



VMDO Architects
200 E Market Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902
434.296.5684
vmdo.com

MEETING MINUTES

Date: 10/06/2020
Meeting: Community Work Session #1
Date Issued: 10/12/2020
Sent To: Jamie Duffy, MCPS Project Manager
Attached: Presentation Slides

MCPS Poolersville High School
VMDO Project No. 1294

ATTENDEES:

NAME	AFFILIATION
Gary Mosesman	MCPS
Jamie Duffy	MCPS
Dennis Cross	MCPS
Debbie Szyfer	MCPS
Adrienne Karamihas	MCPS
Ben Kaplan	Maryland IAC
Jillian Storms	Maryland State Dept of Education
Kristen Hill	VMDO
Maria Brinski	VMDO
Noah Marble	VMDO
Rob Winstead	VMDO
Shawn Mulligan	VMDO
Aaron Mengel	Dustin Construction
Sarah Palmer	Dustin Construction
Beth Singh	PHS Parent
Beth Singh	PHS Parent
Connie Chan	PHS Parent
Jen Brill	PHS Parent
Yun Liu	PHS Parent
Natalie Frazin	PHS Parent, JPMS Parent
Kari Auel	PHS Parent, PHS Alumni, Resident
Andrea Stokes	PHS Parent, PTSA
Dawn Albert	PHS Parent, PTSA President
Sandra Baggett	PHS Parent, PTSA secretary
Jacqueline Zeranski	PHS Parent, PTSA Vice President
Shahram and Sarah Paksima	PHS Parent, Resident
Kathy Clowe	PHS Staff
Regina Grubb	PHS Staff
Susan Krouner	PHS Staff
Teri Gregg	PHS Staff
Mark Carothers	PHS Staff Principal
Lisa Griffith	PHS Staff, PHS Parent
Jane Lehrman	Poolersville Cluster Coordinator

Claire Gunster-Kirby	Resident
Joyce Breiner	Resident
Linda and Michael Huang	Resident, Future PHS Parent
Laura Van Eperen	Town of Poolesville
Jerome J. Klobukowski	Town of Poolesville, Fair Access Committee
Kevin Schramm	Fair Access Committee, PHS Parent
Catherine Beliveau	Fair Access Committee, Resident
Brian Zeranski	(unknown)
Marcy Loftus	(unknown)
H Austin	(unknown)
Rod Nubgaard	(unknown)
Sridhar G	(unknown)

DISCUSSION:

1. Project Team

- a. Representatives from MCPS Design and Construction were introduced with their respective roles.
- b. The project design team from VMDO were introduced with their respective roles.
- c. Dr. Carothers, Principal of Poolesville High School introduced himself and the project.

2. Presentation

- a. The design team walked the community through the project goals, scope, and feedback it received through discussions with the community, and the teachers, staff, and leadership team at Poolesville High School, which summarized their vision for a school that:
 - i. Connects students from all houses, and engages them in PHS community.
 - ii. Is flexible enough to accommodate the varied curriculum, individual courses with multiple learning modes, and will support the school for many years to come.
 - iii. Is equipped with the right spaces, equipment, and technology to allow teachers and learners to work fluidly and creatively.
 - iv. Is supportive, and provides for student and faculty needs & wellness, full of light and air, promoting sustainability and ecological education.
 - v. Inspires and Celebrates the unique place and community, and the high caliber and aspirations of the activity within.
- b. Community Survey results were reviewed, and attendees were invited to contribute.
- c. The design team provided a brief design recap, outlining the approach to the proposed site strategy, organization of the building program on site, and considerations for possible future development.
- d. Proposed site circulation during the school day and for after-hours use, and zoning of the building for after-hours events were discussed.
 - i. Pedestrian access from east side of site is used by students and staff daily.
 - ii. Parking for students, staff, and events were discussed and will be coordinated with MCPS standards and PHS needs.

