

November 10, 2016

FACILITY STUDY COMMITTEE: REPORT AND FINAL RECOMMENDATION



LOGANVILLE-SPRINGFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
UPGRADING (RENOVATION/ADDITION) VS. NEW BUILDING

SUMMARY

As part of an on-going examination and analysis of the Loganville-Springfield Elementary School, and in consideration for actions to utilize Bond Funds which are currently included in our tax rate, the School was evaluated to determine which approach -- upgrading (renovation/addition) or building new on site -- would meet the district's long-range educational and facilities goals.

Based on enrollment projections, preliminary Educational Specifications were developed and applied to both upgrade and new build approaches with a building program of 100,000 square feet. The examination process included on-site visits, physical condition analysis, evaluation of the existing school and its program capacity and fit with the District's educational delivery standards, and other required components of Pennsylvania's Planning and Construction Workbook (PlanCon) A and B process which may permit reimbursement of a percentage of construction costs to the District.

PLANNING PROCESS

At its **September 2015** Team of 10 Workshop, the Dallastown Board of School Directors authorized the formation of a Loganville-Springfield E. S. Facility Study Committee. The Committee, chaired by Board Vice President Ronald Blevins, was assisted by Superintendent Dr. Ronald Dyer, and was comprised of community representatives, teachers, administrators, the principal, and Loganville-Springfield parents. *[Appendix A.]*

The Committee met eleven (11) times throughout the 2015-16 school year. During initial meetings, the Committee considered demographic data, current floor plans and site maps (which included an addition in the 1970's), programmatic usage, deficiencies, instructional and curricular trends, articles on creative methods and quality elements in new elementary school design, and pre- and post-visitation perceptions. Members also toured the Intermediate School.

At its **November 18, 2015** meeting, the Committee created a list of building 'deficiencies' and weighted those areas receiving scores of 10 or more which included:

- proximity of motel (traffic and safety concerns)
- office area to include office, health suite, and conference rooms
- open classroom design (need defined learning spaces)
- layout and floor plan
- classrooms (need to increase number)
- no maker space classrooms
- inadequate classroom storage
- lack of grade level common areas
- front entrance (safety and flow)
- technology (need to increase infrastructure)
- playground too close to parking lot

- age of plumbing
- bathrooms (fixtures need upgraded)
- windows (need for more natural light, upgraded)
- roof leaks
- lack of a sprinkler system

During **December, 2015 and January, 2016**, site visitation committees were selected to tour recently built or renovated elementary schools in York County, Lancaster County, and Harford County, MD. Those schools were: Wallace Elementary, Paradise Elementary, Hambright Elementary, Shrewsbury Elementary, Friendship Elementary, Clearview Elementary, Baresville Elementary, Yorkshire Elementary, Valley View Elementary and Ebb Valley Elementary. *[Appendix B]* Features of these schools – both pro and con – were presented by each site visitation committee in February.

Also in **February 2016**, after a selection process involving three firms, Site Design Concepts (SDC) was retained to perform a Site Feasibility Review to consider site features and limitations for three (3) options: renovation and expansion, demolition of a portion with re-construction and an expansion, and a new school. The consultants also considered a playground, playing fields and traffic/parking flow while examining zoning, utilities, and stormwater management, and presented a report on March 30, 2016.

On **March 16, 2016**, concurrent with the work of SDC, committee groups worked through these two (2) activities:

Activity 1: “Major Requirements” to be added or eliminated based on enlightenment through various building visitations. *[Appendix C]*

Activity 2: “Burning Questions” to build consensus on key issues surrounding upgrade (renovation/addition) or new building options as reflected in the Minutes that follow:

- The **burning questions and outcomes** included:
 - *Should we maintain a library/media center?*
 - Yes! Sub-rooms with moveable walls and partitions should be included
 - *Should renovation/new construction be built “up” or “out”?*
 - Split level school is ideal.
 - Wide staircases (balanced, comfortable, not overwhelming)
 - *Should we have a separate multi-purpose room or cafeteria/gymnasium?*
 - Cafeteria separate from gymnasium. The cafeteria should have a stage designed with acoustics and appropriate sound system.
 - Cafeteria separate from gymnasium. The cafeteria should have a non-skid floor with screen and serve multiple functions. The gymnasium should have a stage with wooden floors and built in seats (similar to Paradise Elementary School).
 - Cafeteria separate from gymnasium.
 - *Should we construct gang bathrooms (multiple stalls/sinks) or separate classroom bathrooms?*
 - Plenty of gang bathrooms with the exception of constructing classroom bathrooms should a pre-school section be added.
 - Classroom bathrooms should be sound proofed.

