

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
FOR THE PURPOSE OF ARCHITECT PRESENTATIONS**

Thursday, September 30, 2010

4:30 p.m.

Board Room at the Education Service Center

BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT PRESENT:

Marianne Donnelly, Board Chair
Janie Gebhardt, Vice Chair
Frank Rash, Board Clerk

John Sargent, Board Member (Excused)
Jackie Cranor, Board Member
Mary Vagner, Superintendent

OTHERS PRESENT:

Architect Selection Committee:
Bart Reed, Director of Business Operations
Bob Devine, Director of Secondary Education
Keith Barnes, Alameda Center, Principal
Kenneth Wright, Maintenance Coordinator

Call to Order/Welcome and Statement of Purpose

Chair Donnelly welcomed everyone and called the Special Meeting/Work Session to order at 4:34 p.m. She said the purpose of the Special Meeting/Work Session was to view presentations from architectural firms and solicit feedback for the Architect Selection Committee. Mr. Reed said there were three finalists labeled 1 – 3. He said each presentation would be individualized to the firm but the format would be the same. He said each firm would have 20 minutes to make their presentation and 5 minutes for questions following the presentation. He said if a firm finished its presentation early it could use the remaining time for further Q&A. He said there would be 10 minutes between presentations for take down and set up. He said a comment sheet was provided to the Board and Committee members for each presentation. He said there was a general comments section at the end of each comment sheet. He said following the meeting the comment sheets would be gathered and reviewed by the Architect Selection Committee. He said the committee would present a recommendation to the Board based on the comments and feedback from that night's meeting. Ms. Cranor asked when a final decision would be made. Mr. Reed said he anticipated the committee would be ready with a recommendation for the October 19, Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Vagner noted that Mr. Sargent was not present but had reviewed the proposals and would also submit comment sheets to the Architectural Selection Committee.

Architect Presentations to the Board and Selection Committee/Q&A

Jensen Barnard Architects, Inc.

4:40 – 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Reed introduced Jensen/Barnard Architects, Inc. He said it was a local firm. He said the District had used the firm's services on past projects. Mr. Jensen said he would give background on the company and the team. He said the firm was located in Pocatello. He said the team had worked together since 1994 as employees, employers and now as partners. He said the firm worked with Nielson Engineering, another local company. He said the firm's experience with education was with interior remodels, fixtures, exterior, new construction and had even worked on Century High School. He said the firm had also redone the Pocatello High School gymnasium. He said the firm's project budget had ranged from \$250,000 to \$52 million. He said the team was successful in tracking project budgets. He reviewed a past project that started off as an empty shell and after working with local artisans revamped the old building to compliment the Old Towne community. He said another project was working on turning old student housing at ISU into classrooms. He said the Pocatello High School gym was the most successful project he had worked on. He said it was a great addition to community and education. He said he was the project architect for Century High School. He reviewed a project in Utah that was focused on using alternative

