



**MAYNARD
TOWN SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES
Meeting # 44-8
May 12, 2011**

APPROVED: June 15, 2011

PRESENT	NAME	AFFILIATION	E- MAIL DISTRIBUTION
no	Mark Masterson	Superintendent Maynard	✓
X	Pete DiCicco	Business Advisor Maynard	✓
no	Mike Sullivan	Town Administrator	✓
no	Laura Chesson	Principal, MHS	✓
X	Jerry Culbert	Committee	✓
X	Matt Briggs	Committee	✓
no	Philip Berry	School Committee	✓
X	Anthony Midey	Committee	✓
X	Ken Neuhauser	Committee	✓
no	Chris Johnson	Committee (FinCom)	✓
X	Bonnie Winokar	Committee	✓
X	Ed Mullin	Committee	✓
X	Bob Nadeau	Committee (Selectman)	✓
X	Marie Morando	Secretary	✓

Brooke Trivas- Tappe, Pat Saitta, Chuck Adam- Municipal Building Consultants
Consultants:

Cesar Dedios, Tappé Associates
Mike Spence, TMP Kevin Caddle, TMP

Other Attendees:

Sally Bubier – Board of Selectmen
(5) Maynard Residents
Mark Price, Tina Woolston, Lee Ellis, Kelly Nadeau, Unnamed resident

May 12, 2011

Meeting opened at 6:35 PM

Jerry Culbert presiding;

1. Reviewed Agenda prepared by Committee
2. Safety:
 - boiler failure at Coolidge
3. Finance:
 - Municipal - \$17,130
 - Andelman and Lalek – 50% invoice – for NSTAR rebate submission - \$4,535.00
 - Linda Hansen - \$75.00 order of conditions filing
 - 1st Jerry / 2nd Anthony approval as a group
4. Approval of minutes:
 - April 28th meeting – “good engaging meeting”
 - 1st MB / 2nd Bonnie – motion passed
 - i. Discussions: there were no edits after it was sent along to everyone
5. Prequalification:
 - Elevator re-advertised – (4) requests so far, closes on 25th
 - Sub-committee meeting next week
 - Reviews are well underway
6. 90% submittal:
 - Tappé passed out (2) sets of 90% drawings
 - FTP has been loaded, made available to all committee members, cautioned about public access
 - Documents available at Town Hall and at the Library for review
 - Front end / division 0 has been sent to town counsel for review
 -
7. Energy Efficiency

BROOKE MADE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT REGARDING OVERALL EFFECIENCY:

We have an efficient building we can all be proud of. Our Building's efficiencies are reflective of our building type, building size, budget, operational efficiencies, and best proven practices.

- Cesar - Senior Technical Advisor from Tappe
 - i. IECC 2006 compared to IECC 2009
 - ii. Comparison to cars
 - iii. Building is efficient and affordable, it is a top of the line building with all construction technology
 - iv. Brooke, we have tried and true experienced projects
 - v. Mike Spence/Kevin Caddle –showing last year's chart used during HVAC and full committee meetings, how we got here
 - 1. Looked at 5 basic systems, that we see used most in school buildings in Massachusetts
 - 2. Reviewed overall performance
 - 3. Reviewed with sub-committee after the meeting and with Newton North's Facility Manager his numbers were right on
 - 4. Fan coil projects were agreed to at that time and over the past year
 - 5. Spent a lot of time justifying what they've done
 - 6. Air Conditioning entire building was a criteria
 - 7. New building will not cost more to operate than the existing building due to having more operating systems.
 - 8. Modeling picks-up operation costs and hours of operation
 - 9. Pete – current MHS costs are not as high as they should be because a number of pieces of equipment are not running. This makes the numbers even better
 - 10. TMP –Brooke – Magda has national credentials in energy modeling.
 - 11. Modeling continues through project completion
 - 12. Higher percentages on CHPS EE.C1 (A) comes from reducing energy costs and providing energy generation solutions, i.e.
- Questions:
 - i. Matt – IECC changes in the future 2012?