- e. The design team reviewed opportunities for Outdoor Program areas were reviewed:
 - i. Opportunities for play fields, outdoor terraces for dining or learning (classes, arts, CTE) were discussed.
 - ii. Outdoor program areas that focus on ecology were discussed, including constructed wetlands and green house and garden opportunities.
 - iii. Responding to community questions, the design team presented three options to provide a connection between the two buildings, including an Enclosed Ground-Level Connector landscape, a Covered Connector, and an Enclosed Bridge.
 - iv. Examples of similar spaces from VMDO and other projects were reviewed.
- 3. VMDO and MCPS facilitated a question and answer discussion with the online participants.
 - a. Questions are grouped into six categories: Project Process, Scope, Budget; Proposed Site Strategy; Renovation and Project Phasing; Sustainable Design; Security and Building Separation, Parking and Site Access, Community Feedback on Outdoor Learning Options, Comments and the last page showing COST ESTIMATES.

Project Process, Scope, Budget

- Q1. Shahram Paksima: To what extent, and how, have the Covid restrictions kept you from where you would normally be in your community input process? Are you concerned about that?
 - A1: MCPS has moved all in-person community meetings to a virtual platform, but attendance has matched or exceeded pre-pandemic meetings. In some ways, the virtual platform makes it easier for community members to attend and comment.
 - Jillian Storms: As someone who attends a lot of these, I can vouch that these community meetings have been better attended than most of the MCPS meetings that happened in the past pre-pandemic.
- Q2. Brian Zeranski: The PHS community does not feel our voice is being heard or has had input in the process. Where is MCPS currently at in the decision process on the options provided? How many (survey) responses you have from the community?
 - A2: MCPS wants to hear community input through meetings like this and by engaging with school leadership, staff, and the PTSA. Community survey responses continue to come in, 25 at last count, and PHS Leadership and educators have responded to custom surveys as well. The survey link will be distributed again on the project website to provide additional opportunities to comment.
- Q3. Joyce Breiner: What level of community feedback was considered in the choice of 'scheme'?
- Q3. Brian Zeranski: Where is MCPS currently at in the decision process on the options provided? Please describe the projected cost of each of the options and the variance between all options?
 - A3: During the feasibility study, VMDO tested a variety of site strategies and cost studies to find the balance of new and renovated construction to meet the construction budget and building program. The proposed scheme provides the most feasible path at this point. Community

Engagement occurs during the Schematic Design phase and the cost estimates can be found on the last page of this document.

Q4. Jane Lehrman: Last year, we were told that MCPS allocated \$71 million in the CIP budget. for a new PHS. Is \$11 million the cost of the design?

A4: The total CIP expenditure is \$71.31M. This includes the Construction Budget of \$60.2 million, funds for design fees, construction management and other project expenses like furniture fixtures and equipment.

Q5. David: Has the construction budget - \$60 million - been approved and appropriated? Or is it still pending some approval by the BOE or Council?

A5: An FY 2021 appropriation was approved to continue the design and planning of this project. Further funding approvals are required by the state and county. Due to current county budget constraints, all future funding on all projects will be evaluated.

Q6. Brian Zeranski: What about the green house is this included in the plan updates?

A6: Yes, a green house is included in the program.

Q7. Catherine Beliveau: Other schools contain Health/Wellness centers into their schools, which serve both students and community members. We are located in the zip code with the worst health rating in Montgomery County, with the least access to county and health services. One would think that, in the interest of fairness, a Wellness center would be an essential part of this new school.

A7: A Health and Wellness center is not part of the current PHS program. Health and Wellness centers at other schools are funded through other county funding sources.

Q8. Lisa Griffith: Similarly, I think it's very disappointing to say the least that nothing is being done to renovate the outdoor athletic fields. There will be a huge disconnect between the school and the athletic facilities. Also, I don't think we were ever told if there will be renovations to the gym - including new bleachers

A8: Renovating the outdoor athletic fields is not part of the current CIP. The proposed scheme includes renovating the existing gym and adjoining athletic facilities to meet, as closely as possible to current MCPS program for Poolesville High School. We understand that bleacher seating is a concern. The outdoor athletic fields will be evaluated and considered for upgrades/renovations by the Special Projects team within the Division of Design and Construction.

Q9. jbrill@cthellmuth.com: I would be interested to hear about why we are picking the lowest cost initial option but with the highest long-term cost to operate? Shouldn't some weight be given to the longer-term cost of operating.

Q9. Joyce Breiner: Agree: The State recommends sharing both construction costs as well as the Life Cycle Cost of each scheme over a 35-year period. That is the only way to understand the benefit of each scheme. We need to understand the comparative operational/lifecycle costs.