sources for electricity and conservation measures. He said the project used windows and skylights and shading devices to maximize natural daylight. He said Neilson Engineering had done a great job working with them on the project. He said the firm was currently working with the Cassia School District and were debating whether to go with a remodel or tearing down and replacing the building. He said another project was working on the Oakley High School which had three separate facilities. He said the school wanted all three buildings connected with the addition of a gymnasium. He said all of the schools had a demand for more space. He reviewed another project that had not been a feasible remodel and the firm proposed taking out the middle section and connecting the two ends. He said the remodel had not been possible due to a Chevron gas line running under the building. He said the solution was to create a campus quad that kept the two end buildings separate but together as a cohesive area. He reviewed another project that had combined a District's Education Center, food service, alternate programs and media center together. He said an important part of any project was good communication and discussion how a project would operate. He said the team brought creativity and problem solving skills. He said the team would take time at the front end to create a design team consisting of administrative staff, the School Board and anyone else with pertinent information to the project. He said an example would be having Ken Wright as part of team who would have relevant input for the project engineers. He said initially the goal was to develop a program outlining needs and wants. He said the firm had a general idea of the budget the District was operating under. He said after outlining needs and wants the team would compare them with the project budget and address needs first and use any excess dollars to address wants. He said the design development was continually refined. He said once the team decided all needs and wants had been met to the best ability a final blueprint was created and work began. He said the firm's team would visit the project site once a week. He said when program cost and quality met it was the most successful. He said the firm's objective was to make sure the client got what they wanted and had a good working relationship. He said a good contractor identified issues in advance and was proactive. He said the team did its own drawings and specs. He said the team talked directly with the contractor when there was a problem, came up with a solution and brought it back to the client. He said the team kept minutes of each meeting. He said the team had bi weekly meetings and were proactive in problem solving and would do that with what could potentially be this project. He showed the Board a preliminary project design idea from the input he had received so far. He said the project design could be adjusted when changes were made. He thanked the Board for its time and said he would really like to work on the project. He said he was raised in the community and was grateful to be able to make a living in this profession. He said his team was local and welcomed the opportunity to work in the area. Mr. Barnes said he spoke with a PE teacher and said PE was of great concern for the alternate program. He said the new building had no room for a track and very little green space. He asked how big a multi-purpose room could be. Mr. Jensen said an initial estimate could be around 30' x 70'. He said there was room to expand that within the budget. He said there were a lot of options in the open building space. He said currently there was a fence all the way around the perimeter but could be developed into asphalt or expanding the green area. He said an important piece to remember with the alternate school was that it was not only for kids that were in trouble and there was a need to make the space look inviting for all students. Ms. Cranor asked how big the current green area was. Mr. Jensen said it was about 24' wide. He noted that preliminary design was just an idea to show the Board the firm had vision and what it could create within the space. Ms. Donnelly asked if the firm had worked on any other green buildings other than the Wasatch building. Mr. Jensen said it was important to note that creating a green building automatically added an additional 25% to the project budget. He said that was one of the items the Board would need to consider. He noted that white roofs were considered green. He said one of the best ways to conserve energy was to analyze the energy demand and usage. He said the project was a blank pallet but the firm wanted to be conscious of tax payer dollars and give the District a nice facility. Mr. Wright asked if the firm's preliminary concept had a ballpark figure. He said he had not done any cost analysis at that point. Ms. Cranor asked if the design included a commons area. He said the design included a commons area in the middle that was 20' x 60'. Mr. Reed asked if the firm would use a construction manager. Mr. Jensen said the most cost efficient way to go was to do a competitive bid. He said a critical element was to have a forward thinking project superintendent. He said a project superintendent that could see a project two weeks in advance made a project move forward smoothly. Ms. Vagner generally a design team consists of teachers, principals and limited representation from outside. She said often the design team would describe wants as opposed to needs. She said often the architectural firm could be hearing proposals that would cost around \$5 million and asked how

the firm would cull the wants and needs of the design team and communicate that it would address their concerns without making any promises. He said first and foremost the firm worked for the School District and the tax payers. He said he understood that needs included effective lighting, instructional space, smart boards and storage space and had a good understanding of establishing needs versus wants. Ms. Vagner said it was important to the District to avoid change orders and asked Mr. Jensen what his philosophy was on the matter. He said if the firm did the front end work most change orders could be avoided but some challenges were unforeseeable. He said through good documentation and research most could be avoided. He said there was always a way to pull together to come up with a solution that could eliminate the need for a change order. Mr. Reed said he appreciated the efforts of the firm to make its presentation to the Board and their professionalism. Ms. Donnelly thanked the firm for coming and said the Board would give the presentation appropriate consideration. Mr. Rash asked if the quote submitted in the packet was final or if it would fluctuate. Mr. Jensen said it was in writing and therefore a record and the price would not change.

JHS Architects, PA

5:17 – 5:37 p.m.

Mr. Reed introduced JHS Architects, PA. to the School Board members and the members of the Architect Selection Committee. He explained the presentation process and time limits to the firm. Mr. Paul Jensen said most of the firm's presentation was visual. He reviewed the firm's projects over the past 30 years in Pocatello. He said some of the firm's past projects included the Farm Bureau building, the Sports Education Center and the District Health Center. He said after the presentation of past projects he would talk about the firm's expertise in alternative schools. He said when the firm began it started with educational work and then moved into medical buildings. He said the firm had worked on educational buildings in Blackfoot, ID and Logan, UT. He said the firm also worked on BYU-Idaho and Idaho State University. He said he had worked with Kenneth Naylor on the National Organization Committee and recently the two firms worked together on construction projects inside of the Idaho Falls LDS Temple. He said the firm had been looking to get back into educational work for the past three or four years. He said if the firm was selected for the project it would partner 50/50 with Naylor Wentworth Lund Architects. He said the team would be involved in all phases of the project the whole way through. He said there were three important elements of the project. He said one it was an old building, two the structure was fairly fragile, and three the firm had extensive experience in metal, roofing and educational buildings. He said the firm was familiar with the Stocks Building and would make sure the alternate programs had a warm safe building. He reviewed the various roofing projects the firm had worked on. He said they had worked with membrane, single ply and metal roofs. He said the firm had even done a six acre roof. Mr. Shropshire said he would talk about roofing and the firm's knowledge of alternative school. He said metal roofs established character and visual appeal. He said the firm had done a lot of metal buildings. He said the firm had previously worked on the Stock's Building when it was Anderson Lumber. He said the firm had extensive expertise with metal buildings and roofing. He reviewed previous studies from Anderson Lumber. He said the building was two structures within one. He said the far right side of the building was the only component that was not metal. He said the first study the firm conducted was to look for ways to introduce natural light. He said an early preference was to bring the light in through the center of the building and eliminate the windows on the perimeter. He said Richard Judkins would review Naylor Wentworth Lund Architect's experience with alternative school buildings. Mr. Judkins said the firm had been in business for over 55 years. He said the firm always had an education architectural focus. He said he had been with the firm for sixteen years and was the project manager on latest alternate school project. He said the firm worked well with JHS Architects. He said the firm believed that they were here to explore options for the District and look at the programs and budget it had to work with and come up with viable options to get the most out of what was available to the District. He said the firm's educational building experience included Deseret Hills High School in St. George, UT. He said it was a high school of 1,600 students and the building was concrete. He said the firm was able to come up with solutions at a less expensive rate than some of the traditional solutions. He said Dixie High School in Washington was a rebuild and the firm was able to build up. He said the firm had worked on Murray High School which was another rebuild and had physical, budget and space constraints similar to the District's project. He said the firm was accustomed to working under those types of constraints. He said the firm had worked on a 1,900 square foot alternative school in Murray, and a 27,000 sq.