- a. Cesar – 2012 code appears to be steered towards residential, already doing analysis in some places
 - b. Kevin – Commissioning required in the future, TMP designs to the code as it exists today. Hard to guess what will change and be required.
- ii. Bob – reduced exterior lighting, how did they do it, security concerns. Water efficiency issues>
 - a. Kevin – not under light, CHPS credit for site lighting, down, not spill light, will not
 - b. LED – not necessarily cheaper
 - c. Water Efficiency –
 - i. Low flow showers, sink water sensors, waterless urinals
- iii. Ken – economizer cycle for ventilation systems, do we have this for heat recovery units?
 - a. Kevin – not needed-required by code for HRU’s, but, yes, the capability is there with wheel heat exchanger (not plate),
- iv. Matt – daylight controls what are they? TMP – classrooms are switched by daylight sensors
- v. Mark Price – resident – “wishes he could have attended more meetings, struck by lack of ambition in the proposal, we do need that by code, code is worst building that can be built, what will we be saddled with, comparison to Prius wasn’t a good one , 30% savings over a 50 year building isn’t great, would have hoped for more. He is in the energy savings field. Challenged the R-value of the wall design. Base line building, not a high performance building. BT defended the work of Magda, TMP, etc....
- vi. Jerry – drawings, designs available all along ; costs are a driver in adding any new technology,
- vii. Ken - Lack of ambition is with the committee and community not the designers, the to reach higher levels of performance the committee and community should-would have to have pushed harder. I’ve been worked over the design, bipolar world,cited work experience in building performance and extremes of ‘world of hurt’ on one hand and ‘world of possibilities’ on other. Tappe had steered us away from ‘world of hurt’. ‘World of possibilities’ is a different kind of process.
- viii. Tina Woolston – resident - higher energy costs, will cause budget impacts to the program and operation, a little disappointing

Comment [KSN1]: Will not...? Is it spill light into neighboring property?

Comment [KSN2]: Not sure of the attribution

Comment [KSN3]: I removed the quotation since this is not a direct quote.

- a. Not going in the direction we thought it was, just found out it wasn't.
- ix. Jerry's comments that all of this came to committee attention at the 11th hour
- x. Bob Nadeau – thanks Ken for his contribution, this is much better efficient than any other building the town has built, no one came to the meetings of those projects either, limited budget, MSBA tight time frames, taking advantage of tight construction system, safety was more important to him than efficiency, give and take, didn't get everything he wanted either, maybe's there more opportunities as we get deeper into construction. Mark's comments were crappy, which he acknowledged,
- xi. Mark again – where is his forum for his comments? Operational costs, better performing windows, small corrections, etc. can only help the town and the taxpayers
- xii. Sally – slamming it in public is not helpful,
- xiii. BT – come to meetings and be informed, read the specs, etc... being defensive is okay
- xiv. Anthony – tried to garner input as best as we could, MSBA process made this tight and prescriptive,
- xv. Lee Ellis – resident – (appears to be on energy committee) too late to have a major impact, concerned with attitudes, last 10% is maybe greater, improvement since the last meeting, owner drives the project, tried to get information, not posted on the web but was posted in town hall, not enough information available.
- xvi. Tina Woolston – please post Minutes from meetings, and CHPs information on web site.
- xvii. BT - Specific and cost effective solutions relative to the design, if analyzed and it would improve the building, potentially could incorporate if reasonable
- xviii. Ken – what were the different glass materials, and what is the [entire-whole-unit](#) U-Value of the window assembly?[e](#)
- xix. Kelly Nadeau – participated in the CHPS process, impression was that we were going well, aren't we? [We are. Compared to other schools, comparable.](#)
- xx. Mike Price – CHPS is linear, increasing points doesn't necessarily increase efficiency
- xxi. Ken – other criteria doing well, beautiful building, well planned and laid out.
- [xxii.](#) Jerry - Education factors were key driving forces

School Building Committee

Comment [KSN4]: Is there an attribution for this?

~~xxii-xxiii.~~ Jerry – invited members of public attending to submit any specific constructive suggestions they might have
~~xxiii-xxiv.~~ Ken – noted that in previous meeting, as shown in meeting minutes, BT indicated that a change could not be accommodated without jeopardizing the move-in datesuggestions from previous minutes, can they be included in the meeting minutes or record

~~xxiv-xxv.~~ PJS – as good as a building as we’ve seen, added value discussion, higher performance building , better then we’ve seen (Brooke said we’re in the middle of the pack) PJS – we are an advocate for the town, we need to follow all bidding requirements and we have done so in this tight frame from MSBA,

~~xxv-xxvi.~~ This building is out to bid in early June.

