

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MT. HEBRON HS on 10/17/07

Ken Roey introduced himself as committee chair

Gail Coffin (Office of Professional Dev.) will serve as facilitator

Attendees introduced themselves

Ken clarified that all meeting will be 2 hours in duration

Gail Coffin shared a starting list of ground rules:

- Participate fully
- Take responsibility for the outcome of this session
- Accept all ideas (advocate for your ideas, don't put down the ideas of others)

Other ground rules were generated and shared:

- Create a communication loop to ensure that all questions are answered
- All contributions should be considered equally
- Ideas should not be discarded unless consensus is achieved
- Keep an open mind
- Actively encourage participation
- Avoid Personal identification

Will have a parking lot for questions and/or issues

Minutes will be taken and shared

Question - are the Construction Manager civil engineer and architectural firm of record a done deal – yes

- will the project go out to bid – yes

Overview of the process:

- FY 09 budget includes money for this project (planning and construction money, the start of which is included in 09 budget)
- Feb. – board will approve the budget
- May – final capital budget approved by the county (County can decrease the budget but can not increase)
- The input from this committee will be used to create schematic design (this must be approved by the Board)
- Will then go out for bid for construction

Question – explanation as to why the architectural part of the process does not go out for bid (was added to parking lot)

Ken Roey reviewed the design objectives and the parameters of the project (document was sent out to all participants). He explained that a major part of how to achieve the objectives will be through the construction of an annex (approx. 25,000 square feet); committee will need to provide input where to construct annex

Programs that are displaced from the interior of the building (due to renovation) can be relocated into annex.

Question – can we come up with a plan and then put a price on it? (Ken Roey explained that the Board has given the design direction to include \$50 million; added topic to the parking lot)

Question – will we have some estimates of how much our options will cost? – yes, rough estimates of possible project components will be provided throughout process

Question – asked for clarification related to funds (state vs. county)

Outcomes for today:

- Understanding of the process
- Preferred location of the annex

Next meeting will include a discussion of the mechanical issues. (Note that the Planning Advisory Committee requested that we discuss program needs first, Ken Roey agreed that we would.)

Ken Roey pointed out that we will probably never get to consensus on some things (such as funding)

Question – how much of the \$1 million in planning money that was required by the county executive is left – answer not know – will have to check

Concept:

- Will be renovating selected areas of the building (based upon programmatic needs for improvement from input of the committee)
- Renovated areas will be trade spaces (moved to annex during renovation)

Question – clarification that renovation is really reconfiguring – answer is yes (electrical and HVAC issues will be addressed throughout the entire building)

Architects discussed current floor plans and existing site plan:

- Major need - better circulation of site and Rt. 99 (have small bus loop, poor traffic flow, storm water management ponds are permanent structures and could potentially impact any plans to front of campus)
- East of building – only access road to back of building (fire access road required by state); dumpster and cafeteria loading dock
- Back - playing fields; appealing because it is fairly flat
- Behind the auxiliary gym – major utilities
- Back of building (between school and stadium) – bleachers and stadium are expensive to move, fire access road
- West side – several practice fields; steep grade change – increased construction cost, but offers possibility of 2 story annex

- Front (by student parking) – access to performing arts

Question – asked about property lines of property (noted that where field hockey field is located is not school system property; that side of campus also included wetlands)

Comment – annex on northwest side of building would be problematic with the student flow inside of the building near there

Question – does the annex have to have a basement (to house HVAC/mechanical)? – no, not necessarily (can address this more next week)

Question – will the portables still exist after the addition of the annex? (probably not, but unsure)

Mt. Hebron currently has enough teaching stations to accommodate 1332 students; annex will add space to replace spaces from renovation

Will be an annex (as opposed to an addition) – driven by the cost of fire code regulations

Question – what is the design criteria for the annex?

Look at the interior of the building to address issues that may affect the decision about where to locate the annex:

- Fine arts
- Congestion at lobby of auditorium
- Front of the building and administrative offices
- Back of the building (ADA issues in some social studies classrooms)
- Athletic/PE program (bleachers in gym, wrestling room, auxiliary gym)
- Tech. Ed.

Comment – are 3 main areas of concern – circulation issues, program issues, “comfort” issues

May want to address program issues prior to input on Annex location

Explanation that we should make some site decisions (decide what is and is not doable), address program-related issues, then come back to the site decisions

Question – how many classrooms would be included in 25,000 square feet - would equate to approximately 20 standard classrooms

Circulation issues – main areas of bottleneck:

- Central intersection by Media Center
- Entrance to English wing/9th grade wing (closest to Media Center)
- Front lobby (particularly before school, after school, during lunch)
- Auditorium lobby (particularly during assemblies and performances)

Stairway near room 420 is rarely used (due to back-up at bottom near English wing)

Stairway near room 214 is heavily used

Annex site possibilities (as presented by architects):

1. front of school
pros – visible, flat
cons – impact circulation, how to deal with entrance)
2. front, right of building
pros – less impact on traffic
cons – could be in way of access
3. right side of building (near the tech. ed. room and stadium)
cons – utility concerns
4. between the school and the stadium
pros – centrally located
cons – size limitations due to stadium
5. back, left corner
pros – grade lends itself to lower level
cons – loss of field space
6. left side of building
pros – flat area
cons – impact of field space, 1 level down
7. in front of the auditorium
pros – close to performing arts; visible
cons – impact traffic

Question – what is optimal distance of annex from building? – 30 feet (are considered 2 structures); are several issues related to fire code that have an impact
Annex can be connected to building with conditioned breezeway (raised or at grade)

Question – why was 25,000 square feet offered as a starting estimate? – is a conceptual estimate based upon the needs of the building (basic – structural and mechanical) and the money available – came up with this estimate (can definitely change)

Question/request – visual (to scale) of annex

Committee members generated an initial list of pros and cons for each potential annex site

Will type up pros/cons, parking lot issues, and minutes to be sent out
Factual parking lot issues/questions will be addressed by the next meeting

Wrap-up

- Want to look into the possibility of visiting a school that has an annex
- Next meeting will focus on programmatic issues
- Excerpts of the building study and condition of the building report are available

Next meeting will be 2:30-4:30 PM in the MHHS Media Center on 10/30/07