- Gang bathrooms should have a visible hand wash area.
- Adult restrooms should be positioned in the front of the school.
- Sink/water in each classroom is needed (“wet space”)
- Consideration should be made to “rough in” plumbing in each classroom should the gang bathroom designed be implored.
- *Should we only consider energy efficiency or strive for energy efficiency certification?*
 - We should not seek certification. Instead we should ensure due diligence related to energy-efficiency concepts.

On **April 13, 2016**, the Committee then considered the viability of all three options by looking at major design features, possible sacrifices and construction challenges as reflected in the Minutes that follow:

Each team was assigned one of the three options. They were asked to consider:

- *What would be the major design features?*
- *What “requirements” that were previously agreed to by the committee would have to be sacrificed?*
- *What challenges would be presented during the construction period?*
- *Other relevant factors.*

The teams deliberated and then reported as follows:

Option 1 – Spruce up existing facility and add a minor addition:

- Features/Design:
 - Phases
 - Patchwork
 - Incongruent
 - Eliminate open classrooms
 - Band aid
 - Focus would be on infrastructure and would not enhance educational excellence
- Sacrifices:
 - Infrastructure stays the same
 - Energy efficiency
 - Equity
 - “Wasted Money”
 - Lack of space (gym, cafeteria, library, office, nurse, etc.)
 - Limited safety enhancements
 - Limited community access
- Staying open during construction
 - Possible but not plausible
 - Highly disruptive
 - Would have to be highly coordinated
- Viable option? **No**

Option 2 - Extensive renovation and major expansion

- Features/Design:
 - Increase size of specialist rooms
 - Would utilize scenarios 1 or 5 from engineer's report
 - Extra classrooms
 - Upgrade security/safety
 - Ability to put all community access in front
 - Chevron parking
 - Upgraded admin. areas
 - More gang bathrooms
 - Classroom storage
 - Could keep existing parking
- Sacrifices:
 - Flexibility of design
 - Limited options on building location
 - Cost of fixing plumbing and other infrastructure
- Staying open during construction
 - Numerous challenges listed
 - Highly unlikely
- Viable option? **Yes**

Option 3 - Build a new school

- Features/Design:
 - Build to suit
 - Total flexibility (with budget)
 - Efficiency
 - New warranties
 - Full continuity
 - Possibility of future expansion
 - Less risk than tying into existing facility
- Sacrifices:
 - Goodwill within community
 - Transition/distraction
 - Financial impact
 - Traffic concerns
- Staying open during construction
 - Possible depending on location
- Building options
 - Scenarios #2,3,4,6,7 from engineer's reports
 - Investigate neighboring properties
- Viable option? **Yes**

The District also selected Crabtree, Rohrbaugh, and Associates, an architectural firm, to translate the Site Design Concepts review into schematic site and floor plan drafts, which also included a district-wide feasibility study, and the pros and cons and projected costs for each of the three options.

Concurrent with the aforementioned activities in April, the PA Legislature enacted legislation that created a Planning and Construction Workbook (PlanCon) Commission. The purpose of the Commission would be to study current legislation and PlanCon processes and, if applicable, to make a recommendation on streamlining the processes and funding parameters.

The legislation also included a ‘moratorium’ on any building projects submitted after May 15, 2016. Given that information, the L-S Facility Study Committee and Crabtree Rohrbaugh collaborated with District administration to formulate a project recommendation at the **May 11, 2016** committee meeting. It included the state’s PlanCon Workbook Parts A and B requirements for Board consideration and possible action.

On **May 12, 2016**, the Board did accept the non-binding recommendation for “Option 3” (new building). The project, along with PlanCon A and B components, was then submitted to the appropriate office at the Pennsylvania Department of Education on Friday, May 13th, ahead of the deadline. As required by the Board of School Directors and the state’s PlanCon requirements, the design recommendations were developed in response to a detailed analysis of the current and projected educational programs, a comprehensive evaluation of the existing building conditions, and a determination of facilities necessary to support future enrollment and programs.

