



State College Area School District

Districtwide Facilities Master Plan Steering Committee Park Forest Middle School Tuesday, February 20, 2024 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Brown convened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and thanked everyone for participating in the Districtwide Facilities Master Plan process. He introduced Mr. Jeff Straub and Ms. Madison Renna from Crabtree Rohrbaugh and Associates and Mr. Mike Fisher and Mr. David Parmelee from the district's facilities office. He noted that the district will not only be embarking on a new facility for the Park Forest Middle School, but also mapping out a 20 year facility needs plan for the entire district which will include: system replacements, deferred maintenance projects, roofing, painting, HVAC, lighting, transportation/bus routes, athletic fields, playground facilities, while exploring sustainable options. The current focus, however, is Park Forest Middle School.

Mount Nittany Elementary School

Mr. Straub provided an overview of the Mount Nittany Elementary addition, which is approximately one year ahead of PFMS. The preface of the project is to expand educational programs with learning support and special education throughout the district. The team has completed the schematic design and has moved into design development. Engineers are starting to engage in structural, mechanical, and electrical with a goal of an early fall bid proposal. The expansion will entail a 40,000 sq ft addition and include six core classrooms, a cafeteria, and a new entrance at an estimated \$20 million project cost.

Park Forest Middle School

Park Forest is currently in the feasibility study phase and will be a year long deliberate process along with an additional year long design process. Mr. Straub reviewed the pros and cons of the three district-owned properties under consideration:

1. Additions and renovations to existing facility.
2. New construction SCASD property across Valley Vista Drive.
3. New construction SCASD property adjacent to PFMS and PFE.

Overall Discussion/Inquiries

- Has a geological study been conducted of options 2 and 3?
- Is this a process of elimination of the options or will there be a scoring matrix?
- Projected cost estimates for each option.
- Stormwater management approaches to existing building.
- Building neglect of existing site.
- PlanCon process and the evaluation of the existing site.
- Percentage of walkers at PFMS (743 students / 75 walkers).

Small Group Breakout Discussion

Site Option 1:

- Total gutting of parts of existing building.
- Mitigation for areas not already renovated.
- ADA requirements.
- Inability to enlarge some spaces in existing footprint.
- Can School Drive be taken back from township?
- PFE expansion space.
- Can part of the existing building remain if sites 2 or 3 are selected?
- Parking challenges. Upper parking lot is unsafe; steep snow/ice; not well lit.
- 8' stormwater pipe – flooding. Can drainage be improved?
- How can natural light get to all classrooms:
- How and when will instruction take place during construction?
- Timeline – longer than other options (additional cost).
- More information needed; not much confidence with this information only.
- Overhaul of current site – insurance cost and liability risks.

Site Option 2:

- Land development in space surrounding “new” campus.
- Traffic light on Valley Vista / Little Lion Drive?
- One access point for all traffic (pro and con)
- Where will infrastructure come from? Plumbing, electric, etc.
- What happens to current space if this option is chosen?
- Little to no impact to students and teachers.
- Only one exit; multiple entries.
- Current infrastructure in the development area.
- Kids and public park.
- Disappointment over loss of walker (all busers)
- No student disruption during construction.
- Most flexible for new construction. More linear timeline.
- Plan for current building? Fields? Keep tennis courts?
- Circleville Park – parents will park there.
- Acreage limited – may not be able to expand in the future.

Site Option 3:

- Can SCASD own School Drive? It is a public road.
- Can the building be placed differently on the site (closer to the road)?
- What happens to existing PFMS?
- Impact on surrounding neighborhoods.
- Horrible traffic. Area/pickup time. Playing fields – parent pickup.
- Trees removed. Tree roots, steep slope.
- Recess access to fields.
- Is proximity of two schools a pro and con?
- Ability for future expansion?
- Water issues with these fields.
- Elementary students (and walkers) impacted by construction.
- Ensure walking path to PFE.
- BIG concerns about this location.

Mr. Brown advised that the district will continue to communicate with the steering committee via email until its next meeting on April 18 at 6:00 p.m. Tonight's information will be used to inform the upcoming community forums as well as the board meetings in March. Mr. Brown is hoping to move to a down select process when the district feels there is enough evidence. He also noted that enrollment projections will also be part of the process to make certain the district has the capacity to house all of the students at each of the sites under consideration. An email will be forthcoming that will provide links to the various project sites.

The meeting ended at 7:40 p.m.

Lynn Tressler
Recording Secretary