

January 26, 2010, 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:

Nancy Goodwin	NG	Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
Jim Alexander	JA	Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
David Breen	DBre	KBA/Trident - OPM
Mary Mahoney	MM	KBA/Trident - OPM
Gino Baroni	GB	KBA/Trident - OPM
Dan Bradford	DBra	KBA/Trident - OPM

Item No.	Item	Description
1.	Call to Order	The meeting was called to order at 3:33 PM by the Chair, Suzanne Lamoureux. (SL)
2.	Approval of meeting notes from 1/12/10	Motion made by Arthur Nicholson (AN) to accept the meeting notes, seconded by George Kazanjian (GK). Unanimous vote in favor.
3.	Feasibility Study Feedback from MSBA	<p>MSBA feedback on Space Summary A letter from Mary Pichetti at MSBA was distributed and discussed. The letter discusses each of the categories of spaces on the space summary and cites various overages and underages of space when compared to the MSBA standards. After issuing the letter, MSBA requested that the district, designer and OPM meet with them to discuss the letter. This meeting is scheduled for January 28, 2010 at 2:30. JA explained that most of the items that were cited in the letter, were items that had been discussed and approved during a conference call that was held in early December. The issues included space square footage discrepancies as well as room type quantities. JA explained that some of the room quantity issues are actually just a space designation issue that will be discussed and recorded at the meeting. Regardless, FA+A is preparing a succinct response to each listed item and will address them on Thursday.</p> <p>DESE Submission DBra reported that FA+A had submitted the DESE information last week on the day that the letter discussed above was received. The package was held until the outcome of the meeting is known. If there are no issues regarding the SPED spaces discussed at the meeting, the DESE package may be submitted to MSBA at that meeting.</p>
4.	Schematic Design Progress	<p>Site Plan: JA presented the overall preliminary site plan that indicated the consideration that the design is paying toward the site impact, including safe pedestrian access, bus pick up and drop off and a well defined front entrance. JA indicated that the plan allows some flexibility for after hour access to some key spaces like the cafeteria and auditorium. JA discussed the loading dock area and how the drop in grade and raising of the first floor level at the addition will facilitate how the loading functions and how that central loading area will work well with the cafeteria location. JA indicated that a traffic study has recently been completed and the findings will be integrated into the site plan design.</p> <p>Floor Plans: JA briefly discussed the space layouts. He indicated that the circulation within each house has been studied further and there is a separate centralized stair within each House that will facilitate movement to and from classes by students. The accessibility for the building was discussed. Ultimately, every feature about the building will be accessible as per the Massachusetts State access code (MAAB).</p>

Item No.	Item	Description
4.	Schematic Design Progress (continued)	<p>Exterior Elevations: JA presented some preliminary exterior elevations of the existing building to illustrate how they will be renewing it to allow it to “fit in” with the proposed addition. FA+A proposes to increase the window sizes significantly to take advantage of natural daylighting and to present pleasant environments for learning. The exterior masonry is to remain.</p>
5.	Temporary Classrooms	<p>GB discussed the options for temporary classrooms that are being evaluated. 1) Modular classrooms to house 20 classrooms for 3 years, 2.) Lease and build out available remote space to house the entire freshman class for 3 years or 3.) Retrofit the Central School to house the freshman class for 3 years and find a new location for the superintendent and central offices. Costs for each option are under review.</p> <p>Joe Leone (JL) asked if consideration had been given to dispersing modulares to several middle schools to house the 9th grade at various locations. The modular option is the most expensive and scattering them in different locations would be even more expensive so that variation has not been considered.</p> <p>Dorothy Najolia (DN) mentioned that in any of the options, consideration needs to be made to consider temporary science labs.</p>
6.	Project Budget	<p>GB distributed the preliminary overall project budget at \$99,960,000. This budget was the result of a consolidated estimate between the designer's estimator and the OPM's estimator. The construction figures are focused on the middle projected costs and are not intended to be conservative nor are they figured tightly to prohibit possible fluctuations in pricing when the project is out to bid.</p> <p>George Kazanjian asked if the costs include consideration of the comments and possible changes noted in the MSBA letter. GB indicated that they do not, however, the possible changes required due to the issues cited in the letter are not significant and wouldn't have an impact on the budget estimate.</p>
7.	Invoices	<p>An invoice from FA+A was presented that the OIPM recommended be reduced to leave 3% of the Feasibility Study Phase in balance until after the meeting at MSBA on Thursday. A motion to approve payment for this adjusted invoice was made by AN, seconded by Robert Vogler and voted unanimously in favor.</p>
8.	Variance	<p>JA reviewed the need for a variance to be sought from the state building code. Essentially, relief from the code that dictates the need for fire rating and separations in the existing building will be requested. JA indicated that the nature of this variance will not cause a compromise to life safety. GB mentioned that he has received the letter and back up material from FA+A and their code consultant and will deliver them to the building commissioner. The request for a variance starts with a rejection from the commissioner and the result will be a variance hearing with the state.</p>
9.	Other Business	<p>Inventory Surveys: Jim Giuca indicated that the last of the surveys has been submitted to him and he will forward to the OPM. There was some discussion about the intent and clarity/lack of clarity of the surveys. The intent of the surveys was to gain some insight from the users (teachers and department heads) about what equipment might be of value and available for reuse in renovated building in an attempt to reduce the FF&E costs.</p> <p>Geotech investigations: DBra mentioned that FA+A would like to take advantage of the February vacation week to perform some sampling and borings of the soils at the proposed additions. A proposal for this work has been submitted and is under review by the OPM and will be presented to the committee at the next meeting.</p>
10.	Adjourn	<p>Motion made by Arthur Nicholson to adjourn, seconded by Robert Vogler. Unanimous vote in favor to adjourn at 4:42 PM.</p>

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: Daniel P. Bradford, AIA