BIG SPRING SCHOOL DISTRICT

Newville, Pennsylvania

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2009

The Big Spring School District is an equal opportunity education institution and will not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, and disability in its activities, programs, or employment practices as required by Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504. For information regarding civil rights or grievance procedures, or for information regarding services, activities, and facilities that are accessible to and usable by handicapped persons, contact the Superintendent of Schools, Title IX and Section 504 Coordinator, 45 Mt. Rock Road, Newville, PA 17241, at (717) 776-2412.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Buildings and Property Committee of the Board of School Directors for the Big Spring School District met in the Large Group Room, Room 140, of the Big Spring High School at 6:30 P.M. with Robert Barrick, Chairperson, presiding. Six (6) directors present: Robert Lee Barrick, Committee Chairperson; William Swanson, Committee Member; Wilbur Wolf, Jr., ex-officio Committee Member; Saundra Rosenberry Deaver, Board Member; Terry Lopp, Board Member; Richard Norris, Board Member.

William Piper, Committee Member, joined the meeting in progress at 6:35 p.m.

Richard Roush, Committee Member, was absent.

Others in attendance: Richard Fry, Superintendent; Jeanne Temple, Assistant Superintendent; Kevin Roberts, Director of Curriculum/Instruction and Educational Technology; Richard E. Kerr, Jr., Business Manager; Rick Sample, Director of Buildings and Grounds; Krista Zeigler, Plainfield Elementary School Principal; and Brenda Line, Board Minutes. Also present: Vern McKissick, McKissick Associates.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Mr. Vern McKissick provided the members of the Board of School Directors with copies of a 36-page document entitled "Big Spring School District, Board of Directors, Discussion Agenda, October 5, 2009." Please refer to the attached document. Mr. McKissick provided an update on the proposed projects and indicated that this information would be covered at the October 14, 2009 BAT meeting as well.

A. <u>Update On Proposed Renovations and Construction at Newville Elementary</u> <u>School</u> (Continued)

Mr. McKissick reported the following highlights of Page 1 of the attached document:

- Most variances and special exceptions for the project have been granted from neighboring entities, such as Newville Borough and North Newton Township. A meeting with North Newton Township supervisors is slated for Tuesday, October 6, 2009
- 2. The Highway Occupancy permit is on the "critical path" and will take 8 to 10 weeks for approval.

Big Spring School Board Buildings and Property Committee Meeting Minutes Monday, October 5, 2009

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

A. <u>Update On Proposed Renovations and Construction at Newville Elementary School</u> (Continued)

- **3.** The architects are working with the Army Corps of Engineers for the soil conservation submission. Working drawings are underway.
- **4.** The administration area is slated for revamping to address security issues at the entrance of the building. The architects are preparing "good, better, and best" proposals for review.
- **5.** The proposed project is on schedule with release of bids in December, receipt of bids in January, work commencement in March, and work completion before the start of the 2010-2011 school term.

B. Update On Proposed Construction at Plainfield Elementary School

Mr. McKissick continued to review the attached document and answered questions. The following items were noted:

- 1. The two-deep concept for Plainfield Elementary School will be addressed at the BAT meeting on Wednesday, October 14, 2009.
- 2. Review of zoning variances are outlined on Page 1 of the attached document.
- 3. The status of PlanCon Documents was reviewed on Page 1.
- 4. The information regarding the potential for decreased construction costs presented to the Board recently contained a couple erroneous methods of calculating. Please refer to Pages 1 to 3 of the attached document for information on project cost calculations.
- 5. Refer to Page 4 of the attached document for a detailed estimate summary. The project would cost approximately \$182.21 per square foot, *not including* the site work and demolition of the existing facility. Mr. McKissick reviewed the square-foot costs for other Pennsylvania schools in 2008 as outlined on Page 19. An independent, nonbiased, gender-neutral source was used to collect this data.
- **6.** Mr. McKissick estimates 60 cents per square foot per year savings for geothermal heating versus oil heating.
- 7. The cost estimates for the geothermal wells in the attached document assume a three-deep school.
- 8. A seven- to ten-year payback is expected for geothermal HVAC systems.
- **9.** The proposal is to heat/cool the building standing alone, "off the grid," with 100 percent ground-based geothermal wells, no boiler, no gas, and no oil.
- **10.** Mr. McKissick reviewed the effect the school size reduction would have on the State reimbursement.
- 11. Regardless of whether the District builds a two-deep school or a three-deep school, the architects would recommend building the core facilities to accommodate a four-deep school so that future expansion could be achieved by simply adding instructional space and modifying the core facilities slightly.
- **12.** Mr. McKissick reviewed the drawings on Page 21 (first floor), Page 22 (second floor), Page 23 (roof structures), Page 24 (core spaces) and Page 25 (view from ground level) and described the changes involved for decreasing the school from a three-deep facility to a two-deep facility, eliminating 13,000 square feet, decreasing from 54,000 square feet to 41,000 square feet.

Big Spring School Board Buildings and Property Committee Meeting Minutes Monday, October 5, 2009

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

B. <u>Update On Proposed Construction at Plainfield Elementary School</u> (Continued)

- **13.** The District is permitted to spend only \$14,414 per student seat on the project before having to seek referendum approval for the project. As a classroom is eliminated, that eliminates \$0.5 million of the referendum limit. Eliminating six classrooms decreases the referendum limit by \$3 million.
- 14. The proposed sloped roofs would accommodate PV panels.
- **15.** Construction would be designed so that there would be very little effect realized if a sinkhole were to occur under the building. Historical documents show that three sinkholes have occurred on the property along Springview Road.
- **16.** Music and art would share a space in the proposed downsized plan.
- 17. Mr. McKissick reviewed Page 26, a hypothetical PlanCon document for a potential project cost of \$11.2 million for a two-deep school, compared with the estimated \$14.224 million for a three-deep school.
- **18.** On-site demolition of the building and use for fill would mostly likely be less costly than trucking the material to a landfill.
- 19. Mr. McKissick reviewed the proposed elimination of items and the decreased costs associated with those items. The Board agreed to <u>keep</u> the following items in the project: <u>high sloped metal roofing systems, geothermal system, daylighting for classrooms, and maintain core-space size for future expansion</u>. Refer to Item iv. on Page 3 of the attached document.
- 20. Mr. McKissick reviewed the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) ratings. The District could attempt either a silver or gold rating. Either rating would qualify the District for a 10 percent increase in State aid (approximately \$140,000). Most of the items included on the LEED checklist were items the Board had intended to include in the project, regardless of the potential for achieving the LEED rating.
- 21. The architects could design a "cheap" building; however, the cost to run the building over time would be far more than constructing initially a more expensive energy-efficient building.
- 22. Mr. Barrick asked Mr. McKissick to address the pros and cons of a gray-water system at the next BAT meeting. The water from a gray-water system would be captured from the roof, stored in a cistern, and used to flush toilets and urinals and used for irrigation. A UV filter, a manual filter for debris, and two sets of pipes are necessary with this system.
- **23.** Photovoltaic power could be considered. The electric meter "runs backwards" when school is not in session and there is excess energy from the panels. Any excess energy is sold to the power company.
- **24.** The administration is recommending that the Board move forward with a two-deep plan, with an alternate bid for expansion of the core areas. If the core areas were built large enough, expansion for 150 or 300 more students, if necessary, would be relatively easy to achieve in a short amount of time.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 P.M.

Robert Lee Barrick, Chairperson