2016-17 School Year

On **September 16, 2016**, Superintendent Dr. Ronald Dyer, Business Manager Donna Devlin, Executive/Board Secretary Lisa Kirby, and CRA Architect/Director of Design Rick LeBlanc, met with James Vogel, Architectural Consultant for PDE’s Division of Budget and School Facilities, to review the District’s PlanCon A and B submission and future PlanCon requirements. There were two (2) key findings:

- The project is site specific (i.e., the building must remain on the site of the current school per the PlanCon A and B submission).
- Prior to July 1, 2019, the District must first have (a) PDE’s written approval of *PlanCon Part F, Construction Documents*, and (b) subsequent signed construction contracts.

The Committee also reconvened on **September 28, 2016** for a preliminary view of District finances and possible limitations before revisiting all three building options. After review, the Committee re-affirmed that “Option 3” (new building) would be its strong recommendation. It then formed a Sub-committee, which met on October 18, 2016, to complete this *Report and Final Recommendation* document which received full-committee deliberation and approval on **October 26, 2016**.

Sub-committee members included:

- Co-Chairs: Dr. Ronald Dyer and Katie Herrington
- Parents: Melinda Svec and Jen Baumgartner
- Teachers: Barb Myers and Lisa Buer
- Administrators: Kelly Kessler and Donna Devlin
- Community Members: Ron Tombesi and Roger Coleman

The Sub-committee also provided this **Table: Summary of Considerations:**

CONSIDERATIONS	UPGRADE (RENOVATION/ADDITION)	NEW BUILDING
Temporary Housing	Phased construction could allow continuous use with the potential need for a few modular classrooms.	Temporary housing (6-8 modular classrooms) for an estimated one school year.
Moving & Disruption	Greater disruption to the educational process - requires movement of functions because of multiple phases.	Less disruption to the educational process - consistent placement throughout the school year.
Community	Impacts on other school buildings, such as special events, fundraisers and transportation schedules. Neighbors impacted by construction noise.	Impacts on other school buildings, such as special events, fundraisers and transportation schedules. Neighbors impacted by construction noise.
Phasing	Complicated	Least impact
Schedule	Longer construction schedule	One year (estimated)
Bus and Car Parking	Inadequate space for buses and parking in front of school; visitor parking remote from main entrance	Greater potential for improvement in front of school: 20 busses/58 cars
Program	Does not fully meet some current and future programmatic needs due to existing building constraints	Fully meets current Educational Specifications and permits future enhancements
Maintenance, Operations and Resource Impact	Major plumbing, HVAC, and electrical needs; lengthy circulation system; building orientation is not ideal; will need Asbestos abatement and possible mold or other remediation if found	Up to Code; will be more efficient and purposeful usage for current and future needs including technology infrastructure; adjacencies significantly improved and ideal building orientation
Site Safety/Accessibility and Traffic Flow	Upgrade would improve but not fully resolve all outdated safety standards (circa 1953 and 1970); would need to retrofit for ADA compliance; possible removal of the access road which would improve traffic safety; PennDOT will conduct a Traffic Impact Study.	Up to Code and ADA compliant; public spaces centrally located (more viable for community use or emergency shelter, etc.); possible removal of the access road which would improve traffic safety; PennDOT will conduct a Traffic Impact Study.
Future Expansion	Few expansion options due to existing layout and site constraints; may not fully address projected enrollment and services which might be mandated, such as preschool, social services, etc.	Includes future expansion options for projected enrollment and services which might be mandated, such as preschool, social services, etc.; would allow for expansion of in-house Special Education services.
Cost/Value	Some initial savings: however, risk factors with (a) existing building components which are over 60 years old and (b) other upgrades which may be needed in the near future; hidden/unknown costs.	All components are new and warranted. For both options, the District's existing debt structure/tax rate includes projected costs (i.e., existing bonds will be issued).
Staff	With multiple locations there would be collaboration limitations, time/travel constraints for specialists, and complexities with administrative oversight.	Limitations will be determined based on new school construction plan and schedule

RECOMMENDATION

Reflecting an integrative and collaborative process that included site and programmatic needs analyses, detailed examination of options, and examination of enrollment and other pertinent data, the Committee unanimously agreed that **Option #3 “Design and build a new elementary school on current site”** would be its recommendation for Board of School Directors consideration to replace the current Loganville-Springfield Elementary School.

