

FACILITY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

December 14, 2011

PROJECT

CRA Project No. 2443

On December 14, 2011 at 8:00 AM, a meeting was held by the Penn Manor School Board Facility Committee.

Board Members Present: Ken Long, Johnna Friedman, Kirk Schlotzhauer, Dr. Richard Frerichs. Also present were Dr. Mike Leichter, Chris Johnston, Vickie Hallock, Charlie Reisinger, and Denny Coleman. Larry Levato and Hal Hart were in attendance representing Crabtree Rohrbaugh & Associates. Rhonda Lord from Kegel Kelin Almy & Grimm was present for the discussion regarding the commercial triangle.

New School: Schematic Design Review

CRA provided a summary of the schematic design process that the planning committee has been a part of over the past several months. The following is a basic summary of that process and where we are to date, as well as the current recommendations.

Site Plan Review/Discussions

- The site plan was reviewed and discussions focused on basic orientation of the building, adjacency and relationships to the Manor Middle School, natural daylight and solar gain, parent/bus drop off zones and parking. There was further discussion with regards to the concern of solar gain in key spaces and how that will be treated.
- There was discussion regarding combining the deeds of two parcels of land while keeping the Fisher Farm tract a separate deed. This will provide the district with flexibility should they desire to sell that tract off in the distant future.
- There is still the possibility that Donnerville Road Improvements may be required, even if we do not build presently on the Fisher Farm. This discovery process will continue as we begin discussion with the Borough and begin the land development process.
- A traffic study will most likely be required as we are adding additional traffic to Charlestown Road and the area.
- CRA presented a sketch of potential site change vs. what Jim Hocker had presented. The intent of the sketch is to have a common access point at the main entry for both bus and parent drop off areas. While separated physically, the main factor is the amount of queuing length provided to both parent and bus traffic to allow same zones for students and those monitoring these evolutions. Jim Hocker will revisit the site sketch and continue to work on refinement with the design team.

Plan Review/Discussions

- From the site plan we moved into discussions of the floor plan and basic organization of the building.
- At present we have developed a main street concept that divides the educational houses from the more public areas such as the library, gym and cafeteria.
- Further discussions focused on the educational house organization and how the academic commons could be used in several ways. There is the capability to have a grade level function, small group functions and even individual break out functions, as the main intent is develop and provide a collaborative learning environment for students and staff alike. In addition, the commons can house various resources specific to grade level that may be commonly found in the library as well as housing some elements commonly found in classrooms, such as casework and storage. The intent is to reduce the redundancy of casework and items typically found in classrooms that will be located in the commons and assist in the collaborative atmosphere of the commons.
- In addition, technology will be much more flexible in this environment and will not just be limited to the classrooms themselves. The academic house will be organized to maximize flexibility, but focus on ability of staff to collaborate on teaching efforts and afford a level of comfort in controlling and directing students. Other schools using academic house have experience the effect of “house” pride based on this type of arrangement. The present staff at Hambright Elementary was presented that current scheme and overview of the plan. In addition, the potential use of the academic commons was outlined. This will not be a place where they are moved to the school and develop ways to use the spaces. This type of program dynamic will be develop during the remainder of the design process and specifically coordinated with the direction of the curriculum. This should allow for a smooth transition, but also increase the use of the space.
- Discussions then focused on capacity of the facility. Based on early discussions the facility will have a base bid as follows:
 - 3 classrooms per grade level x (25 students/class) = 450 students
 - 2 half-day kindergarten classrooms (50 students/session = 100 students
 - Total capacity (not including special education classrooms) = 550 students
 - Total capacity (using 2 special education classrooms) = 600 studentsUnder this scenario, core spaces such as gym, cafeteria etc will be sized to accommodate future growth, but under this scenario there will be decreased efficiency in this scheme due to the over sizing of the core spaces. The plan square foot vs. the capacity results in approx 145 SF per student.
- Based on early discussions the facility will have an alternate bid as follows:
 - 4 classrooms per grade level x (25 students/class) = 600 students
 - 2 half-day kindergarten classrooms (50 students/session = 100 students
 - Total capacity (not including special education classrooms) = 700 students

- Total capacity (using 2 special education classrooms) = 750 students
Under this scenario, core spaces such as gym, cafeteria etc will be sized to accommodate the projected capacity, and under this scenario there will be increased efficiency in this scheme due to the proper sizing of the core spaces. The plan square foot vs. the capacity results in approx 122 SF per student.
- There was further discussion from various attendees about the proper size of the facility. Should the base bid be for the 4 classroom deep option resulting in some capabilities to accommodate future growth and housing development in the immediate area. These discussions will continue with the board during a January 2012 workshop.

Next Steps:

- Beginning in early January the design team will develop the final concept plan in addition to the revised site plan to begin the design development process.
- Jim Hocker will work to establish a preliminary meeting with the Borough to present the concept sketch and overview of the project.
- The design development process will now shift from the planning committee to the Facilities department to oversee the development of the building and integration of both programming as well as supporting building systems.
- CRA and Jim Hocker were asked to present a summary at a board workshop to be held January 2nd at 5 pm and to be present at the board meeting that same night.

Commercial Triangle:

- Rhonda Lord was present for this part of the meeting. Discussion followed regarding the current status of the development of the commercial triangle. Dr. Leichter reviewed information from Millersville Borough and Lancaster Township. A potential agreement regarding the Wabank Extension Road was reviewed. Discussion followed regarding the potential sale of additional tracts of land surrounding the current land under agreement. Mrs. Lord was authorized to approach LMS to discuss possible terms for an additional agreement.

Millersville Borough Park:

- Dr. Leichter stated that he was approached by Millersville Borough regarding the addition of a walking path that would connect the borough park and Eshleman Elementary. He stated that he will pursue the plan with the borough and report back to the committee and the board regarding costs and a possible agreement.

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Long.