



October 28, 2009, 3:30 PM, Meeting held at the Searles Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room
MEETING NOTES

Committee Members Present: See attached sign-in sheet

Guests Present:

Jim Alexander	JA	Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
Nancy Goodwin	NG	Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
Regan Shields Ives	RSI	Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
Tony Hsiao	TH	Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
Gino Baroni	GB	KBA/Trident - OPM
David Breen	DBre	KBA/Trident - OPM
Mary Mahoney	MM	KBA/Trident - OPM

Item No.	Item	Description
1.	Call to Order	The meeting was called to order at 3:34 PM.
2.	Approval of meeting notes from 10/13/09	Motion made by George Kazanjian to accept the meeting notes, seconded by Arthur Nicholson. Unanimous vote in favor.
3.	Feasibility Study Progress	<p>Overview JA provided an overview of what's been done. He reminded the committee that MSBA requires that three schemes be delivered to them along with the space tabulation charts that include the proposed program space requirements. All of this information will be submitted to MSBA after this building committee meeting. FA+A has been working with developing the three schemes to prove out that the program space requirements will fit. JA indicated that one more meeting with the small program group is required to review adjacencies and to solidify program integration into the schemes. JA anticipates that by the next building committee meeting, there will be a sense that they will be heading toward one preferred scheme.</p> <p>Space discussion RSI indicated that the existing space usage information is completed and has been forwarded to Art Wagman. She reviewed the standard MSBA square foot guidelines for high schools and noted the differences with the Methuen HS program needs and indicated that they are working on space difference resolution. MSBA maximum sf allowance is 383,375 so she mentioned there may need to be some space trade offs to bring the designs in at that limit. RSI indicated that the Art programs and Teachers Offices consume a large amount of space and should be reviewed. RSI mentioned that they still have questions about space adjacencies, and with some specific ed program needs such as the Lower House (9-10) and Upper House (11-12) science, math, etc. She discussed the location and cluster of other uses including the library, administration office, teacher offices (clustered), cafeteria/kitchen (clustered) and voc ed (clustered).</p> <p>Scheme presentation TH presented a review of the three schemes: All concepts will include security monitoring and control. All will also provide an infusion of light to interior spaces by use of new light wells.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Bridge" concept – Reviewed the distribution of spaces and large program areas for core curriculum. Dining is centralized. Voc ed is in a separate area. The second floor could house the program for academic use and the Library is housed on the second floor in a separate wing. Teachers offices are centralized and the support area is on the lower level. FA+A would like to review the option of renovating the auditorium versus demolition and reconstruction of the auditorium. This scheme graphically presents the area of new construction versus renovation.

Item No.	Item	Description
3.	Feasibility Study Progress (continued)	<p>Comments about “Bridge” – Arthur Nicholson (AN) mentioned that the SPED spaces must be distributed throughout the building and Dr. Whitten stated that this is required to enable inclusion. Dr. W indicated that the SPED program may need to be pulled back because the overall square footages for SPED appears to be excessive. Robert Vogler (RV) asked if Dr. Kelleher has been involved and Dr. Whitten indicated yes, through the school administration program. RV inquired about the cost factor for a new auditorium and concerns about the educational program impact to possibly be without an auditorium during the school year. TH indicated that the difficulty in building around the auditorium (schedule and cost) will have an impact on the final scheme for the auditorium. AN commented that the Teacher’s workspace should be evaluated and consideration given to pulling away some space from classroom sizes.</p> <p>2. “Court” concept – TH indicated that this scheme provides a centralized gathering with 2 additions. The centralized gathering includes the administration, Auditorium, cafeteria, library and the academic wings are located out back. The Library/media center is a 2-story piece. The educational wings are more split due to the two wing concept. Science would be located on a third floor to allow access to the roof for a possible future lab. Thought has been given to the constructability of the third floor science to meet the program needs and to create a clear separation of the science classrooms. Teachers planning/offices are split over two floors but each are clustered.</p> <p>Comments about “Court” – Dorothy Najolia (DN) is not comfortable with the location of the science classrooms versus the Bridge Scheme and isn’t comfortable with pulling science out of the “house” scheme to separate the wings. Suzanne Lamoureux (SL) asked if the science for 9-10 and 11-12 could be placed within the two houses. GB noted the complication with splitting science and placing it in any area other than a single new building area. RV expressed safety concerns with building a third floor over an occupied space. NG indicated that this work would be addressed during phasing and would probably be done in a preliminary phase to avoid any work over an occupied area.</p> <p>3. “Street” concept – TH indicated that this provides a central gathering and he reviewed the proximity of the entry to the front of the building. The Library/media is located at the front of the building as well. A 2-story academic core is maintained and imbedded in the center of the building. Dining is pushed toward the center as well. Reviewed the separation of the new vs renovation in the building. New construction is “woven” throughout the building which could make the impact of construction on the school function difficult. The drop off area is impacted by the build out areas in this scheme. The scheme is “spreading” and could have an impact on the costs.</p> <p>Comments about “Street” – AN mentioned that the corridor in all three schemes need to include the fitness center that is currently located in this main corridor. He also indicated that consideration should be given to integrating the Ranger program and proper drop off for that program. SL indicated that these schemes need to be submitted to MSBA. NG indicated that they are planning on doing that.</p> <p>Cost discussion NG indicated that all three schemes do appear to fall within the preliminary budget amounts and deserve to be considered for further discussion.</p> <p>Construction period NG indicated that the timeframe for each scheme would be comparable at around 2.5-3 years. Phasing needs to be developed. NG suggested that Methuen consider space elsewhere in the city to serve as swing space because none of the schemes provide enough new space to house the students during the renovation phases. Exterior access to the building must be reviewed relative to each scheme.</p> <p>Conclusions There are pros and cons to each scheme but there are no glaring issues about any one scheme.</p>

Item No.	Item	Description
4.	ECEC Program Discussion	Dr. Whitten indicated that the proposed program requirements would require a substantial amount of space that was not initially indicated in the ed program that has been approved by the school committee and submitted to MSBA, nor are the additional students that would be involved in the program accounted for in the signed enrollment agreement with MSBA and Methuen. Concern about the negative impact this could have on delays to the design were discussed and Dr. Whitten suggested a possible separate SOI being submitted for this future program. Suzanne L. mentioned that a separate SOI may allow for greater community inclusion in the program. The ECEC program will not be included in the feasibility study/schematic design.
5.	Accounting Items	<p>FA+A Invoice Motion made by Arthur Nicholson to recommend payment for FA+A invoice for 35% of the feasibility study phase contract amount, seconded by Stephen Zanni. Unanimous vote in favor.</p> <p>Project Budget GB reviewed the overall project budget indicating that with the approval and payment of the FA+A invoice, the project remains on time and on budget in accordance with the projected schedule and budgets.</p>
6.	Other Business	SL indicated that the ed program has been sent into MSBA and no comment has been given so therefore it is assumed they have approved it.
7.	Adjourn	Motion made by Stephen Zanni to adjourn, seconded by Arthur Nicholson. Unanimous vote in favor to adjourn at 4:35 PM.

To the best of my knowledge, these notes are a fair representation of the issues and items discussed at the meeting. Additional items or corrections should be brought to the attention of the writer.

Submitted by: Mary Mahoney