Comment [KSN5]: Is there an attribution for this?

8. Next meeting

- May 25th
- Adjourn Motion: Bob, Matt
- 8:45 PM

April 28, 2011

Meeting opened at 6:35 PM

Jerry Culbert presiding;

Safety – nothing new since last meeting, air quality study results at green meadow may take another 4 weeks

Finance –

One bill- Jerry Culbert moved approval of Tappés Invoices totaling - \$247,500. The motion was seconded by Ken Neuhauser; discussion: none, approved by all voting members

Approval of minutes:

Minutes for January 2011 – April 6, 2011 meetings were presented for approval. Members had previously been sent the minutes via email to review.

Discussion: Ed Mullins would like to see the committee review minutes of meetings at the next following meeting. All agreed they will do that going forward

Jerry moved, Anthony 2nd

All approved

Prequalification Update:

Municipal presented a summary of the qualification packages received on April 21, 2011.

Twelve (12) General Contracting firms submitted qualifications.

(93) Submissions for subcontractor prequalification were received

Some firms submitted multiple packages to become prequalified for multiple trades. One firm submitted on (8) categories

Most categories received at least (6) submissions

Acoustical Ceilings only received (5)

Resilient Flooring only received (4)

HVAC only received (5)

Only received (1) submission on Elevators (see below)

Elevator submission options: (Will need to be verified by Town Counsel)

Only (1) prequalification package was received which MAY mean that category will need to be re-advertised. If after that pre-qualification round is complete and there are still not at least (3) firms and the committee has (3) options:

Re-advertise a 3rd time

Abandon the pre-qualification process and solicit filed-sub bids

If (2) are pre-qualified owner may invite filed sub-bids from the (2) firms only

Schedule:

Must have prequalification reviews and deliberations complete by May 17th. Therefore committee must complete reviews and meet sometime between May 9th and 13th.

Ed commented on his personal knowledge of some of the contractors at Falmouth High School.

Are prequalification committees meetings open meetings and require posting? Municipal will forward this and the other questions raised to Mike Sullivan for forwarding to the Town's legal counsel.

Update on HVAC conference call:

A (2) hour call, was held with Jerry and Ken from the Building Committee, Brooke from Tappé, Mike Spence and Kevin Caddle from TMP, Pat Saitta and Chuck Adam from Municipal attended.

The main topics of discussion included on the call were Ken's questions of Ventilation and overall design of the system in relation to occupancy and usage of the spaces.

Not getting into a lot of details, but did discuss design of system, large units, ventilation units on roof, looked at another method, more distributed way, units for each classroom, corridor ventilation (transfer grilles), design is based on full occupancy in every room all the time, TMP as good engineering practice doesn't design for exact population. Sally Bubier asked questions, relative to the difference between the heating/cooling and ventilation systems as designed and Ken's suggestions

Ken commented that one key element is that the system does not have capacity to turn down the systems for each room if room is not occupied, TMP determined it would be about \$8k per classroom which all agreed would be hard to justify.

Jerry discussed maintenance concerns with any of the systems and importance of training and Commissioning

Tappé commented that TMP emphasized that the system designed is based on standards and constraints of contractors' available and current trends in the industry

Ken Neuhauser commented that the systems were better than standard "issue" of design in the marketplace.

CHPs presentation/update by Tappé:

The project does make the threshold agreed to during the Schematic Design phase.

"Good efficient green building"

IAQ, water conservation, O&M, site issues were all incorporated
Assigned tasks for verification, on CHPS checklist for the required documentation

We will start getting design reviews of these items through CHPs.

Reviewed the mandatory prerequisites and what documentation is still required

Sally asked who would take care of the non-building items, and suggested there needed to be an advocate at the school department or high school.

Jose went through each category in the checklist and identified where/what was designed (in general)

Ed, degree of trust, since committee chose Tappé to do this, do we have to go through each line item

No irrigation designed, indigenous plants and low water usage materials will be specified.

Waterless urinals will be installed

Responsibility of owner – letters

Sally mentioned that if Maynard elects to go through the Green Communities Act – the project should make sure it can document and provide community education on the green elements included in the design.

