



STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6

May 10, 2022

**MONTGOMERY AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
DISTRICT-WIDE FACILITY STUDY**

CRA Project No. 3545

In Attendance:

Representing

Tony Wright., School Board President
Paul Stryker Jr., School Board Member
John DeSantis, School Board Member
Gary Yocum, School Board Member
Daphne Bowers, Superintendent
Grant Evangelisti, Business Manager
Kelly Concini, Director of Instructional Tech. & Curriculum
Joe Stoudt, High School Principal
Karen Snyder, Elementary Principal
Jason Ottman
Scott Cousin, Principal/Senior Project Manager

Montgomery Area School District (MASD)
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Montgomery Area School District
Community Member
Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates (CRA)

On the above date at 5:00 pm, a meeting was held at the administrative offices of the Montgomery Area School District to discuss the district-wide facility study. The following represents the writers understanding of the issues and pertinent items of discussion at the meeting.

Existing Building Tour

1. The committee toured the existing building to see firsthand the issues noted in the existing facility conditions assessment and deficiencies outlined in the educational and functional needs assessment.

Updated Construction Options

2. Updated construction options were developed to fit within the district's borrowing capacity.
3. The following cost reductions were made to the existing facility infrastructure improvements. This resulted in reducing renovation construction costs by \$12.5 million.
 - a. Eliminated work that is recently completed or planned to be completed in the near future.
 - b. Eliminated low priority upgrades – LED lighting & Controls, interior finishes in some locations, enclosure of the satellite data equipment, and upgrade of the sound/clock/intercom systems.
 - c. Deferred some items for future maintenance to be competed out of yearly capital budgets – Paving, re-roofing, and replacement of built-in casework with moveable furniture solutions.

4. The following educational program modifications were made:
 - a. Reduce the size of a typical classroom to 850 sf.
 - b. Refined Technology Education program and space needs.
 - c. Refined Special Education program and space needs.
 - d. Reduce quantity and size of collaboration spaces.
 - e. Developed efficient schematic designs for each option, reducing the gross square feet of new construction.

5. The following revised options were reviewed:

Option 1 – Upgrades to existing facility infrastructure only

- This option remained unchanged..

Option 2 – Comprehensive renovations and additions to the existing K-12 building.

- A schematic floor plan and site plan were reviewed.
- Total estimated project costs: \$36 - \$40 Million

Option 3 – New 7-12 building at the MAACC, comprehensive renovations at the existing K-6 building

- Schematic floor plans and site plans were reviewed.
- Option 3 was separated into two phases with the first phase being the new 7-12 addition at the MAACC and the second phase being renovation of the existing K-6 building. The second phase would be completed in the future under a separate borrowing effort.
- Total estimated project costs for 7-12 first phase project: \$34-\$38 million.
- Two sub-options were developed for the Elementary second phase. Sub-option 3a incorporated comprehensive renovations to the existing building and sub-option 3b incorporated facility infrastructure upgrades only to the existing building.
- Total estimated project costs for K-6 second phase project (3a): \$9-\$10 million.
- Total estimated project costs for K-6 second phase project (3b): \$14-\$15 million.

6. The committee made the following comments regarding the revised options:
 - a. With option 1, the district will be in the same place they are now in 10 years.
 - b. Option 2 give the district what is needed but locks them into a restricted site. If enrollment would increase, there would be no where for the students to go.
 - c. Option 3 is ideal and is where we need to go, but we cannot afford the second phase for the elementary school.
 - d. There has been an increase in special needs students and those spaces should be closely evaluated to make sure the need is met.
7. The next step will be to present the revised options along with the full study to the school board and public.

The above represents the writer's understanding of the issues discussed. Any misrepresentations or miscommunications in these minutes should be conveyed to Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates within five (5) days receipt of these minutes.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Cousin, AIA, LEED AP®
Principal | Senior Project Manager
Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates - Architects
P: 717.458.0272 C: 717.557.8382
E: scousin@cra-architects.com

Cc: Meeting Attendees