foot school in St. George, UT. He said the firm was able to get natural daylight into the buildings on both projects. He said the schools had well lit entry ways and integrated technology. He said one of the firms project was an 80,000 square foot project with a slightly larger focus on natural daylight. He said the team was able to merge the commons area with the cafeteria and had experience at meeting a wide array of needs. He said the Valley High project included art rooms and kilns which could be considered for the District's project depending on its needs. He said one alternate school project even had a fitness center and a lecture hall. He said the team would work with the District to look at all available options. Mr. Shropshire said if the District decided to work with their team it would be a collaborative process and the firm would provide the best value and building for a sustainable learning environment and safe and secure campus. Ms. Cranor asked if the firm would prefer to leave the metal siding on the building. Mr. Shropshire said the firm would not come onto the project with any preconceived notions and would solicit feedback from the design committee and the Board to come up with various options. Mr. Jensen said the only input he would have is to make sure the structure was not endangered by changing the siding and would probably depend on the roof that was put on the building. Mr. Shropshire said the existing facilities roof system had some rusting. He said Anderson Lumber had chosen to go with a spray on urethane foam roofing system that needed to be recoated every 8 – 10 years. Mr. Reed asked what would a rough ball park figure would be for the project. Mr. Jensen said it could be \$3 – 12 million but would depend on the wants and needs of the project. He said the District had a workable budget for the project. Ms. Vagner asked how the firm would sort through the needs compared to the wants of the design team. Mr. Jensen said the firm would set parameters from a business standpoint based on the budget. Mr. Judkins said most districts had directors or administrators that were key people in sorting what was a want versus a need. He said the firm would discuss those items with the people who understood what the needs were. Mr. Jensen said a critical element was to use one space for multiple programs and would keep the cost down. Mr. Shropshire said typically the design team would help the firm understand the needs of the District and students but decisions would have to be made by the committee or the School Board, whichever the District decided. Ms. Vagner asked how the firm would handle any change orders. Mr. Jensen the only way to work with change orders was for the client to set a maximum dollar volume allowable per project which the firm would not be able to go over. He said sometimes there were unforeseeable surprises. Mr. Shropshire said the firm knew the building which could help in reducing any change orders. He said the firm was very detail oriented in working with the contractor to get a very accurate bid. Mr. Reed asked if the firm would utilize a construction company or a project manager. Mr. Jensen said it was always better to have a contact person for easy access, which could be someone like Mr. Wright but not necessarily another company. Ms. Cranor asked how often the firm would visit the site. Mr. Jensen said it would vary but a few times a week was ideal. Mr. Reed said he appreciated the firm coming to give its presentation and anticipated having a recommendation to the Board in October.

Plan One Architects

6:00– 6:20 p.m.

Mr. Reed explained the presentation process to Plan One Architects. Mr. Bob Heneage said he was the Principal in charge of the Idaho office. Mr. Garrett Chadwick said he was the project architect from Soda Springs. Mr. Heneage said the company was 25 years old, had 25 employees and 5 licensed architects. He said the firm was the second largest firm in the state of Wyoming and the tenth largest in Idaho. He said together the firm was a regional force. He said the team had a lot of educational experience in Idaho and Wyoming. He said the firm had worked on a lot of renovation school projects. He said the firm also had experience with renovating former retail buildings which was comparable to the District's project due to the large open warehouse type structure. Mr. Chadwick said the firm worked on Teton Middle School and High School. He said the team also did the administration remodel. He said the firm had done over 100 educational projects with a lot of repeat business. He said the some of the firms past projects included but were not limited to Buffalo High School, Rocky Mountain Elementary, Wind River Elementary, Greybull Elementary, and Lander Middle School. He said Rocky Mountain Elementary was viewed as one of the most successful educational projects in Wyoming. He said it was a well lit space and was energy efficient. He said the firm had worked on eight building in the Snake River District with some still under construction. He reviewed local letters of recommendation. He said the letters of recommendation spoke to the firms Collaborative approach, its dependability in speaking with administrators in