Design of the Exterior Walls discussion:

Jerry indicated that since this issue has been discussed on numerous conf. calls, and that Tappé was not prepared to discuss at committee meeting Tappé indicated that the wall system designed has been used and proven and used extensively

Modeling under new code hasn't been done all that much and an alternative design may be difficult for the modeling program, Ken asked:

If there is a code provision for a minimum gap behind in brick (1")?

What is in drawings is 2", is that good practice or normal practice? Industry practice, can you maintain 1" reasonably? Real world

Physically you don't need the gap, it's included for construction quality,

Ken reviewed how changing the exterior wall design could change the overall R-value and reduce the temperature infiltration through the exterior walls. Ken detailed how he believes his proposed design could increase the R-values by 25%.

Motion made by Ken to eliminate the spray foam insulation in the steel studs, replace the 2 ½' poly isocyanurate with 3 ½" insulation and reduce the brick cavity from 2" to 1". 2nd by Jerry for discussion:

Tappé may require a liability release for this change as they feel the proposed design is not a tried and true design and that it would be the first time they have used it. They prefer a design that has worked for years and has historical "experience".

The change would extend the bidding by a month

Could be jeopardizing a Sept. move-in and move in December

After lengthy discussion a motion was made by Ed to move the question.

Vote:

In favor – 1

Against – 6

Matt – believes we are limiting ourselves, we must make sure took forward to new projects and make sure we do these things in the future, likes and appreciates ken's science but short time frame isn't fair to the process.

Ed – at times when he is out in the community it is brought to his attention that changes are required by a lot of individuals he speaks to. He responds that the committee and its professionals have done a large amount of work and what has been done is professional and needs to be recognized, great due diligence, trusts in team and process
Anthony also doesn't like that this came so late in process but fully appreciates Ken's expertise and his efforts.
Ken offered a counter proposal to delete closed cell spray foam and replace with batt insulation, Tappé would like to look at this and advise.
Tappé will review and report back

Tappé presented other areas of the building that have developed through the design:

- Entry Areas wall materials and design
- Dumpster relocation and deletion of screening at the old location
- Development of rear classroom plaza
- Reviewed interior perspectives of areas throughout the building

MBC reviewed the progress and meetings that occurred over the past month and was included in a packet.

- On budget , actually tracking \$200K under budget
- On schedule – committee action tonight keeps project on schedule
- Memo on roof slab improvements and upgrades for “safer room” is included in packet.
- Cons Com closed, waiting for final order of conditions
- Discussion Relative Humidity

Next meetings

- May 12th and 25th
- Adjourn Chris, 2nd Anthony
- Adjourn 8:45 PM

April 6, 2011

6:30 pm Phil Berry – Vice Chair opened the meeting

PD – Safety issues – today DEP was at the Green Meadow to do air quality testing. This was organized by the BOH Director, Kevin Sweet. The school department had concerns from the staff. It will take 4-6 weeks for a report from DEP.

Pat Saitta – update on the cost estimates. We are on schedule and on budget. Two ads have been placed in the central register and the Beacon Villager for the prequalification of contractors. The closed date is April 21, 2011 all packets will go to the Pete DiCicco's attention at the school department. Municipal Building Consultants submitted their monthly report. .

There is a Request by the Fire Department and FEMA to use the old High School for training. Pat cautioned the committee to make sure that they will not demo any of this building for training. They could have approximately a three to five day window of opportunity. We need to know before this goes out to bid.

L Chesson: questioned if the booster club could cut up the gym floor to sell. The moveable items have to be tagged and there might be a window of three to five days to have this removed. This conversation will continue between Laura and Pat.

Dumpster location: location of the dumpster next to the auditorium entry. Discussion you will see the dumpster even with the green that is being proposed. BT showed designs of the hallway from the kitchen to the back of the house and has made the design team reconfigure the present design. The dumpster will be located in the back of the house.

(Corner of the building) If the weather is good they could go outside from the kitchen right to the back of the house, the walk is the same as it is now. Cafeteria was designed as a community space you won't need a fence but will leave some pavement there.

There is a possibility that the corridor will have an updated material installed.

Window discussion: fiberglass or aluminum. We did not spec the fiberglass window – BT will send the criteria of the window to KN.

Green slate is planned on major entry areas. BT – clip system is the best way, we are looking for a local installer. You will see the clips if you are up close, from far you will not notice them. This building is brick, metal cap and slate. They are very simple panels, with similar pricing. The slate is a lot nicer than the metal panels.