A9: Life-cycle analysis will be explored in detail as schemes are developed. Previously noted operational cost comparisons were 'relative' projections related to the extent of new high-

performing exterior envelope construction in the finished project. Since the Mechanical and Electrical systems will be similar for any proposed scheme, which accounts for much of the operations and maintenance costs, these should be relatively small differences.

Q10. David: I guess the next question is to why Poolesville is only budgeted for \$60 million? Would there be more for us if \$150 million wasn't spent on Seneca Valley or \$130+ earmarked for Crown High School? Or \$20 million for an Arts Center at Whitman?

Q10. Dawn Albert: So equity goes out the window for residents of the Ag Reserve?

Q10. Joyce Breiner: How do younger buildings in other MCPS projects warrant full replacement?

A10: MCPS does not like to compare projects. No projects are the same; the two new high schools referenced in the question above have student capacities over 2000 and Whitman is receiving an addition not an Arts Center.

Q11. h_austin@yahoo.com: Can the school not appeal to either the IT Community and also Pharmaceutical Community in close proximity to here? I assume if they donate to funding, there could be tax benefits to the donors in addition to promoting excellence in education to our community.

Q11. h_austin@yahoo.com: Would it be possible to do a joint venture with private developers and sell residential units above the school in order to get funding for the best option possible?

A11: This could potentially be a zoning and security issue for the school.

Q12. Sandi: What would be the projected start and completion dates?

A12: Proposed construction start is spring 2022, construction completion in 2024, site in 2025.

Q13. Andrea: This option takes the most time is that correct? Was it 3.5 years to complete?

A13: No, this scheme is estimated to take approximately 3 years to complete.

Proposed Site and Building Strategy

Q14. Brian Zeranski: What is the current SF how much is the increase of the new building?

A14: Current facility includes 167,000 sf (146,000 sf Main Building, 21,000 sf Science Annex). The program for the completed project will provide approximately 203,000 sf total.

Q15. Regina Grubb: Will we be adding the following to the main gymnasium: a 2nd full basketball court, knocking out the wall and putting in more bleachers, higher ceiling, adding concession area, larger lobby, ticket booth, storage, etc. Will it be the same size as the spec in MCPS like Gaithersburg and paint branch? Will the locker rooms and PE offices be renovated? Where is the weight room going to be located? If we make the old gym into a dance studio and a wrestling room, we lose floor space for our PE classes and for our athletic teams for practices. Where will PE classes have their class and athletics practice when the gymnasiums are being renovated?

Q15. David: What will be the size of the new gym?

Q15: Jane Lehrman: I submitted a detailed CIP request to Dr. Smith in June. Everything that Ms. Grubb mentioned were addressed on the request.

A15: Final configuration of the athletics facilities will be determined as the design develops with input from MCPS and PHS Staff. Currently, the existing competition gym with (1) court will

remain to be renovated along with adjacent locker and PE offices. MCPS and the design team can review options to increase bleacher, lobby, concessions, and athletic storage where possible. Renovations of interior spaces will be phased to impact instruction as minimally as possible.

Q16. Regina Grubb: How many team rooms in the Athletic area?

A16: The program includes one large (1,000 sf) and five small (500 sf) Team Rooms.

Q17. Brian Zeranski: What is the actual number of classrooms as compared to the current footprint? It seems smaller.

A17: There are currently 29 General Classrooms, 3 Visual Art Classrooms, 5 Low-Intensity Labs and 6 high-intensity labs. The new program provides 33 General Classrooms, 3 larger Visual Arts classrooms, 6 low-intensity labs, 12 high-intensity labs, and a significant

Q18. Brian Zeranski: How many students can be held in the dining commons? Currently an outdoor dining facility can only be used in good weather, where will there be additional areas for students to eat?

A18: The dining commons is programmed at 5,000 sf which will seat approximately 333 students per code. Additional distributed commons areas for gathering and eating are proposed throughout the building, along with an outdoor dining terrace.

Q19. h_austin@yahoo.com: Is there going to be specific areas allocated specifically for special projects of the different magnet programs. A place to allow Magnets to create new opportunities for students?

A19: The proposed design provides a combination of specific and flexible spaces.