charge, and the teams process. He said the team believed it was important to talk to the school administrators and maintenance staff. He said the team would set preliminary goals for the project and would go through them in greater detail. He said the firm's team used charrette sessions that included a kit of parts made from card stock where the design team and the firm would sit down with the kit of parts to come up with ideas and take pictures as the session went along. He said it was a fun process. He reviewed a project that was a new build but said the process would be the same. Mr. Chadwick said the firm's process was very effective. Mr. Heneage said once the design team agreed on the final layout the firm's team would put it into Cad and bring it to the District for review. Mr. Chadwick said there was a lot of flexibility in the building and particularly for an alternative school. He showed an example of being able to close off or expand a space. He said panels and partitions were helpful in this type of a setting. He said a space could be modified with panels and partitions without additional renovation. He said storage in an educational environment was a premium and a school could never have too much. He said there were only four walls in a room so the firm's team developed a learning wall that would fit behind a white board. He said the learning wall was a hit at every school it was installed in. Mr. Heneage reviewed the Driggs City Hall project which was a large shell of a building and comparable to the Stocks Building. He reviewed multiple layouts and phases of the project and reviewed how the firm adjusted to fit the needs of the client. He said the firm was able to come up with creative ways to use the space which was a challenge with all of the columns in the building but were able to make it work. He said the Stocks Building would have similar unique challenges because of the layout of the building. He said the firm estimated a \$2.75 million budget. He said the building needed an exterior patch and paint and a roof overbuild to resolve the joined building roofing issue. He said the structure needed natural interior lighting and said a roofing overbuild would provide a great opportunity for skylights. Mr. Chadwick said the preliminary drawing was not exact but the team measured the building to the best of its ability to get a general idea of the size of the project and space it was working with. He said the team came up with some preliminary ideas to present to the Board but did not want to take away from the direction the District wanted to go. He said the building had some outstanding options. He said there was a lot of space for small classrooms, a commons and a multi-purpose area. He said it was a good idea to design long straight corridors for better monitoring in the school. He said the ability to control cost was the greatest at the front end of the project. He said the firm would work hard up front to reduce financial surprises, which was important. Mr. Heneage said he believed the firm had educational experience and a good understanding of the District's project needs. He said the firm had a great effective process that was collaborative to ensure everyone was involved and heard. He said the firm offered a fair price and loved what it did and would love to work with the District on the project. Ms. Cranor asked if the outside appearance of the building would be able to be changed. Mr. Chadwick said there was a lot to do to make it aesthetically pleasing. He said there would be window openings which would break up the large expanses of metal siding. He said the shell of the building was in relatively good shape but the firm would work with the District to create what it wanted. He said a lot could be done to improve the structure with the added openings and paint at a minimal cost. Mr. Heneage said from his preliminary understanding outside appearance was low on the priority list for the District. He said if outside appearance was a priority it could spend the money on improving the outside but would take more money from the interior as the budget would remain the same for the project. Ms. Vagner asked how the firm would handle separating needs from the wants of the design team. Mr. Heneage said the team recorded everything from the design team's input but the final decision on needs versus wants was up to the District as they were in charge of the budget. He said the firm's team would look for patterns when identifying wants and needs. Mr. Chadwick said the firm received good information from each of the programming sessions that it would bring back to the District. Mr. Reed asked how being a few hours away would affect the management of the project. Mr. Heneage said the firm was accustomed to being hours away from a project. He said the firm had just completed a project over six hours away and there were no complaints from the client in regards to contact time. He said he understood that clients needed responsiveness and the firm would give that. Mr. Chadwick said the firm worked with ESA and Payne on the electrical. Mr. Reed asked if the firm would utilize a construction manager or a clerk management. Mr. Heneage said he felt that was a Board decision and would leave it up to them. He said the firm was more than willing to work with a clerk manager. Mr. Reed thanked the firm for its presentation. He said the committee anticipated having a recommendation for the Board by October 19, 2010. Ms. Donnelly thanked the firm for its time.

Board Input

The Board of Trustees and the Architectural Selection Committee were provided with comment sheets for each firm presentation which would be taken back to the Selection Committee for review.

Adjourn

Chair Donnelly adjourned the Special Meeting/Work Session at 6:34 p.m.

APPROVED ON:

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

BY:

Secretary, Board of Trustees

Chair

ATTESTED BY:

Clerk