

Present: Jeff Adams, Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, Stan Durlacher, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Tim Hult, Karla Johnson, John Lindner, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Peter Nobile, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Sergio Siani, Bill Tice, Margaret Waterman, Jerry Wedge,

Also Present: David Saindon, KVA, Jeanne Roberts, Leland Koehler/Rice, Michael Rosenfeld, Lisa Pecora-Ryan, OMR

Absent: Walter Birge, Richard Waterman, Chris Whelan, Elise Woodward

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Karla Johnson at 6:04 PM.

II. Reading of Minutes

Karla asked if there were any recommended changes to the amended minutes of April 13, 2011. A motion was made to approve the April 13, 2011 amended minutes by Bill Tice and seconded by Diana Rigby. The motion was unanimously approved.

III OPM Update – David Saindon, KVA

MSBA update: David stated that he has had continued dialogue with MSBA since submitting the PDP on April 1st and April 7th but unfortunately the dialogue has only been between David and John Jumpe over the phone; we have not received anything in writing. A few weeks after the PDP was submitted we received a certification form to fill out; David is calling it a PDP Certification letter that we sent back to the MSBA on April 26. MSBA has invited us to a Feasibility Assessment Subcommittee meeting; it's a meeting with the MSBA staff and probably half of the board of directors. It's a meeting which typically takes place about six weeks before they have a board vote; it's an opportunity to meet with the MSBA and have an open dialogue with their staff members about the data presented within the PDP submission. Hopefully when we leave the FAS meeting on May 11 we will have a clear direction followed up with something in writing. David feels that this FAS invitation is a good sign; he was not expecting to be on the schedule for a month of two but with the PDP that the District submitted to the MSBA, David feels that MSBA was impressed with the PDP.

Revised Options Comparison Analysis: On the April 13th meeting Option 3 (one which we were not interested in) the committee had questions if the 36-month time frame was accurate. David took another look at it and seeing that the 36 months was extremely aggressive he put the time frame back to 42 months which then affects certain cost drivers resulting in a new cost of \$93.5 million vs. \$91.2 million. Since this was part of the PDP David would like to have a motion be made so he can formally submit this to the MSBA as an amendment to the original PDP.

Schedule: OMR will have a work plan update later on. David handed out the proposed project schedule and as far as "checking the box" we are on schedule. In regards to the June 22nd FAS review; this is the key critical point to make the schedule work, we need to get an acknowledgment from the MSBA of the option that will be pursued. To make the schedule work hopefully we'll be on the same page with MSBA so we can start schematic design and have MSBA accept it at their board meeting on July 27, 2011.

Diana explained that the School Committee will be here tonight to vote on the revised Ed Specs after the Building Committee votes to approve them so that we can send the revision to the MSBA. We revised the Ed Specs based on David's conversation with John Jumpe at the MSBA. In those categories you will recall where the delta was larger than zero; MSBA wants the delta to be zero.

IV. OMR Update – Michael Rosenfeld

Tonight we'll review and approve preliminary alternatives. Diana shared the revised space summary list to reduce the G.S.F from 247,241 to 242,275. It includes:

- Art Gallery moved to Other.
- 300 NSF of Art Storage moved to Gross.
- Health Classroom added in Core Academics.
- Gymnasiums reduced by 1,000 NSF.
- PE Alternative – Multipurpose space reduced to 2175 NSF.
- Officials/coaches locker rooms deleted.
- Trainer's room reduced to 500 NSF.
- Visiting Team Room deleted.
- CCHS Team Rooms reduced to 3 rooms, 2 at 500 NSF and 1 at 675 NSF.

A discussion took place in regard to eliminating the coaches' locker rooms; Brian Miller thought this was very disconcerting. Michael Rosenfeld felt we should keep this in mind as we move down the process, how we can address functional issues like this. Right now the goal is to navigate the MSBA process and get to a preferred solution and maybe we can deal with this in the gross square footage.

At the April 13th meeting the committee members suggested that we proceed to further study and revise option 6 and option 12. Michael presented the revised options to us which are now labeled at Option 6R1 and Option 12R. The goal is to talk about the two options and we have two matrices that will be handed out; one from KVA and one from OMR. The purpose behind this is to document that we have considered these things carefully and had an opportunity to record opinions.

V. **Action Items:**

Motion to approve the revised Ed Spec as presented by OMR on May 4, 2011, which supersedes the Ed Spec approved on March 23, 2011 and issued to the MSBA on April 1 as part of the PDP. So moved by Bill Tice, seconded by John Flaherty. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion To approve the revised option cost comparison for option 3 as presented by KVA on May 4, 2011, which supersedes the option cost comparison for option 3 which was issued to the MSBA on April 7 as part of the PDP. So moved by John Flaherty, seconded by Sergio Siani. The motion was unanimously approved.

IV **OMR Update continued:**

Going back to the matrices. We want to have a quantifiable evaluation that we can hand to the MSBA that the building committee has weighed in on how the goals & values reflect on each scenario. Even though we are looking at Option 6R1 and Option 12R, the MSBA guidelines request that you analyze three solutions. We will be rating Option 4, 6R1 and 12R on cost and project and product goals. The Committee rated the two matrices; one from OMR and one from KVA.

We have another amendment to vote on before we take a break in the meeting to have the School Committee vote on the Revised Educational Specifications.

Motion to approve amendment #3 value of \$13,145 consisting of \$2,585 for Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. (WJE) and \$10,560 for Nobis Engineering - \$2,585 represents the agreed upon value approved at the April 13th meeting for WJE involvement at the integrated design meeting held on April 26th, \$10,560 represents early geotechnical services during the feasibility phase to be performed by Nobis. The motion was moved by Brian Miller, seconded by Bill Tice. The motion was unanimously approved.

Break – SCHOOL COMMITTEE VOTES REVISED EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS.

VII. **Subcommittee Update:**

Peter Nobile reported that it was a terrific Charrette and is waiting for the summary of the Charrette. The ideas that came out of the meeting can be applied to any scheme in one way or another. Scheme 12 has some better advantages but not significant.

Michelle reported that the next forum is May 19, 7:00 PM and the next newsletter will be emailed out on Tuesday morning. We also have a Facebook page.

Jerry asked if the Finance Subcommittee could generate a list of potential savings for the new building such as bringing special ed costs inhouse.

VIII. **New Business:**

Peter Badalament mentioned that one of the math teachers saw the surveying team doing site work and thought it would be a good idea for the building project to be a learning opportunity. If it meets with the Committee's approval they would like to get the surveying group together with some of the math classes and talk about surveying in relationship to calculus and trigonometry.

IX. **Public Comments:**

None.

X. **Adjourn**

A motion was made to adjourn by Michelle Ernst and seconded by Bill Tice at 807 PM. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Leona Palmaccio

Approved: 5/25/11