Q20. Linda and Michael Huang: Does making a wetland out of a pedestrian access area on the lower left make any sense?

Q20. Linda and Michael Huang: Once these are designated wetlands that meet stormwater requirements, how do you take that away without getting a waiver from MDE?

A20: Montgomery County's storm water management regulations will require additional storm water management areas on site. If possible, these should improve the landscape and outdoor learning opportunities. It is not possible to remove designated wetlands.

Q21. h_austin@yahoo.com: Will there be a space outside to allow school to hold general assembly events and meetings outside as needed?

A21: Options for outdoor meeting, gathering, and educational spaces will be explored throughout Schematic Design.

Q22. Sandi: What are the size of the classrooms?

Q22. Jiyoung Lee: What are the numbers of classrooms before and after?

A22: Average standard classrooms are 840 sf.

Q23. David: Can MCPS staff confirm that Poolesville isn't ADA compliant?

- A23: Further evaluation is needed at this time to acknowledge if the school is currently not ADA compliant. Upon completion of the project, the entire Poolesville High School will be ADA compliant.
- Q24. Brian Zeranski: Where will the second elevator be for the 2nd story addition in the mail building?
- A24: Elevators in two-story additions will be located near central circulation areas.

Renovation and Project Phasing

- Q25. Sridhar G: I assume this will be answered later, will there be a need for a holding school while the new school is being built? If no holding school, how will impact of construction impact on students and staff be minimized?
- A25: A final phasing strategy to minimize construction impact on instruction will be refined with the Construction Manager as the design develops. The current proposal is to move students into completed additions, use summers to complete interior demolition and renovation, and then demolish and renovate the existing building. If required, temporary facilities can be located on site to accommodate
- Q26. Joyce Breiner: Please explain in detail extent to which the existing building would be 'gutted'. If building is gutted and there are new exterior walls - what is left?
- Q26. Brian Zeranski: Infrastructure - Option C contemplates keeping a part of the existing school and modernizing it. MCPS has acknowledged that the existing support systems such as HVAC and plumbing have been "patchworked" together over many years and it will take a lot of work and resources to rebuild these systems and successfully integrate them into the overall structure of the new school. Given the concerns on the age of the building and the historical experience with asbestos, how will remediation be handled and why are these plans not including new infrastructure?
- A26: Interior partitions and finishes (wall, floor, and ceilings), mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems will be completely removed – leaving interior and exterior bearing walls and roof structure.
- Q27. Joyce Breiner: Will hallways be opened up/widened. Current hallways are built for 1950s middle schoolers.
- A27: Where possible, interior circulation areas will be made more generous.
- Q28. Jerry Klobukowski: Is the cost asbestos removal factored into the cost? Also, will this require lead paint removal too?
- A28: Yes, hazardous material remediation is factored into the cost.
- Q29. Andrea: Percentage wise, what percent of the existing building will be demolished?
- A29: Approximately 57% of the existing school building will be demolished.
- Q30. Melissa: It seems like classroom space in being reused in only one hallway (plus an added story) so there appears to be lots of new building in addition to space Reno. Is that a correct impression?

- A30: Yes, approximately 10% to remain (Science Annex), 25% renovation, and 65% new.
- Q31. Sridhar G: I am hoping to hear about the potential impact on students of the noise, dirt, asbestos etc. pollution that this long-term construction will have on the staff and students. And how these will be minimized.
- A31: Every effort will be made to separate the main instructional areas and the instructional schedule from the construction activities.