Gym area long discussion re: Kalwall and Oxalox

The Oxalox is more expensive than the Kalwall – questioned which is better and which looks better. What % of the total cost will we be spending? It is approximately 3500 square feet that we are covering. The cost could be \$50,000. The Kalwall has the grids and the Oxalox framed on the outside of the cut pieces. BT looked at the slope of the roof if we changed it would we still need as much. The Kalwall has been around for many years and some people may think that we are using an older version of materials, but the Kalwall holds up well, better insulated, less expensive and practical. The Kalwall is in your present gym now. Maintenance ? How much more light will get from the Okalox –

You could have 4 foot panels with Kalwall. EM we are looking to Pat for his guidance on this as to what schools have used the Kalwall – The Kalwall function meets all requirements.

BN – motion to go with Kalwall vs Okalox

2nd EM – discussion:

Oxalox is marginally better light – the price differential should come into play

Motion passed to use Kalwall instead of Okalox

PB – motion to pay the invoices to Tappe' in the amount of \$262,680 and Municipal Building Consultants in the amount of \$24,885

2nd MB – Motion passed 6-0

CHPS Sub-committee – finalize the points, BT should have the model back somewhere around April 8th or during that week. We could do a conference call between the committee members;

We could also do the HVAC sub-committee during that same conversation, they will work with the chair to put together date for the conference call. And please place it on the agenda for a meeting, speak with the chair.

MS – talked about the solar pre bid meeting tomorrow and would like to add that the school is adaptable to have solar panels installed; there is a provision to have them installed, it will be structurally ready to handle the panels. Pete DiCicco should get involved with this for the school side. They should probably talk to TMP; we would like to become partners with the school for solar panels.

KN – are we compromising the design to keep this on track for construction this summer? PS – if we want to open this school in September 2013 – we need to stay on this schedule. If the design team could not meet the deadlines, she would let us know. It is crunch time and they have met all of their deadlines.

BT - we have concerns about the schedule, it is very tight, we are all under a lot of stress and we need to have the decisions made quickly we cannot wait for the windows and anything that is a big decision we need to make it now.

We are on target with the 90% completion to go to MSBA in the first part of May.

The 90% to 100% completion will be a coordination of all of the documents. We will have this together for bid in early June.

EM motion to adjourn

BN 2nd

Motion passed – 8:20 pm

March 23, 2011

JC – opened the meeting at 6:35 pm

No updates from Pete DiCicco on security and there were no invoices to be voted on.

JC – since Mark Howrey was Vice Chair before he resigned I would like to appoint Phil Berry as Vice Chair in his place.

EM – motion to approve Phil Berry as Vice Chair of the School Building Committee

2nd by AM

Motion passed – 6-0

B Trivas: We are at 60% completion and we have submitted to MSBA on 3/16/2011; we need to have two complete sets of drawings in Town Hall and the Library. The estimates are not complete and when they are they will be submitted to MSBA and we will have to put the documents inside the booklets at Town Hall and the Library. Maybe we could have half of sets at the Library. Went over the exterior views of the building; the board looked at windows, brick and roof materials. We are trying to soften the hill next to the school where the radio tower is. The design team is looking at two patterns of bricks.

EM – concerns about the landscaping and care of the fields.

Discussion: The Fowler School fields – we should really look at the landscaping around the fields. BT stressed that there is no irrigation with this project, we should be careful

about what kind of landscaping we are putting around the school, because if it is not maintained it will look like what is around the Fowler Middle School.

BT – would like to put stone around the plaza, this was not in the estimate and special material to be used at the entries.

Concerns: About the dumpster being located next to the auditorium. If they move the dumpster the alternative is to walk through the entire school with the trash to get to the back of the school. BT – will revisit the location of the dumpster.

Discussion: Discussion of the type of window being installed: single hung windows; high performance glass, aluminum, triple glazed windows. The design team is still working on the windows waiting for the model.

Discussion: Different types of brick, color, sizes; that are looking at gray brick with two different sizes and shapes at the gym and auditorium. Two types of roof materials being considered – 75% of the roof will be covered with stone and the rest of the roof area will be white; all roofs are pitched to the drains. Design team still working on this. BT will bring roof materials to the next meeting.