Pending outcome of the Board consideration process, the Loganville-Springfield Facility Study Committee will be placed ‘on hold’ -- but is available for further meetings should the Board request. The Committee is poised to reconstitute itself as the Loganville-Springfield E.S. Educational Specifications Committee, expanding membership to include representatives from our curriculum & instruction department, library/technology, gifted and special education and resource teachers, guidance, art, music, physical education, and cafeteria, custodial and transportation services.

Appendix A: Names of Facility Study Committee members

Appendix B: School/Site Visits (locations/dates)

Appendix C: Major Requirements (before and after school/site visits)

APPENDIX A:

LOGANVILLE-SPRINGFIELD E.S. FACILITY STUDY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISTRICT ASSOCIATION
1	Bahn	Duane	Admin - Former Director of Buildings & Grounds
2	Caffrey	Kathy	Admin - Transportation Coordinator
3	Devlin	Donna	Admin - Business Manager
4	Doll	Dr. Joshua	Admin - Assistant Superintendent
5	Dyer	Dr. Ronald	Admin - Superintendent
6	Eimerbrink	Harry ("Hap")	Admin - Director of Buildings & Grounds
7	Fisher	Troy	Admin - Director of Employee Relations & Administrative Services
8	Knaub	Corey	Admin - Building & Grounds, Maintenance Representative
9	Blevins	Ronald	Board Vice President (Chair)
10	Blevins	Chris	Citizen
11	Coleman	Roger	Citizen - Jacobus Borough Council President
12	Tombesi	Ronald	Citizen - Loganville Borough Council President
13	Bentzel	Steve	Ex-officio, DASD Board Member
14	Hartman	John	Ex-officio, DASD Board Member
15	Heistand	Sue	Ex-officio, DASD Board Member
16	Lytle	Bill	Ex-officio, DASD Board Member
17	Nicholson	Dr. Thomas	Ex-officio, DASD Board Member
18	Noll, Jr.	Michael	Ex-officio, DASD Board Member
19	Potter, Jr.	Butch	Ex-officio, DASD Board President
20	Trout	Hilary	Ex-officio, DASD Board Member
21	Baumgartner	Jennifer	Parent
22	Herrington	Katie	Parent
23	Mastromatteo	Jillian	Parent
24	Smith	Christa	Parent
25	Svec	Melinda	Parent
26	Woodall	Candy	Parent
27	Carl	Scott	Principal through 2015-16 SY
28	Kessler	Kelly	Principal beginning 2016-17 SY
29	Lattuca	Tracey	Teacher - Grade 1
30	Myers	Barb	Teacher - Grade 2
31	Messina	Katie	Teacher - Grade 3
32	Buer	Lisa	Teacher - Kindergarten
33	Egolf	Jessica	Teacher - Specialist