Sustainable Design

- Q32. Joyce Breiner: Please explain how sustainability, building energy efficiency etc. is being approached. How is this different than the other proposed schemes?
- Q32. Jerry Klobukowski: Will Option C align with Montgomery County's zero carbon footprint for projects? From what has been presented, this renovation does not appear it would.
- Q32. Linda and Michael Huang: LEED silver (minimum) I think is required for new public schools as mandated by the state is that correct?
- Q32. h_austin@yahoo.com: renewables also reduce annual energy budgets! can't the savings be captured to invest in an additional budget allocation?
- A32: Sustainability will be part of the design process, and we are confident we can deliver a project that will be high on the Green Globes rating system. VMDO will make significant improvements in building performance and we will strive to create low energy, high performing, healthy facilities. All renovations will be substantial in terms of HVAC systems, which will have a huge impact on indoor air quality and healthy environments as well as the energy performance of the building. This building will be designed as a "Net Zero Ready" building, making sure that its orientation and roof structures and electrical systems are set up to receive renewable energy systems when that becomes a possibility and a priority for MCPS. VMDO also uses healthy materials inside the building.
- Q33. Catherine Beliveau: How about the possibility of a green roof?
- A33: A green roof is one option to deal with storm water management, but they can be expensive to build and maintain. Our preference is to design roofs to receive a PV array to capture solar energy, lower heat gain, and reduce long-term operating costs.
- Q34. Joyce Breiner: Will the outdoor dining areas be using permeable pavement/pavers as a sustainability measure?
- A35: Storm water management is a key part of this project. Many solutions, like landscape interventions and permeable pavers, will be considered as part of an overall solution.

Security and Building Separation

- Q36. Joyce Breiner: Why are buildings not connected? How will movement between buildings be secure? Has a tunnel between the unconnected buildings been considered in light of security issues?
- Q36. Jillian Storms: Sorry if I missed it, but could you clarify if there a building code issue preventing the different building sections from being fully connected? It might also help to share if there are any other "campus" high schools in Montgomery County.

Q36. Brian Zeranski: This plan does not address security during the school day between the two buildings. How will security be addressed in these options? We as parents are looking for more structured security options not “landscaping” that can keep the areas isolated, perhaps a courtyard design with structural or fences to restrict access. Access to the gym from the parking lot would require to go through a common area that should be closed during the school day to ensure security.

A36: Options to connect these buildings were presented, a secure outdoor landscape, a covered outdoor connector, and an enclosed connector. Enclosed connectors have the most significant code requirements and cost. The options – separate and combined, will be explored through Schematic Design.

Q37. Sridhar G: Does PHS has bandwidth for staff to monitor entrances through the day?

A37: This is a school operations/security team matter for how the doors are monitored and secured during the day.

Q38. Joyce Breiner: We are talking about the point between the two buildings that are unlocked all the time so that students can move between the two buildings'

A38: The new buildings and renovated portions will be connected and secured.

Parking and Site Access

Q39. Brian Zeranski: How many parking spaces are allocated for students. We seem to be losing quite a bit of parking for students.

Q39. Joyce Breiner: Does the parking/traffic plan account for the fact that 60% of students commute to school. some dropped off by parents, many students drive from far away.

Q39. Brian Zeranski: The majority looks like it is for faculty not students. students are currently parking in the Baptist church.

A39: There are currently 317 parking spaces and 170 are for students. The parking target for the Feasibility Study was 350-400 total parking spaces, and the current plan provides 357. If there is an agreement for students to park at the church, MCPS has no objections to this. It is the goal of the project to provide enough parking for staff and current projections for student enrollment.

Q40. Linda and Michael Huang: There are cars / trucks that constantly use the parking lot after school hours in ways (Monster truck Rally, donuts, etc.) that disturb the current residents near the lot. What provisions are being provided to prevent something like this happening in the new design?

A40: The new/renovated facility will have more CCTV on the exterior of the building. Residents are encouraged to report any non-sanctioned or illegal activities to MCPS security or MCPD.

Q41. Regina Grubb: The new parking effects the fields that PE classes use on a daily basis and where practices take place.

Q41. Avery Penn: A large portion of the sports practice field have been eliminated by new parking lots. Will the stadium be updated to accommodate additional hours of use with turf or other alternatives?

A41: Demolition of the east of the existing parking area that's south of the Science Annex, which is located where existing sports practice fields. D

- Q42. jbrill@cthellmuth.com: The student drop-off area is very small. A majority of students commute to PHS - Willard is already backed up on mornings, making the space smaller might be an issue.
- Q42. Yun Liu: How about traffic and cross signs on the west Willard Rd for pedestrians and events participants?
- Q42. Kirsten Lewis: A new cross walk across West Willard from the Baptist Church parking lot to the bus loop entrance would be great. Yes, the existing cross walks at W. Willard and Wootton and W. Willard and Spurrier Ave are currently used.
- Q42. Joyce Breiner: Tunnels instead of crosswalks would eliminate conflicts with traffic.

