

Abington School Building Committee

March 5, 2014

Paul K. Smith Music Room, Abington High School
6:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Richard Testa, Peter Schafer, Richard LaFond (departed 7:10pm), Ron Blanchard, Felicia Moschella, Michael Lyons, Kathy Bailey, Roseanne Kurposka (departed 7:15pm), Shawn Reilly, Jason Linn, Roger Boddie, Michael Franey, Peter Serino, Teresa Sullivan, and David Drew.

Committee Members Absent: Jannette Leary, Kevin Atkinson, Andy Burbine, Tricia McDonnell, Keri Maguire, Barbara Cristoforo, James West, Jessica Sullivan and George Whiting

Professional Staff: Scott Dunlap, Troy Randall, Arthur Eddy, Cari Orsi, and Mary Mahoney

Mr. Testa called the meeting to order at 6:25 p.m.

A. Approve Minutes for February 4, 2014

Draft meeting minutes for the School Building Committee meeting on February 4, 2014 were considered.

VOTED: on motion of Mr. LaFond, seconded by Mr. Blanchard, the members of the Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes for February 4, 2014.

B. MSBA – Preferred Schematic Solution Supplement

Ms. Mahoney reported on developments with MSBA. On February 7, 2014 the Preferred Schematic Solution Supplement document was forwarded to MSBA for their review and comment. On February 28, 2014, a conference call was conducted with representatives of MSBA, Abington School Building Committee, School administrators, Ai3, and KBA to review project administrative items, review comments resulting from MSBA's review of the Preferred Schematic Solution Supplement, and advise that project presentation to the MSBA's Facilities Assessment Subcommittee was not required prior to the March 26, 2014 MSBA Board meeting. Notes of conference call discussions were previously forwarded to Committee members. On March 5, 2014, MSBA forwarded formal correspondence that included the review comments discussed during the February 28th conference call and a cover letter stating that response to MSBA review comments shall be returned by March 12, 2014. Response to MSBA comments is being drafted and will be transmitted by the March 12th receipt date. MSBA has indicated that with acceptable response to review comments received by March 12th then the project will be placed on the agenda for the March 26, 2014 MSBA Board Meeting.

C. Design Update

Mr. Dunlap introduced project team members including Art Eddy of Birchwood Design Group, the project landscape architect, and Cari Orsi of PARE Corporation, the project civil engineer and explained the role each firm takes in the site investigations and design development documentation.

A site plan was presented with an overview of advancement and adjustments to design based on discussions with the project working group, including:

- Vehicle Access – A separate bus drive is provided from the public vehicle access point. The design team is also investigating a shared entry that diverges to a separate bus queue and access drive to parking to avoid duplication of features and reduce cost, however this consideration needs to be fully vetted to ensure control and safety for vehicle traffic, proper flow to avoid congestion, and bus loading/unloading needs. The bus queue area has been sized to accommodate eight buses without impacting entry or exit from school parking areas.
- PreK drop off and parking siting options were reviewed. The location of van queue, parent drop off and parking needs to be in close proximity to the PreK building entrance and separate from general circulation patterns to ensure safety and control on site.
- Tennis court were adjusted based on existing topographical and site boundary information obtained in the preliminary site survey and wetland investigations. The adjustment also provides improvements to vehicle flow within the Middle School student drop off and parking areas.
- Provisions for a secondary emergency vehicle access points continued to be investigated with focus on access from the east side of the site.
- Primary and secondary entry points for the Middle School and High School were reviewed including route for two way traffic around the building. Vehicle travel paths are designed to provide completely separate circulation patterns for each school with some flexibility for future adjustment based on changing occupancy needs. Adjustment to Gliniewicz Way is proposed to provide for a new street side drop off zone to reduce the site traffic during school drop off and pick up periods. The preliminary traffic study confirms that Gliniewicz Way has the capacity for future vehicle counts for the co-located school.

Committee inquiry and discussion ensued including:

- *Whether the proposed site plan and parking lot designs provide sufficient parking for the new facility?*- Mr. Dunlap reporting that the site plan will provide 100 marked spaces above what currently exists at the High School and provides sufficient parking.
- *The Tennis Coach has reported that six tennis courts are preferred based on competition needs.* - Mr. Dunlap reported that the court count and lay out includes considerations to minimize changes in the natural site topography and need for retaining walls to construction the courts. The addition court option will be investigated.
- *Are synthetic turf fields being considered in the site design?* - Mr. Dunlap responded that synthetic field construction is being offered as an option for site development based on the attributes of the system including ease of maintenance, expanded field use flexibility (multi-sport use), extended play time and season, and its immediate availability for play following construction which will reduced the school and community field loss impacts of the building project. Construction of a synthetic field can provide the equivalent of 3-4 natural turf fields in terms of play time and seasonal use.
- *The existing high school playfield at the north side of the site are often wet will this continue to be an issue with the new site design?* – Mr. Dunlap noted that the north play field area is the lowest lying area on the site and that it abuts wetlands. Soil test documentation indicate no soil problems but that the issue in the field area is the low grade, flatness and proximity wetlands. The project design includes raising grades at the field area, slope the grading towards the field boundaries, and providing storm water management systems which will eliminate the issues causing current conditions.
- *Is there a storm water management system existing at the field area?* – Mr. Dunlap reported no storm water management system exists in the field area.
- *The existing playing fields abut wetlands, what impact if any will this have to the project?* – Ms. Orsi reviewed ongoing investigations that will delineate the wetland boundary and preliminary design plans for storm water management which will include structures to

