

FACILITIES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Date & Time: July 17, 2008
7:00PM

Title of Project: Bethel Park New High School
Meeting Location: BPSD Administration Building
Bethel Park, PA

Meeting with the Architect to review the High School Project.

ITEMS OF DISCUSSION:

1.0 Site Selection / Proposed Location of the Building and Design Scheme

The current Schematic Design Scheme P and Alternate Design Scheme Q were reviewed. Design Scheme P

This scheme locates the building at the curve in Black Hawk Drive. The footprint of the building is condensed and floor levels stacked, thus the building is integrated into the hillside. The School Board elected to proceed with Design Scheme P and building location.

- Design Scheme Q

This scheme stretched the footprint of the building across the site. Attempting to move some of the mass of the building to the North. The increased footprint of the building on the site added costs to the construction estimate due to the deep foundation systems.

1.1 Purkey Field

Several concerns were raised regarding the removal of the existing Purkey Field. The design team noted that Purkey Field will remain and other locations for parking on the site will be reviewed.

1.2 Parking Locations and Proximity to Building

It was noted that parking adjacent to the Auditorium with ADA accessibility is preferred. The design team presented a revised site plan sketch locating parking along the east side of Black Hawk Drive adjacent to the Auditorium. This also provides parking more centrally located within the Athletic Complex.

1.3 Secondary Entrance to Physical Education

To allow for two major events (Auditorium and Gymnasium) to occur simultaneously, it was noted that a secondary entrance to the Gym would be preferred. The design noted that this recommendation and will review the design of a secondary entrance to the Phys. Ed. area on the east side of the building between the Gym and Auxiliary Gym adjacent to the parking area.

1.4 Rotunda Design

The circular design of the Rotunda at the north end of the Academic Wing was questioned for space layout efficiency as well as construction related costs. The design will look at other design options for the Rotunda such as a square, diamond, and octagon shape.

1.5 Academic Wing Relationship to Church Road

The impact of the Academic Wing along Church Road was reviewed. At the north end, the Rotunda is approximately 88 feet from Church Road and at the south end the building is 153 feet from Church Road. The design team noted that they would look at pulling the Academic Wing further away from Church Road. This will also tighten up the courtyard to make it more secure.

**BETHEL PARK HIGH SCHOOL
BOARD MEETING
Thursday, July 17, 2008**

Meeting Minutes

Attending:

Board Members: David Amaditz; Donna Cook, Dan Duff, Susan Gout, Dick Rose, Chuck Scheuble, Russ Spicuzza, Ron Sustich.

District Staff: Dr. Tom Knight, Nancy Alois Rose, Matt Howard, Dr. Zeb Jansante.

Architects: Dick Fox, Charles Yazembiak, Mark Duane.

1. The purpose of the meeting was for the Board to become interactive with the design process and to gain an understanding of how the design has developed and evolved into its most current design scheme. Drawings were issued for the Board Members to put into their Board Project Information Binders. Two design options were presented by the Architect. The expected outcome of the meeting was to outline the pros and cons of each design scheme and determine the concept of the building plan and the general location of the building on the site for which the Architect can continue with design development.

2. Dick Fox opened the meeting by reviewing the most current design scheme (Scheme P) and explained the evolution and methodology for which design choices were considered and then made. The concept of this design is that the building consisted of three major parts (Educational Classrooms, Physical Education and Fine Arts) and all parts would relate to one "Common Area" that would also serve as the main entrance to the building. This provided for maximum control of circulation, security and the ability to zone each wing independently, but there were concerns with sound issues and overlapping Phys Ed and Fine Arts traffic in the one "Common Space". The Classroom wing was stacked in four levels and expanded in a direction that utilized the existing site grades to provide for natural light into the spaces. This wing incorporated a "Rotunda" shape. This layout also created an exterior courtyard that could be utilized for outdoor activities.