KN – Cal wall is less money than curtain wall, will bring different options to the next meeting.

Discussion: The committee has concerns about having the dumpster out front; this building is a challenge because of the design of the kitchen in the front of the building. Cafeteria doors will be locked from outside entry. Laura Chesson is working on this from an operational standpoint; controlled entrance into the building.

BT – trying to get a special material for part of the building; it is a green slate which will run \$17 per square foot with the panels and the clips. This product is similar to copper and we are trying to get this material at the same price to stay in budget.

Pat Saitta: Submitting 90% completion by May 4th, must look at all items and make decisions to keep this project moving on schedule. It might take up to three months to do the abatement at the site. Must mark the equipment once you know what is staying and what you are moving into the new building. Laura will be making these decisions with the department heads.

Prequalification committee: Matt Briggs and Chris Johnson from the committee, OPM (Chuck) and Brooke Trivas from the design team.

KN – motion to appoint Chris Johnson and Matt Briggs to the prequalification committee they will be representatives from the School Building Committee.

HVAC – the committee had a conference call and discussed different systems for different parts of the building. Gym will be on its own system; auditorium will have two systems. They are setting up another call before the next meeting and will report to the committee. MB – concerns about the media center, admin part of the building; has it been designed with too much or too little; once the sub-committee has come up with a question list, please give it to BT and she will get the answers the committee needs.

TMP has worked with WAVM to make sure that the design can fit all the equipment

CHIPS Sub-Committee – will be setting up another meeting waiting for the remodeling. All questions and concerns should be directed to KN

Next meeting: April 6, 2011 at 6:30 pm at the Coolidge School

JC – motion to adjourn 8:20 pm – 2nd AM – Motion passed – 6-0

March 1, 2011

Pete DiCicco Ice fell of the roof at the Coolidge School, no one was injured

JC - We will hold off on the bills until we have a quorum present

JC- Today there was a meeting with the police, fire and building commissioner from 2:30 to 4:45, a lot of ground was covered.

Discussion: Went over security with the Chief of Police and locations of the pull box, the alarm out front at the main entrance; smoke detectors and modification, sprinklers, not in the electric closets, smoke and heat detectors. The Fire Chief was ok and the exit signs will be red standard. We also discussed the hood system in the kitchen. We had no outstanding questions at this time.

B Trivas - Went over the card access system, who has access to different parts of the building and how it is controlled. Custodians will have to let people in and out of the building on the weekends. The building will have a buzzer, cameras and intercom system, motion detectors, handicap access. The biggest topic today was with cameras inside the building. Some parts of the building will have the wiring for the camera's but will have not cameras in place, maybe someday the building will have more cameras. Front door, stairs, very limited cameras inside the building.

PB – concerned about the amount of camera's in the building. The cameras will be for asset protection. In the stair wells that are exposed.

There was a long discussion about the placement and non-placement of cameras. There will be a camera's in the parking lots and around the exterior of the building.

The school department will need to put operational procedures into place when the new school opens.

BT- the next submissions are close together they are filing with MSBA on March 16, 2011, 60% completion.

I would like to change the next meeting until March 23, 2011 instead of March 16, 2011 at 6:30 pm. because of the submission to MSBA

PS – Had discussion around the approval from MSBA for the new design for the gym.

The design team is refining elevations, locker rooms will be full height and we now have windows in the gym.

We are still on budget and still on target.

Conservation informally met with Nitsch Engineering and they will be on the agenda for March 14, 2011, Planning Board has had their hearing and they have filed their decision with the Town Clerk, and we have our decision in hand.

Need a meeting with the HVAC sub-committee.

Qualification Sub-Committee, please we need the members by the next meeting. It will consist of two committee members, the OPM and someone from the Design team.

Motion to pay invoice to Municipal Building Consultants in the amount of \$27,408.00 which includes AM Fogarty 2nd M Briggs – Motion passed -6-0

Ed Mullin asked to address the committee: he is running for school committee and would like to tell everyone, he pulled papers today.

KN – reminded the committee that Bill Reed is going to be at the library on Saturday 3/5/2011 at 10:00 pm.

MB – motion to adjourn

JC – 2nd

Motion passed -6-0 – 8:00 pm

February 16, 2011

Mark Masterson: No safety issues.

The roofs were cleaned and there are a few leaks, but nothing dangerous

Green Meadow – concerns with mold.