collect rain water, remove certain sediment and pollutants, and manage its discharge. Components that will be used to collect and management storm water will be underground drainage and controlled discharge systems, rain gardens or infiltration trenches, and a reclaim (grey) water system. Mr. Dunlap explained that a grey water system will collect rain water from the building roof and route it to underground storage tank for use in building water closets and urinals. The system will enable the project to attain a LEED sustainable design credit by reducing the use of potable water in the building. Benefits include reduced use of drinking water resource/low bills and discharge management for storm water from roof drains.

- General discussion ensued regarding field development and construction phasing including; options for early field construction to offset field loss due to building construction and methods to provide parking and access to the field based on the limited land area available for continued school occupancy, building and site construction, new field location and parking facilities.

Site Plan review continued with presentation regarding natural turf and synthetic turf playfields.

Mr. Eddy presented information regarding natural and synthetic turf fields, including a description of the design and construction to ensure proper drainage and longevity for each system. Synthetic field benefits were reviewed including; more hours of play both in terms of hours per day and days per year since the field do not need to rest to maintain grass, greater durability for extended play, multi-sport flexibility, all weather use, and reduced maintenance. Maintenance for synthetic fields includes clearing the fields of wind swept debris and grooming. Grooming includes grooming and sweeping with equipment provided as part of the field purchase. A cost analysis for two natural turf and two synthetic turf fields to be located at the project site was presented with information including field costs with natural \$700,000 and synthetic \$1,000,000 and field lighting \$500,000. Costs for a single off site field location was also presented with field costs natural \$370,000 and synthetic \$850,000 and field lighting \$400,000. Lastly a comparison of natural turf and synthetic construction costs, future maintenance costs, replacement costs, factored to field play time was presented with the conclusion that the long term gains of synthetic turf fields outweigh upfront costs.

Committee inquiry and discussion ensued including:

- *Whether the information existing regarding the probably of injuries on natural turf versus synthetic turf?* – Mr. Eddy reported that there is a lot of research on academic and collegiate sport use of synthetic fields and highlighted reports published by the National Football League and Pennsylvania State (Penn State) University. The Penn State study concluded that injury trends are about the same for each field type.
- *What is the life span for each field type and what are the replacement costs?* – Mr. Eddy reported that the life span for natural and synthetic fields are the same 10-12 years and replacement cost are: natural turf field \$350,000, synthetic turf field \$350,000-\$400,000 in today dollars.
- *What maintenance is required for synthetic turf fields?* – Mr. Eddy reported that synthetic field construction costs include the maintenance equipment, a groomer and a sweeper. Depending on use the field should be groomed every 4-6 weeks and localized sweeping performed more often at high, repetitive use areas. The construction assemblies of synthetic turf field were reviewed and as well as options for field layout to optimize use.
- *What will the current project budget support?* - Mr. Dunlap noted that the current project budget includes approximately \$6.0 million in site costs as an allowance above the MSBA site cap eligible grant for the project. This allowance will provide for some basic amenities required to support the building such a site drives and parking areas, and other local community needs such as tennis courts, play field construction, site lighting and other site improvements. The exact assignment of scope and costs is part of what is

being developed through working group, Committee, and local community meetings and advancement of schematic design documents.

First and second floor plans were presented with advancement of space allocations developed through Working Group sessions and meetings with School Department user groups. These user group meetings will continue next week to provide greater detail on the building's individual spaces.

D. Budget Update

Ms. Mahoney reported that there was one invoice received this month:

- Ai3 Invoice 00011E-1301.00 in the amount of \$939.40 for Feasibility Study Traffic Study Services.

The invoice was posted as expended on the budget report and based on the invoice submitted the project is tracking below budget.

E. General Business

Mr. Testa reported that the project information brochure titled, "Did You Know?" is finalized and will be distributed at upcoming community meetings. Copies of the pamphlet are available for distribution. Members are encouraged to submit ideas for future editions to the pamphlet.

F. Schedule for Future Meetings

Mr. Testa reported that project presentation and discussions are scheduled with community sports organizations on March 12, 2014 at 6:30 P.M., at the Abington Police Headquarters Community Room and March 11, 2014 at the meeting of Abington's Rotary Club.

Committee members discussed the schedule for future meetings and agreed to schedule the next Building Committee meeting on Thursday, April 3, 2014, 6 P.M., at the Abington Police Headquarters Community Room.

Mr. Testa reminded Building Committee members that the next project working session will be conducted on Friday, March 7, 2014 at 7:30 A.M. at the Superintendent's Office.

G. Adjournment

VOTED: on motion of Mr. Reilly, seconded by Ms. Bailey, the members of the committee unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 7:49 P.M.

Meeting Handouts:

Agenda for March 6, 2014 meeting

Draft Minutes School Building Committee: 2/4/14

KBA Total Project Budget 3/6/14

Ai3's Presentation to the Abington Building Committee March 6, 2014

Abington School Building Committee "Did You Know" pamphlet