3. Then Mr. Fox reviewed another design option (Scheme Q). This option was based on a similar layout that was discussed as one of three design options in February, 2008. That layout was then developed to the same level of detail as Scheme P to create Scheme Q. The concept of this design is for the three major parts of the building to be arranged in a linear fashion with the Classroom Wing in the middle and the Phys Ed and Fine Arts wings on each side. This allows two separate entrances to the Phys Ed and the Fine Arts wings. This provides maximum separation of sound and traffic. However, the only connection between these two wings is through the Classroom wing, thus limiting the ability to zone the building. The Classroom wing, due to its location on the site, has been reduced to two levels with an interior courtyard. This accounted for a larger footprint and thus more

foundation costs. The courtyard was noted to be unusable because of its limited size.

4. A review of the most recent Site Plan noted that Purkey Field would remain in its existing location, and parking was added closer to the Auditorium. The site work was reduced from the previous scope of work in that improvements on roadways and walks were reduced. The Architect suggested that many of the site amenities could be bid as alternates.

5. Ms. Gout noted that the School Board could have done a better job communicating with the residents of Bethel Park about the proposed high school project. Because the residents have not been well informed, many rumors have started about poor design decisions and potential problems. Mr. Scheuble suggested that the Architect prepare a publication addressing each of these issues such as building on fill material, mine subsidence, flood zone issues, and building Title IX athletic fields.

6. Dr. Knight noted that the project is no longer on the original project schedule. Mr. Fox noted that the project is about 4 months behind the original schedule. It was stated that the ideal time to bid a school project is January/February, but this opportunity is no longer achievable. Dr. Knight requested that the Architect prepare PlanCon parts A and B and recommends that the Board approve the submittal of these forms to the state at the July 31, 2008 School Board Meeting. Ms. Gout requested that the Board stay involved, and make timely decisions to move the project forward and not cause any further delays. Ms. Gout noted that she would develop a schedule for routine (biweekly) Board Workshop Meetings, so that the School Board members could stay involved during the design process. It was requested that the Architect prepare a summary of these meetings and issue them to all the School Board members, so that those who could not attend are still informed.

7. The School Board asked the Administrative Staff to make their recommendation for the preferred Design Scheme. Dr. Knight prefers Design Scheme P and noted that the Administrative Staff has been involved with the evolution of this Design on a weekly basis. Dr. Jansante noted that his main concern is with security and student control. Therefore, he also prefers Design Scheme P because of the building's ability to be zoned into separate parts and its more compact vertical layout of the Classroom wing. Also, the integration of some useable exterior space is desired.

8. Ms. Gout requested that each member of the School Board give their opinion of which design concept is preferred.

Russ Spicuzza – Likes Design P, likes Rotunda shape.

Ron Sustich – Likes Design P, likes Rotunda shape, wants separate Phys Ed entrance.

Dick Rose - Likes Design P, but not sure about shape of Rotunda.

Donna Cook – likes Design P, wants to look at optional shapes for Rotunda.

Chuck Scheuble – likes Design P.

Dan Duff – likes Design Q, likes separate entries and thinks massing would be less obtrusive to neighbors.

David Amaditz – likes Design P, interested in closed courtyard for more security.
Susan Gout – likes Design P – does not like Rotunda shape.

9. Ms. Gout noted that a majority of the School Board prefers Design Scheme P and the related site location and that the Architect should proceed with this design taking into consideration the many comments and requests that the Board has made. PlanCon A and B will be based on Design Scheme P.

10. Dick Fox stated that it would cost 2 million dollars more to build Plan Q because it would require additional support structures, and that WMF would have to do additional core drilling to determine what the soil requirements would be.

11. While there was general consensus of the revised location proposed by Design P, several Board members indicated a desire to have an in-depth discussion about the extensive amount of new road construction (and the associated cost) proposed with this design. It was agreed that the discussion about the new roads was not part of the PlanCon A or B and the discussion about the new roads would be held until a future meeting.

12. There was a question about the functionality of the court yard as it relates to security. If students would be allowed to access the court during the school day then would this reduce the effectiveness of a single building security concept with one "front door." Dick Fox stated that they would possibly look at a locked gate at the open end of the court, and a member of the community in attendance pointed out that a locked gate might not work due to fire code regulations.

13. The next meeting of the Facilities Committee will be July 30 at 7:00 PM in the District Administration Building.

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