



February 9, 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)
 Tony Hsiao TH 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 3:35 PM by the Chair, Suzanne Lamoureux. (SL)
2.	Approval of meeting notes from 1/26/10	Motion made by Bryan Sweet (BS) to accept the meeting notes, seconded by Stephen Zanni (SZ). Unanimous vote in favor.
3.	1/28/10 MSBA meeting to discuss letter issued regarding space summary	<p>Space Summary topic: DBra reported that the meeting at MSBA was arranged to clarify the issues raised in the letter signed by Mary Pichetti regarding space square footages, designations and quantity of various spaces, as they compared to the MSBA guidelines. The result of the meeting was that MSBA was satisfied with the explanations and rationale for the deviations from their guidelines. A letter is being prepared by Mayor Manzi that includes meeting notes and a letter from FA+A that addresses the initial letter point by point that will state that the outcome of the meeting was positive and brings closure to the concerns indicated in the initial MSBA letter.</p> <p>Postponed Preferred Schematic delivery: Although FA+A and the district indicated that they are on schedule to make the March hearing date, MSBA suggested that it may be in the best interests of the project if this project is presented at the next hearing, which is on May 26. The date for delivery of material to them for that meeting was not known at the time of the meeting but John Jumpe indicated that he would issue that date.</p> <p>Subcommittee hearing: John Jumpe mentioned that MSBA offers the opportunity for districts to make pre-presentations to a subcommittee in a less formal setting to get feedback about the presentation and that there is a subcommittee meeting scheduled on February 24. The Methuen HS is scheduled to be presented at this meeting. All material is to be submitted to MSBA on 2/16 before noon.</p>
4.	Schematic Design Progress	<p>Presentation for 2/24 MSBA Subcommittee:</p> <p>New Option 4 To address comments that were made at the MSBA meeting on 1/28 by their senior architect, Karl Brown, JA feels that it is important to justify the preferred scheme. An effective way of doing that is to take a step backwards and present a scheme that conforms to their comments, namely, maintain the media center, auditorium and cafeteria in their present locations and assess the impact to the project. TH reviewed a new scheme that addresses the project in that manner. TH clearly demonstrated that this scheme will eliminate many educational program goals and results in an increase of non-educational space and inefficiencies of the building layout. The result is a larger building and eliminates the 2-house concept. Extensive renovation will be required and the cost will be greater than the preferred scheme.</p>

Item No.	Item	Description
4.	Schematic Design Progress (continued)	<p>Preferred Scheme: TH presented progress on the preferred scheme. The space relationships seem to be coming together well and the separation and circulation is clear and efficient.</p> <p>TH presented some options for the exterior elevations, including the additions. The options reviewed several possibilities for windows. One option was very straightforward and ordered while a second option was less structured and the windows at the upper level have a more random appearance. TH explained that they want to look at opportunities they have with the new spaces to involve shapes, color and features to enhance the building. Several committee members mentioned that they had some reservations about the random window spacing option. JA mentioned that one aspect that they want to consider is what the building will look like at night when lit from within and that the random window arrangement may be very dynamic. TH mentioned that the normal standard for quantity of glazed area is roughly 30% and that these schemes are in that range.</p> <p>TH then reviewed several interior perspectives that have been generated that capture several views of interest such as a light shaft and the main interior entrance. TH and JA described the 2-story main entrance that highlights a portion of the media center at the second floor that could float into the lobby and provide a very special space that highlights the media center as one of the educational hubs in the building.</p>
5.	Variance	GB noted that this is in progress and that he will be meeting with the building commissioner.
6.	Temporary Classroom Options	<p>GB reported that the reclamation of the Central School is looking like the most economic and viable solution but it is still under review.</p> <p>DBra brought up the point that something that needs to be considered in providing any solution will be the need to employ a designer to provide bid documents for either the Central School renovation or a modular bid package. In the case of the Central School renovation, it could take up to 3-4 months for that effort. The renovation option will have to be issued under Chapter 149 bidding for construction. The renovation of Central involves the need to provide new housing for the superintendents office. Mayor Manzi indicated that he anticipates information back from the superintendent regarding their space needs. This will determine how much space may need to be leased elsewhere or possibly remain in the Central in part, if space allows. Robert Vogler mentioned that he has had some discussion with personnel that are currently in the Central school and they mentioned that they will not need some of the spaces that they currently occupy in their new location.</p>
7.	Invoices	<p>OPM: An invoice for the month of January from KBA/Trident was presented. A motion was made by Arthur Nicholson (AN) to approve payment, seconded by George Kazanjian (GK) and voted unanimously in favor.</p> <p>Designer: An invoice from FA+A for the 3% balance remaining for the feasibility portion of their fee was presented. A motion was made by Arthur Nicholson (AN) to approve payment, seconded by George Kazanjian (GK) and voted unanimously in favor.</p> <p>An invoice from FA+A for 32% of their schematic design fee was presented. The OPM had recommended approval of the invoice but holding onto release of the check until FA+A provides deliverables that constitute the 32% completion of this phase. A motion was made by Arthur Nicholson (AN) to approve payment, seconded by George Kazanjian (GK) and voted unanimously in favor.</p>
8.	Other Business	Next meeting: February 23, 2010 at 3:30.
9.	Adjourn	Motion made by Arthur Nicholson to adjourn, seconded by Robert Vogler. Unanimous vote in favor to adjourn at 4:38 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: Daniel P. Bradford, AIA