

**BETHEL PARK HIGH SCHOOL
BOARD MEETING
Wednesday, July 2, 2008**

Meeting Minutes

Attending: **Board Members:** David Amaditz; Donna Cook; Dan Duff; Dick Rose; Connie Ruhl; Chuck Scheuble; Russ Spicuzza; Ron Sustich.
District Staff: Dr. Tom Knight; Nancy Alois Rose; Matt Howard; Leonard Corazzi; Dr. Zeb Jansante.
Architects: Dick Fox; Kevin Hayes; Mark Duane; Charles Yazembiak.
Const. Mgr: Dan Kiefer

1. The purpose of the meeting was to review the present further information on the development of the proposed Schematic Design, receive feedback from the Board, and set the stage to bring PlanCon A and B to the Board for authorization to submit to the PA Department of Education.
2. Dick Fox explained that with authorization to submit PlanCon A and B would not cost the Board anything unless major changes were made after that. Then the District's cost would be based on the time it would take to make the changes. The District would still be allowed to make changes in the project between PlanCon A and B, and PlanCon E and beyond, without penalty from the State Dept. of Education.
3. A review of the programming for the proposed project was reviewed next. A chart was distributed that had the existing programming square footages, the original Board-approved programming square footages for the proposed new high school, and the current Schematic Design programming square footages. Dick Fox explained that the current program did NOT include everything everyone wanted; instead, it includes everything everyone needs to meet the goals outlined by the Board. Dick Fox went on to explain that the original programming requirements were based on discussion with the Board and administration. Schematic Design included further input from staff through interviews. Increases in square footage was included in the program where it was thought the space was needed for the intended use of the space.
The net comparison of scheduled space has the existing SF at 183,000, the Board approved SF at 193,000, and the current Schematic Design SF at 206,000. The additional 14,000 SF was the result of a closer look at specific spaces along with teacher input.
4. Dick Fox reviewed the current Schematic Design Floor Plans with the Board. The major changes made to the plans since the last meeting with the Board were as follows:
 - A. The Ninth Grade Academy classroom area has been deleted. Those rooms will now be General Classrooms that will allow flexibility in planning.

B. The concept of no permanent teacher classrooms was modified. Now certain teachers will have blocked scheduling for continuous use of a room for three to five periods. This will be decided based on seniority and ability to schedule to meet the students needs. This change in philosophy allowed a reduction in the size of the planning centers.

C. An ensemble room was added in the Fine Arts wing.

D. The “Black Box” was combined with the Large Group Instruction room.

E. Life Skills and Autistic Support rooms were moved to Level 4 to be next to the main Lobby and closer to the administration and health suites.

F. The Auxiliary Gym was redesigned to allow two competitive venues within the new high school (Main Gym and Aux. Gym.)

G. The Batting Cages will be in gym space. The Rifle Range will be within foundational space not yet identified on the plan.

H. In general, the plans were “tightened” up everywhere possible to reduce total SF.

5. The Board members present had a variety of questions and comments on the revised Floor Plans. The key ones are summarized below:

A. Dan Duff asked if there were any advantages to the pie-shaped classrooms? Dick Fox responded that they save space and they work well for science labs and the LGI room.

B. Ron Sustich asked if there were enough elevators for the building? Kevin Hayes responded that there is one in the Classroom Wing near the Lobby, and one in the Phys. Educ. wing. Plus one service elevator. This requirement will be looked at more in the Design Development phase.

6. Dick Fox reviewed the current Schematic Design Site Plan with the Board. The major changes made to the Site Plan since the last meeting with the Board are as follows:

A. Two segments of the loop road were deleted, but there is still internal circulation of the buses. The buses would stack around the staff parking adjacent to the stadium parking.

B. The distance from the bus drop-off to the school has been reduced. The bus loop is now at the front of the school. Student parking is moved to be adjacent to Church Road.

C. As the building got smaller in footprint, the distance off of Church Road increased from a minimum of 50’ to a min. of 90’.