The budget update: Both estimates are within the original amount – they are within the confines of the project funding agreement.

Brooke Trivas: Design progress – we have increased the seating in the auditorium by 40 seats; we illuminated walls that were not necessary, we are putting rubber flooring in the corridor and classrooms no wax it will be easier to clean. Talked about porcelain tiles, they are inexpensive and that are already included in the estimates. Showed samples of the floating floor for the gym, carpet will be in the library, auditorium and the admin spaces.

Bathrooms will have small mosaic tiles. The locker room areas will have rubber, walls, will have tiles with a variety of sizes; tiles are already in the estimates.

KN – will the tiles be the same on both the floors and the walls – that has not been determined.

Colored MDF around the room entries

Brooke stressed to the committee everything that she is showing tonight is included in the estimates. Ceilings; will be 2x2 tiles in the classrooms and offices and both 2x2 and 2x4 tiles in the corridors, hard ceilings in the bathrooms.

Mark Masterson: will there be access panels, the will be in the spaces where we need them; where the shut off valves are. The will be solid with accessibility where needed.

School Building Committee

There is a lot of vandalism in the bathrooms, - the opinion of the committee that there are hard ceilings with access panels in the bathrooms.

Boiler room will be polished concrete, mechanical and storage areas, building maintenance rooms – rubber and maintenance closets with tile walls- we need good durability in those areas. In the janitor’s closets – we need durable finishes. Light fixtures are 3 lamp fixtures even foot candles, dims it evenly.

Toilet rooms – molded plastic sinks, toilet partitions will be black.

The bleachers in the in gym will be approx. 600 retractable most likely black and orange; roller shades on the windows; double tier lockers in the corridors, solar shading system in the gym, waterless urinals and hand dryers, automatic flushers and faucets, still putting paper towel dispensers with two dryers; teachers bathrooms still have paper towels and dryer; not built in paper towel dispensers. Signage with raised letters and brail; fixed and some will be interchangeable, think about this. Do you want them to be interchangeable Admin and guidance areas will have drywall, auditorium seating will have numbers.

We can work with the plan of the coaches rooms by adding toilets and showers, but we need to be given the blessing from the MSBA to flip the gym first.

Brooke showed the committee a couple of designs of the front of the building, one view with a point and one straight.

How many like point 6

How many like straight 3

She has moved the canopy closer to the building.

Pat Saitta: The committee should form a qualification committee by our next meeting; this committee will review the sub-contractors qualifications. Required are a member of the committee one from the design team and one from OPM and two from the committee. This will take some time to go over all the packets received.

Tappe is working on the front end of the project agreement and this should be reviewed by Town Counsel.

JC – motion to adjourn meeting 8:45 pm

2nd by AM

Nest meeting is March 1st at 6:30 pm

Motion passed

February 7, 2011

Pete DiCicco - Safety Concerns: We are starting snow removal on February 8, 2011 at the Green Meadow Elementary School and the Maynard High School. No other major issues – just snow.

Pat Saitta, Municipal Building Consultants submitted a monthly report – Design Development Documents will be submitted to MSBA this week

Both estimates are in range of budget.

Budget estimates are close to \$35,628,582 that was voted in

The estimates will go to MSBA by 2/11/11.

The project is in front of the planning board on 2/8/2011 and then informally in front of Conservation Commission on 2/16/2011, they are preparing the documents to have a hearing with Conservation Commission on 3/1/2011.

JC – motion to approve invoices in front of the board:

1. Tappe Associates in the amount of \$274,500 for design development
2. Municipal Building Consultants in the amount of \$17,295

2nd by AM

Any discussion:

Motion passed 6-0

Brooke Trivas: Three sets of drawings one set will be at the Coolidge, one at Town Hall and the third at the Library. Specs are at Town Hall, if you get input please have them send it to Brooke at Tappe'

Ed Mullin: Changes in the gym area – we have increased that area by switching the side of the gym the locker rooms are at, the original plan the locker rooms with a corridor were on the left they are on the right and the corridor has been taken out of the design, this has to be approved by MSBA. Ed, would you write a letter stating why this should be done?

This is in line with the estimates; WAVM has a bigger classroom, with the same square footage; we took space from the waiting area.