A42: Traffic needs, flow, and safe pedestrian site access will be considered and addressed as the design develops. Community feedback like this is very helpful to this progress. Tunnels and bridges would add significantly more expense for this

- Q43. Joyce Breiner: Have electric vehicle charging opportunity been incorporated into the parking lot plan? Could L1 EVSE for each parking space be incorporated into the parking lots at a minimum?

A43: Sustainability and a smaller carbon footprint are a top priority. Any and all opportunities will be evaluated through the design process.

Site, Gym, and Athletic Fields

- Q44. Dawn Albert: There is no budget for any improvements to the athletic fields?

A44: Improvements to existing athletic fields are not included in this CIP and further evaluation by the Special Projects Team will be conducted.

- Q45. David: Will the Lawn Play Fields be natural grass or artificial turf? Are these "play" fields regulation size so that sports teams can practice on them?

A45: These are proposed areas where many types of activities can occur: sports practice fields, outdoor ecology gardens, or unstructured grass lawns. Play Fields would likely be lawn.

- Q46. David: When I take my kids to sports competitions at other high schools, it is sometimes a challenge to find/know where the gym is when we arrive. Eventually we find it and it usually has a dedicated/adjacent parking lot. It looks like the gym entrance won't be visible from the parking area.

- Q46. Brian Zeranski: are you then proposing that access to the gym is only from the interior?

A46: The current idea is a large commons space that cuts East-West through the building. That is certainly subject to further study, particularly with students and teachers. We will coordinate access control so it will function appropriately in different use modes (school day, rec use after hours, etc.). For public events at gyms in High Schools, we typically see entry into a lobby / "pre-function" space before entering the gym. Egress doors may open directly from the gym to the outdoors.

- Q47. David: What is the MCPS guidance in terms of gym capacity relative to school enrollment? 40% 50% 60% other?

A47: Total capacity of a space is based on its total area, not total school capacity.

Community Use

Q48. cgkir: This plan does not allow for access to athletic/gym facilities during daytime hours for groups like senior citizens. This would not address the access needs for services for this group. Was that ever a goal for this project?

A48: The Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) program allows the community to use facilities after school hours. Synchronous daytime use by student and Poolesville community adults is not a goal for this project, and it poses significant scheduling and security concerns.

Q49. David: I had a question about the community use graphic and how to interpret the data. Related to community use and PHS use of the facilities.

A49: The graphic shows after-hours facility use by type: 59% is 'community use', CUPF and League Athletics; the remaining 41% is PHS use, mostly Performing Arts, with some Athletics, Academics, and Administration.

Outdoor Program Options

Q50. Community Feedback: What are your priorities for Outdoor Program Areas?

A. Outdoor Learning; B. Play fields, play courts; C. Green House + Ecology; D. Outdoor Terraces.

A50: Regina Grubb: B, A, C, D

A50: Sandi: agree B, A, C, D

A50: Rod Nubgaard: B, A, D, C

A50: Avery Penn: B, D, C, A

A50: David: B, A, C, D

A50: Brian Zeranski: A B C D

A50: Melissa: B, C, D, A in that order (lawn space, in particular needs to be maximized to compensate for lost practice field space, which is heavily used in all sports season)

A50: Kirsten Lewis: These are all awesome outdoor spaces. I believe the order would be B, C, A, D

Outdoor Learning – Landscape Connection

Q51. Community Feedback: What landscape connection between the two buildings do you prefer? A. Enclosed Ground-Level Connector; B. Covered Outdoor Connector; C. Bridge Connector?

A51: Kirsten Lewis: Re: connection between two buildings it appears that option A allows for the largest group of people to move at the same time compared to the other options

A51: Lisa Griffith: A seems like the easiest option to secure.