D. The women's softball field was made larger.

7. Dick Fox reviewed design investigations for two alternate site locations for the building. One was to move the building north on to the existing practice field. The other was to move the building east onto the existing stadium parking. Both locations would involve building on top of fill, similar to the current proposed site. So there would be no savings relative to deep foundations on either of the two alternative sites. Also, on both alternative sites, zoning regulations would limit the height of the building. This would result in a larger footprint to the building, along with the likelihood of windowless rooms.

8. The Board members present had a variety of questions and comments on the revised Site Plan.

The key ones are summarized below:

A. Dan Duff noted that there was a significant retaining wall to the east of the IMS access road that is in dis-repair. The Architects noted that this will have to be reviewed.

B. Connie Ruhl said she remains concerned about the storm water run-off associated with the proposed high school. Dick Fox noted that the proposed plan, with its consolidated building footprint, should have a net reduction in storm water. Nonetheless, the point is noted and will be looked at in more detail once a design direction is chosen.

C. David Amaditz stated that many residents complain about the lack of toilet rooms for the athletic fields on the high school site. Dick Fox stated that a concession building is shown on the Site Plan. This is currently an Alternate and not a part of the Base Bid package. The estimated cost is about \$300,000.

D. Dan Duff said he remains concerned about noise levels and logistics if two events are taking place on the same evening. Dick Fox responded that the Main Gym will be surrounded by walls, so this should reduce any noise issues. And separate entrances could be utilized for the Gym and Auditoriums if needed.

9. Dick Fox and Charlie Yazembiak reviewed the three dimensional model showing Elevations of the current Schematic Design. The major changes made to the Site Plan since the last meeting with the Board are as follows:

A. The basic materials will be field brick and accent brick with areas of curtain wall to allow natural light into the building.

B. Volumetric forms that vary from wing to wing break up the apparent massing and help the building to appear smaller.

C. The height of the building benefits from its location because the zoning ordinance requirement is measured from the curb height at the main entrance.

10. Dan Kiefer of Massaro Corporation provided an overview of current probable costs. The current probable cost totals almost \$96 million dollars. This compares to the \$80.3 million

figure presented in February. There are six areas of change. The first three account for 97% of the \$15.7 million increase:

- A. Additional SF \$4.1 M
 - B. Average SF Const. Cost increase from \$204 to \$223 \$5.8 M
 - 1. \$9 of increase was due to deep foundation requirements
 - 2. \$10 of increase was due to a larger % of spaces with higher finish level quality
 - C. Contingency increase from 8% -12% \$5.2 M
 - D. Increase in scope and costs for drives, walks, and parking \$0.2 M
 - E. Increase in scope and costs for general landscaping \$0.1 M
 - F. Increase in bond financing costs \$0.3 M
- \$15.7 M

11. The increase in contingency is warranted due to the increase in material costs being experienced at this time, particularly with oil-based products.

12. Dan Kiefer noted that the level of detail in the current Schematic Design probable cost is much higher than usual. In fact, it approaches more of Design Development probable cost than a SD probable cost. The effort put forth by Massaro and the Architects was done because of the Design Team's awareness that the School Board and District faces important and critical decisions on the scope and cost of the project that moves forward.

13. Dr. Knight commented that the obvious question was, "How does the new probable cost for the proposed high school impact the District finances?" He asked Matt Howard to address this question. Matt noted that the key issue is how long will the money to finance the new high school project be borrowed? The financial models that Matt has run were based on a 20-year borrowing period. If this were maintained, the increase in annual debt service to cover the additional project costs would be approx. \$1.2 M. This translates to about 1 mill, and 0.7 mills of new debt beyond what was already planned. If the borrowing period were extended to 25 years, then the increase in annual debt would be only \$508 K. This translates to about 0.45 mills, and 0.15 mills of new debt beyond what was already planned. Matt felt that either amount was manageable within the Bethel Park community. He noted that no potential energy or staff savings were included in his calculations.

14. Dick Rose suggested that a Finance Meeting be held to review the cost impact to the District. Matt Howard responded that the Board could do this, but the numbers will not change.

15. David Amaditz requested that the Architects provide a summary of the major building system components and their expected life so that the Board could review the issue of financing for 20 or 25 years with this information in mind.

16. The next meeting of the Facilities Committee was set for July 17, 2008 at 8:00 PM in

the District Administration Building, to occur right after the meeting of the Finance Committee.

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.