

**BETHEL PARK HIGH SCHOOL
BOARD / FACILITIES COMMITTEE MEETING
Thursday, August 28, 2008**

Meeting Minutes

Attending:

- Board Members: David Amaditz, Dan Duff, Donna Cook, Susan Gout, Dick Rose, Connie Ruhl, Russ Spicuzza, Ron Sustich.
- District Staff: Dr. Tom Knight, Nancy Alois Rose, Matt Howard, Leonard Corazzi, Dr. Zeb Jansante, Vicki Flotta.
- Architects: Dick Fox, Charles Yazembiak, Kevin Hayes.
- Construction Mgr.: Chris Lasky

1. The purpose of the meeting was for the Board to review the overall project schedule, receive an update on the Planning/Zoning Approvals, hear information on the IMS/High drive design, receive information on miscellaneous concerns the Board has expressed about site issues, and have a presentation of the exterior design development.
2. Dick Fox opened the meeting by reviewing the overall project schedule:
 - A. The Design Development phase will be completed by November, 2008.
 - B. PlanCon Parts D and E require a public hearing (Act 34) prior to submission. This is scheduled for early December, 2008.
 - C. The Act 34 hearing process involves require public notices before and after the meeting. As such, PlanCon D and E are not scheduled for submission to the state until January, 2009.
 - D. To maintain a bid date of March or early April, 2009, it will be necessary for the Board to authorize proceeding with construction documents while the legal review process for Act 34 continues and concludes. This is recommended because any delays would incur an increase in project costs of approx. \$800,000 per month. After four months, or about July of 2009, it would probably be required to wait and bid the project in early 2010.
3. Kevin Hayes provided a brief synopsis of the various planning and zoning issues affecting the project:
 - A. The appeal of the variance denial has conference with Judge James in September.
 - B. The non-conforming use registration was submitted to Bethel Park and is being reviewed by the zoning officer. It is hoped that feedback or confirmation on the registration will be received in early September.

4. A review of the proposed internal drive circulation for IMS and the proposed high school was reviewed. It was noted that the original design had an internal loop road that went around the stadium and continued along the east property line up to IMS, as well as a connector road between IMS and the proposed ballfields. The loop road around the stadium and the connector road were removed from the scope to reduce project costs. However, the loop road to the east connecting the IMS parking lot with the high school Stadium lot was kept to allow a change in the bus drop-off and pick-up. The change would allow all kids at IMS and the HS to unload/load in front of their respective school.
5. Two other options were discussed, both of which would allow the deletion of the connector road to the east along the property. This would save about \$375,000. These were:
 1. Drop-off and pick-up at respective schools, but using public roads to go between schools. This could take up to 30 minutes longer to the District's afternoon drop-off times.
 2. Drop-off and pick-up at one central location, probably the large parking lot between the proposed ballfields and high school.
6. There was much discussion among Board members about whether the connector loop road was a good idea. Some said that the proposed drop-off and pick-up at the respective schools was not identified as a priority in the goals matrix for the project. Others disagreed, saying that it improved the safety of the campus and students. Another point was that the connector loop would be a private drive and therefore have to be maintained by the District. The administrators recommended having the connector drive to facilitate drop-off and pick-up at the respective schools because of the better safety, security, and supervision that this approach offered.
7. A majority of the Board, 6-2, preferred to have the connector loop road included in the scope of work for the project, and have a deduct alternate in the bidding documents for removing it from the scope that is built.
8. The Architects provided information on several miscellaneous concerns the Board had expressed about site conditions on the campus:
 - A. The Architect and their civil engineer evaluated the retaining wall at IMS. Both concluded independently of each other that there was no eminent structural problems with the wall. The steel "H" columns/piles tied back into the road with anchors were still plumb and true. Some surface rust was present, but this could be handled as a maintenance project. The treated timbers between the piles were in good condition, except for a few at the top. The Architects will review the Feasibility Study by L. Robert Kimball which apparently recommended the wall's replacement, and get a recommendation/response back to the Board.

- B. The gas company's transmission line running through the campus property is a 6" or 8" diameter line, medium pressure, and not 20"-24" line as once rumored. Also, the easement agreement that the District has with the gas company (Columbia) contains provisions that the gas company has to pay for the relocation of this pipe if required to facilitate any construction by the District.
 - C. There is a building gas line serving the current buildings that will have to be relocated at the District's expense
9. The Architects reviewed the design development of the exterior "look" of the building. The current design featured curved roof lines over the Auditorium, Gymnasium, and Pool areas. The building has mostly brick facades that vary in color. This along with varying roof lines, varying building forms (such as the rotunda area), and vertical areas of glass at the stair towers and main entrances serve to break up the apparent massing of the building.
10. There was a public comment that the brick should be all of one color. The Architects changed the three-dimensional computer model projected at the meeting to show this effect. The Architect's suggested that having one color would make the larger HS building look even larger and monolithic.
11. Several administrators and Board members expressed concern that the "look" of the exterior did not evoke enough of a "traditional feel." They would like to see more rounded, Doric columns and triangular pediment similar to that seen at S. Fayette HS when that building was toured. Some other administrators and Board members were not sure such a look would fit with the curved roofs and "look" of the rest of the buildings. The Architects noted that perhaps a semi-circular or segmented-arch pediment might work. The Architects will study the entrance and try to come up with some design options to review with the Board, along with perhaps some more photos of precedents for the Board to consider.
12. **The next meeting of the Facilities Committee will be September 10 at 7:00 PM in the District Administration Building.**

The foregoing constitutes the Architects' understanding of the major points of the meeting. Any corrections, changes or modifications requested can be directed to the Superintendent's office, and copied to the Architects.

End of Document