SITE VISITS OF THE LOGANVILLE-SPRINGFIELD FACILITY STUDY COMMITTEE

DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT
York Suburban	South Western	Hanover	Southern	Pequea Valley	Penn Manor	West York	Carroll County	Pennsbury
SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)	SCHOOL(S)
Yorkshire El.	Baresville El.	Clearview El.	Shrewsbury El.	Paradise El.	Hambright El.	Wallace El.	Ebb Valley El.	Oxford Valley El.
Valley View El.	(same day visits)		Friendship El.	(same day visits)				(this visit is tentative)
CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON	CHAIRPERSON
Scott Carl	Ron Blevins	Ron Blevins	**Bill Lytle	*Barb Myers	*Barb Myers	Josh Doll	Melinda Svec	TBD if needed
DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE
Jan. 28th	Jan. 20 th – plan for most of the day to visit both sites		Jan. 15 th	Jan. 13 th – all day trip to both sites (approx. 8:00 – 4:30)		Jan. 11th	Jan. 22 nd	
Plan for the majority of the day to visit both schools			Plan for the majority of the day to visit both schools			This will be a PM trip (approx. 2:00 – 4:00)	This will be an AM trip (should return by early afternoon)	
MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:	MEMBERS:
*Tracey Lattuca	*Jessica Egolf	*Jessica Egolf	*Lisa Buer	*Lisa Buer	*Lisa Buer	*Katie Messina	*Tracey Lattuca	TBD if needed
**Hap Eimerbrink	**Corey Knaub	**Corey Knaub	R. Blevins	**Hap Eimerbrink	**Hap Eimerbrink	**Corey Knaub	**Corey Knaub	
C. Smith	C. Smith	C. Smith	J.Baumgartner	R. Blevins	R. Blevins	R. Blevins	C. Smith	
R. Blevins	J. Baumgartner	J. Baumgartner	S. Heistand	J. Baumgartner	J. Baumgartner	J. Baumgartner	R. Blevins	
J.Mastromatteo	S. Heistand	S. Heistand	C. Blevins	K. Herrington	K. Herrington	S. Heistand	J.Mastromatteo	
K. Herrington	S. Carl	S. Carl	K. Herrington	S. Bentzel	S. Bentzel	K. Herrington	S. Heistand	
S. Bentzel	C. Blevins	C. Blevins	**C. Knaub	**C. Knaub	**C. Knaub	B. Lytle	K. Herrington	
**C. Knaub	K. Herrington	K. Herrington	R. Dyer	B. Potter	B. Potter	R. Dyer	B. Potter	
R. Dyer	R. Dyer	R. Dyer	B. Potter	M. Svec	M. Svec	B. Potter	**Hap Eimerbrink	
M. Svec	B. Potter	B. Potter	R. Tombesi			**Hap Eimerbrink		
	**Hap Eimerbrink	**Hap Eimerbrink	**Hap Eimerbrink					

*teacher

**knowledge of facilities (construction, HVAC, etc.)

1/7/2016

APPENDIX C:

**Loganville-Springfield Facilities Study Committee
Major Requirements March 2016**

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO SCHOOL VISITS			ADDITIONS/DELETIONS AFTER SCHOOL VISITS
Group A 12/2/15	Group B 12/2/15	Group C 12/2/15	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 – 10 additional classrooms needed providing for 2 more classrooms per grade level plus 2 for special education. The grade classrooms should be clustered with a small common area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 additional classrooms the same size as the original rooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 more classrooms with possibility of building up or out 	<p>Added Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large welcoming lobby/restricted access ▪ Chevron bus parking with cover ▪ Separate area for parent pickup ▪ Large storage under stage ▪ Split level school ▪ Cluster “public areas” together ▪ Locker type storage ▪ Water fountain/bottle filler ▪ Specialist area with common area (flow of design) ▪ Designated PTO area ▪ Bathroom which is near playground ▪ Natural lighting ▪ Clarity (#/size) ▪ Outside fields and learning spaces ▪ Double “buzz in” security entrances ▪ Café/gymnasium ▪ District centric vs community needs ▪ Community gym space for common use ▪ Gang bathrooms visible for management ▪ Designated areas for severe weather ▪ Energy-efficiency ▪ Metal roof ▪ Inviting colors ▪ Security light/notification system ▪ Lots of storage ▪ Common area for each grade level <p>Eliminated Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Separate staff/public parking (not a priority)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small classroom extensions needed • Common gathering area • Ample specialists’ areas • Teacher work room per grade level • Common storage areas with one per grade level • Expanded unified arts area with ample storage • Inclusive guidance area • Separate nursing station • Large, secure administrative office area with room for 2 principals, a separate reception area, public and staff restrooms, along with ample meeting and conference rooms • Appropriately-sized gym and cafeteria (suited to building capacity), complete with dividers and stage in one of the areas • Protected playgrounds • Separate traffic patterns for busses and parent drop-offs • Isolated public and staff parking • Established receiving area with dock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 -10 small group instruction rooms • Additional space for teacher workrooms • Full size gym with seating • Expanded cafeteria • Larger custodial closets • Expanded health room separate from office • Conference meeting rooms • Practice and storage rooms for music programs • Expanded main office • 2 – 3 special education rooms • Expanded special areas (art, library, music) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slightly larger classrooms than current classrooms with storage • At least 2 expanded workrooms with copiers and ample storage in each • At least 4 maker spaces • Individual small group instruction rooms for each grade level • Full size gym with ability to divide • Additional “special classroom” for Days 1 -6 cycle 	