its' engineers to try to achieve an EUI of 32 which the Committee believes is reasonable and attainable. The Committee talked again about having construction oversight because they did not want to see problems similar to recently completed buildings repeated. They have asked PDT to submit the PDT process for quality control and quality assurance so the Subcommittee would have an understanding of what the typical process looks like with DOE and PDT Architects. The Subcommittee acknowledged the big unknown would be the quality of the contractor who would become the new team member. The Subcommittee would have a concern about what the QA and QC process would be for the contractor. PDT had asked the Sustainability & Building Systems Subcommittees to do some homework to define a 100 year building and what implications it would have for cost and constructability. 	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>4. Review of Concept Plans for the high school.</p> <p>4.1 The Building Committee began a review of earlier concept plans for the high school.</p> <p>4.2 PDT had passed out a matrix with thirty items listed as issues to be discussed as part of the review of the five floor plan concepts.</p>	
Further Discussion	<p>4.3 PDT's matrix of issues had allowed for discussion of all five sites: Site 5, Site 5.2, Site 7, Site 8 and Site 9.</p>	
	<p>4.4 The first item discussed was parking for staff, short term visitors and athletic events. The comment was made that the site plan needs to be redrawn to be more accurate to show the actual layout for the new school bus parking lot. This will change layouts and the way the school will be perceived as visitors approach the school along Eagle's Way.</p>	
	<p>4.5 Site scheme 7 and 9 presented the largest parking lots similar to layouts for big box stores.</p>	
	<p>4.6 It was mentioned that it is best for supervision of students to have all student parking in one place. In the future there will hopefully be video cameras showing the student parking lot.</p>	
	<p>4.7 After much general discussion it was agreed that the best site schemes for parking seemed to be 5.2, 8 and possibly 9.</p>	
	<p>4.8 There was a general conclusion to try to get more parking closer to the competition field and that a series of smaller parking lots should be investigated to try to break down the large, big box feel of the parking areas for staff and visitors.</p>	
	<p>4.9 It was agreed visitor parking should be located close to the front entrance.</p>	
	<p>4.10 The Building Committee discussed school bus patterns, including drop off and end of day pickup. There will be little congestion with morning drop off.</p>	
	<p>4.11 PDT to contact the Transportation Director to get his input.</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>4.12 Questions were asked about how many buses could be accommodated on any of the loops. None of the schemes allowed for all of the buses to be queued up off of Eagles Way.</p>	
	<p>4.13 Chris Shaw explained there were basically three approaches to buses as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring buses onto the site in individual waves of 8-10 buses. • Do double stacking in a dedicated bus lane. • Have buses strung out along Eagle’s Way resulting in long distances from the front door to the buses. 	
	<p>4.14 Chris Shaw explained that the buses are double stacked in the dedicated bus lane at the middle school and the pattern seems to work well.</p>	
	<p>4.15 It was acknowledged that site schemes 8 and 5.2 could easily be made into two lane, dedicated bus loops that could probably accommodate all of the buses.</p>	
	<p>4.16 It was agreed that however the bus loop is organized, the buses really want to turn east and then head north on Eagle’s Way to allow them to get out onto Route 201 via Canam Drive. This would allow cars to leave via Eagle’s Way or cars could also head north and exit via Canam Drive.</p>	
	<p>4.17 Best location for a loading dock was discussed. Site scheme 5.2 does a nice job of getting service away from the front door and public face of the building but it ends up being in the center of the “U” shaped classroom wings resulting in a potentially ugly, noisy, smelly and undesirable feature in what otherwise might be a natural and friendly green space courtyard.</p>	
	<p>4.18 It was agreed that service along Eagle’s Way, such as site scheme 9 and 7, was undesirable. It was also noted that service as placed in site scheme 5 was undesirable because it took up the best prime real estate overlooking the pond.</p>	
	<p>4.19 It was noted that site scheme 8 had two service access points, one for the kitchen and one for deliveries and athletics.</p>	
	<p>4.20 It was agreed that service should be hidden as much as possible. It should work closely with the dining commons.</p>	
	<p>4.21 Classroom Views: There was general discussion that people preferred classrooms which oriented north and south to take advantage of natural daylighting but the classrooms should also have</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	a strong presence possibly looking toward the pond, towards tree lines and the Mt. Ararat hillside.	
