

**BETHEL PARK HIGH SCHOOL
BOARD MEETING
Wednesday, July 30, 2008**

Meeting Minutes

Attending:

Board Members: David Amaditz, Donna Cook, Susan Gout, Ron Sustich.
District Staff: Dr. Tom Knight, Nancy Aloï Rose, Leonard Corazzi, Dr. Zeb Jansante.
Architects: Dick Fox, Charles Yazembiak, Kevin Hayes.

1. The purpose of the meeting was for the Board to review modifications for Scheme P from the last meeting, and to review the resulting PlanCon A and B submission based on the most current plans. The expected outcome of the meeting was to finalize the PlanCon A and B submission in preparation for authorization Thursday, July 31 by the Board to submit these to the PA Department of Education.
2. Dick Fox opened the meeting by reviewing the PlanCon A and B submission with those in attendance. The primary areas reviewed were:
 - A. Project Description that included background and contextual information.
 - B. Project Accounting based on the cost estimates provided by Massaro, the const. mgr.
 - C. Building Capacity for the district and justification of the need for the proposed HS.
 - D. Special Education needs were documented.
 - E. The Rated Student Capacity (RPC) for the proposed HS is 2,454. This will become the basis for the reimbursement by the state as the project moves forward.
 - F. The Architect will create an addendum to the District Feasibility Study to complement the work done by L. Robert Kimball, and include this with the PlanCon A and B submission.
3. The schedule for the design development and construction document phase of the proposed high school project was discussed. The Architect will have a more detailed schedule to review at the next Facilities Committee meeting. However, the initial intent is to have the Act 34 public hearing for the project in mid-to-late October. There is a 20-day advertisement period prior to the meeting, and a 30-day comment period after the meeting before the Board could act to submit PlanCon Parts D and E. Receiving the Design Development (DD) estimate from Massaro Corp. will be necessary before the public hearing can be set. The Architect may ask the Board for authorization to proceed with the Construction Document (CD) phase of work while the public information process proceeds. This is because of the desire to still be ready to bid the project in March. This target date is aggressive, and will require overtime work by the Architect and timely decision-making by the Board to achieve. The Architect and CM both noted that if the project is bid after April 1st, the current budget for the project will be exceeded.

4. Modifications to the drawings of the Site Plan and Floor Plans for Scheme P, based on comments from the Board from the last meeting, were reviewed. The key issues were:
 - A. Purkey Field remains in its current location. It will not be moved.
 - B. Student Parking will now be east of the high school across Blackhawk Drive.
 - C. A direct entrance was added into the Phys. Educ. wing at Level 4 east of the wing and adjacent to the visitor parking lot. This will be separate from the main entrance.
 - D. The Classroom wing was rotated to move it further away from Church Road. Also, a section of the Classroom wing was taken and turned ninety-degrees to partially enclose the courtyard.
 - E. The swimming pool is now located on Level 2 instead of Level 3.
 - F. A rifle range is now shown on Level 2.
5. The type and size of lockers, and even eliminating the lockers, was discussed. Currently the corridors are sized for lockers, which will allow the District flexibility in the decision now and in the future. Lockers will be planned moving forward. This decision should be resolved by the end of the Design Development phase.
6. Donna Cook asked if a future balcony was still possible at the Auditorium. The Architect responded, "No, not in the current design." Other Board members commented that it would be better to have additional performance(s) than to increase the cost for that future possibility. The Architect mentioned that the current design emphasized quality of space over quantity of seats. This issue will be revisited when the Architect has building sections to show the Board.
7. The Architect and administrators noted that the number of science labs still needs to be confirmed. Any reduction in labs would need to be approved by the Board after it was reviewed by the Curriculum Committee.
8. It was decided that the Student Activities room could be moved to a classroom between the Cafeteria and the Classroom wing. This will allow the weight room and fitness center sizes to be increased.
9. Donna Cook suggested that toilet rooms be provided adjacent to the Auxiliary Gym so that if this area is used by itself, it could be isolated from the rest of the school. It was agreed that this was a good idea and will be worked into the Scheme P design.
10. After a review of design options for the "rotunda" transitional section of the Classroom wing that included a square, diamond, and octagonal options, it was agreed to move forward with the current circular design. The Architect noted that the square and diamond shapes would not save any costs because their square footage would need to be increased to facilitate circulation within their cores.

11. Susan Gout requested that the School District develop various methods to communicate the current design for the high school to the community, and to invite community involvement in the review and development of the design. Ideas discussed included:

A. Digitally-Based

1. The Architect will develop a “movie-image” of the three-dimensional computer model of the proposed HS design. This will include sequenced images of the building from different angles to simulate walking or flying around the building. These images will be put on an electronic “loop” to allow the continual re-playing of the images.
2. A link will be placed on the District’s web-site to the “image loop” file so that the public can access and view it through the web-site.
3. The “image loop” will be loaded onto a lap-top computer so that it can be viewed wherever desired.
4. A link will be placed on the District’s web-site to Frequently Asked Questions about the HS project. The list of these questions was developed by the Board and staff. Answers to these will be developed by the staff, Architect, and Construction Manager.

B. Copy-based

1. The District’s public-relations staff will work with the District Admin. Staff to develop a tri-fold brochure explaining the proposed HS design. This brochure can include the key features of the proposed HS, and if space allows, images of the 3-D model or plans, along with answers to some of the frequently-asked questions about the project.
2. The Board will review if the brochure would be sent to all households of BP.
3. The Board will review if businesses in the area could display the brochure, or even include the brochure with each purchase made in primary retail stores.
4. The Board will review if a press-release will be developed for the local newspapers, including the Almanac, and south editions of the larger papers.

C. Community Day Participation

1. Susan Gout suggested that the District have a booth at the Community Day Festivities on September 13. The booth would be for information purposes only, and minimally staffed by representatives of the District, but not Board members. The “image-loop” could be displayed on a monitor, and brochures could be there for the taking. A copy of the Board Information Binder could also be available for community members to review.

10. **The next meeting of the Facilities Committee will be August 13 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.