A51: Jiyoun Lee: B

A51: Kirsten Lewis: B, love the covered outdoor space

A51: Brian Zeranski: C or A

A51: Brian Zeranski: A

A51: Rod Nubgaard: C

A51: Joyce Breiner: C

A51: Yun Liu: A

A51: Teri: C

A51: Jiyoun Lee: A

- A51: Catherine Beliveau: C, A, B
A51: Joyce Breiner: A, C, B
A51: Linda and Michael Huang: A
A51: Jerry Klobukowski: A
A51: jbrill@cthellmuth.com: C, B, A
A51: Kari: Connection choice A, B, C
A51: Joyce Breiner: Combo of A & C. outdoor but access restricted with bridge.
A51: Shahram Paksima: A C B, A seems to provide not only more likely options for security, but also has a nice college campus feel, and flexibility for lots of space use options.
A51: Brian Zeranski: bridge would only be one?
A51: Dawn Albert: Doesn't this space include the gym entrance?
A51: Sandi: Would both floors connect?
A51: Brian Zeranski: where are the majority of the classroom on the second floor or first floor? that should dictate the walkway
A51: Yun Liu: connecting with both floors would be great
A51: Yun Liu: Traffic will be heavy between two buildings when changing classrooms
A51: Lisa Griffith: How do you secure the buildings if you go with the bridge option?
A51: Sandi: Are the outdoor areas secure?
A51: h_austin@yahoo.com: my vote goes to utilizing the ARIZONA plan to the max!
A51: Andrea: Probably need two bridges or two covered ground-level walkways to move hundreds of kids in between classes

Comments

- Comment: PTSA also sent email to Mr. Duffy notifying that the PTSA also has questions.
- Comment: Dawn Albert: Again, the possible County community center would be placed where these lawn/practice areas are designated, thereby taking them away
- Comment: In the past JPMS has also used the performing Arts facilities.
- Comment: Lisa Griffith: So basically, we are getting a renovation with addition and not a new build!
- Comment: David: On a per student basis based on capacity. PHS is currently \$41,000/ student. SVHS is \$62,000/student.
- Comment: Lisa Griffith: It's not a question of size and enrollment. It's a comparison of per student cost.
- Comment: Brian Zeranski: That is correct. Why not redistrict to increase the population of the school?
- Comment: Kirsten Lewis: Thank you.
- Comment: Shahram Paksima: Thanks!

CONSTRUCTION COST

A COMPACT

1.4 NET-TO-GROSS	CONSTRUCTION COST RANGE	
	LOW	HIGH
New Building	\$ 67,034,000	- \$ 69,948,000
Renovate Auditorium	\$ 3,240,000	- \$ 3,239,800
Existing 2009	\$ -	- \$ -
Demolish & abate	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,999,500
Façade replacement	\$ 203,000	\$ 202,500
DED .25YR Gen. Cond.	\$ (225,000)	- \$ 1,700,000
9/15 program reductions (-5,749 NSF)	\$ (2,777,000)	- \$ (2,897,500)
TOTAL	\$ 69,475,000	- \$ 74,192,300

B CAMPUS

1.4 NET-TO-GROSS	CONSTRUCTION COST RANGE	
	LOW	HIGH
New Building	\$ 59,940,000	- \$ 66,600,000
Renovate Auditorium	\$ 3,240,000	- \$ 3,239,800
Renovate Gymnasium	\$ 1,274,000	- \$ 1,448,000
Existing 2009	\$ -	- \$ -
Demolish	\$ 1,872,000	\$ 1,872,000
Façade repl.	\$ 203,000	\$ 202,500
Logistics, ADD Gen. Cond.	\$ 650,000	- \$ 1,700,000
9/15 program reductions (-5,749 NSF)	\$ (2,608,000)	- \$ (2,897,500)
TOTAL	\$ 64,571,000	- \$ 72,164,800

C BAR + RENOVATE

1.4 NET-TO-GROSS	CONSTRUCTION COST RANGE	
	LOW	HIGH
New Building	\$ 48,114,000	- \$ 53,460,000
Renovate Auditorium	\$ 3,492,000	- \$ 3,492,000
Renovate Gymnasium	\$ 4,019,000	- \$ 4,566,600
Renovate Classrooms	\$ 5,087,000	- \$ 5,781,000
Existing 2009	\$ -	- \$ -
Demolish & abate	\$ 1,310,000	\$ 1,309,500
Façade repl.	\$ 203,000	\$ 202,500
Portables & logistics	\$ 1,700,000	- \$ 1,700,000
9/15 program reductions (-5,749 NSF)	\$ (2,608,000)	- \$ (2,897,500)
TOTAL	\$ 61,317,000	- \$ 67,614,100