4.22	Site scheme 5 was noted as being the least desirable where the classrooms predominately look out on the bus garage, bus parking and the back of Route 201 retail buildings.	
4.23	There was general discussion about the arrival view of the high school from Eagle's Way.	
4.24	PDT suggested the existing overflow parking for bus drivers could be removed so the right hand side or south side of Eagle's Way could be landscaped to create a cleaner, more welcoming entrance off 201.	
4.25	Some committee members were concerned that the District would not want to lose the gravel parking lot on the south side of Eagle's Way because it's additional overflow parking for school events, athletic events and becomes a place to park visitor buses and cars for commuters.	
4.26	Some committee members complained about the problem of the gravel parking becoming a prominent location for smokers because it is technically off school grounds.	
4.27	The gravel parking lot is presently owned by CMP. There were questions about what legal rights had been granted the School District to use the CMP land. The School District can have their surveyors review deeded easements that may be have been granted to Bubba's, MSAD #75 or other third party individuals.	
4.28	There was general discussion about the best location for the dining commons. It was noted the dining commons inevitably has the kitchen joined at its hip which also brings along major service and a trash loading dock area.	
4.29	After much discussion there was general consensus the dining commons seemed to offer more opportunity when it was located adjacent to the gym and the front door so it could be used before school, after school, and for after school events similar to the dining commons/food court at Cony High School.	
4.30	There was discussion about the Learning Commons and best location. There were favorable comments for site schemes 5.2 and 7 where the Learning Commons had a prominent location and view directly out onto the pond.	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>4.31 At this point the discussion moved onto the issue of classroom wings, clusters, or houses. It was noted there were basically three different ways of organizing the classrooms shown on these five schemes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A “U” shaped linear chain as shown on scheme 5.2. • Two academic house wings as shown on schemes 5, 7 and 8. • A large, combined academic block as shown on scheme 9. 	
	<p>4.32 There seemed to be general consensus that scheme 9 would offer the most short term flexibility and long term adaptability for rearranging clusters or academies or other arrangements in the long term future.</p>	
	<p>4.33 There was discussion about where Science would be located. Some schemes have science centrally located between the classroom clusters.</p>	
	<p>4.34 There was discussion about whether half the Science classrooms could be located on the first floor and half on the second floor.</p>	
	<p>4.35 There was a note that it would be nice to have the classrooms have easy accessibility to the pond for outdoor ecology, botany and biology classes.</p>	
	<p>4.36 There were questions about locations of teacher areas. It was noted teachers would not want to be located in one large workroom. It was agreed there should be equal number of teacher areas on the first floor as well as the second floor.</p>	
	<p>4.37 There was continuous discussion throughout about the different locations for the Forum. It was acknowledge that the Forum would be used extensively during the school day for combined classes, presentations, as well as theatre and musical rehearsals. It was also acknowledge that the Forum could be used after school for small scale performances and for School Board meetings, faculty meetings, student senate meetings and student clubs.</p>	
	<p>4.38 Location for art rooms and music rooms was discussed. In general people preferred to have the art rooms located to have good natural light with access to the ground level, as well as easy access and views to the pond or other natural features.</p>	
	<p>4.39 It was noted that if music was located near the gym, dining commons and Forum that music could use those spaces for after school uses, as well as the main lobbies and easy access for parking and loading and unloading of instruments.</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>4.40 Committee members made suggestions that scheme 9 could be rotated 90 degrees to allow the classroom block to overlook the pond. In this scenario the gym and dining commons would swing around to the south at which point the plan would be flipped so the gym would be facing the west or towards the bus garage.</p>	
	<p>4.41 Several members liked the setup of scheme 7 where there were two main streets, one heading north/south and one heading east/west. This plan had many advantages except the greatest disadvantage being service was along Eagle's Way.</p>	
	<p>4.42 There were additional comments to try to have the dining commons oriented so it could point towards the pond and have outdoor dining space similar to scheme 7.</p>	
	<p>4.43 PDT acknowledged they would work with the comments given during the evening and would start with the suggestions of making rotational plan changes based on scheme 9. PDT also acknowledged there were other concept ideas they did not fully develop that might be brought back up for further refinement and presentation to the Building Committee.</p>	
<p>Next BC Meeting</p>	<p>5. Upcoming Building Committee Meetings. Next Building Committee will be on June 1, 2016, MTA HS Learning Commons, 5:30 – 7:30 PM</p>	