Ed is concerned about supervision to the boy's locker rooms – Mark Masterson agreed;

KN – Can we flip the boys and girls locker rooms?

Discussion: Concerns about the boys and girls coming out of the locker rooms and walking right onto the gym floor, they need access to the fields, with the new layout they will walk right from the locker rooms to the access door to the fields. Tappe' feels that the new layout is improved. Can we take from the storage area?

BT – warns the board that there is no wiggle room with MSBA with square footage, we cannot add square footage. Different ideas were submitted by moving different locker rooms, coach's room, switching girls and boy's locker rooms. Our argument with MSBA is that we took hallway space to useable space. If MSBA does not approve this new design it will go back to the old design.

KN – changing the diagram by flipping the gym – the children will not cross over the gym floor.

Coach's room should be open to the lockers in the vestibule. Double door to the locker rooms, do we have an elevator machine room – yes.

Ed Mullin agreed to send a letter to MSBA supporting this new diagram.

The athletic director and the principal will sign onto the letter.

Points in letter to MSBA:

Have capacity which will support 30 players.

Coaches will have supervision of the players

Focus on harassment and bullying facing all other schools and we are trying to prevent this. This did not add to square footage and still in the budget. The gym is not bigger than first design. The goal of the committee and team is to submit to MSBA by Friday, February 11, 2011.

Brooke went over different materials for inside the school, tiles, walls, rubber floor and where the tiles and rubber flooring will be. Carpet in the admin spaced. There are display cases throughout the school (in budget already). The lighting was high when the estimates came in.

At the next meeting we will discuss: roofing materials, windows and look at a glass spec; tint of the windows and roofing. She will send out information regarding this before the next meeting.

HVAC – concerns were brought up to make sure that the gym is air conditioned. Some additional areas that will have the choice to be air conditioned: WAVM, gym, auditorium, alternate PE room

The committee should vote:

JC – motion to move forward to the construction documents phase subject to comments to MSBA

2nd AM

Motion approved: 6-0

Facility sub-committee on 2/23/2011 that is with Capital Planning Committee

HVAC sub-committee meeting scheduled for 2/15/2011.

Brooke has requested that we change March 2nd meeting to March 1st.

JC – motion to adjourn – 8:30 pm

2nd AM

Motion passed – 6-0

January 5, 2011

JC – Mark Howrey has resigned from the School Building Committee and Phil Berry has been appointed by the SC to succeed him. M Masterson will send the SBC a letter to that effect.

PD - Fowler School, water leak at the Fowler School – 6th grade wing with 6 classrooms and storage. This shorted out the alarm panel; waiting for report from alarm company.

The rooms have been repaired and restored.

Green Meadow School – a heating coil leaked with minor water damage. We have a \$10,000 deductible for the insurance. Also, we had leaks at the Maynard High School Gym.

JC – motion to approve \$10,380 invoice from Municipal Building Consultants and \$1,250 for Chips – 2nd by KN – motion passed – 8-0

BT – update – had programming meetings with staff – took comments and made some classroom changes. Prefer that the building committee take a look at the plans and then go to the Chair to the administration to Brooke.

Discussion: Laura Chesson is working with the specialty consultants and other department heads are working closely with different consultants to make sure everything is the way it should be.

KN/JC – had an open discussion meeting today, to discuss the traffic flow of the students, still gathering and collecting information.

Auditorium seating has been changed; boiler room has been moved to the back of the building, WAVM is closer to the elevator; we are now doing an internal control review. Tile along the corridor with display cases outside the classrooms, some will have shelves and some will not. There should be glass on the display cases, mesh railings, square off point at the top instead of a triangle over the front entrance. Discussion: There cannot be exposed bulletin boards in the hallways – it will not meet the fire code; must be closed in.

Waiting for dimensions on the dumpster from Kevin Sweet

Interior discussions: there will be no alternates in bid documents. We don't want to slow this project down; we are on a tight schedule. No larger locker rooms; no artificial turf. EM- disappointed in the decision to use the scaled down; we cannot miss this construction season.

Tech meeting is scheduled for 1/12/11 at 1:30 pm at the High School.

CHIPS – we are still working on getting into the system. Security meeting – we are scheduling this meeting with the police, school and the consultants

Theatre design meeting scheduled for January 18, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.

PS – went over the timing schedule. We will need a prequalification committee – two members of the SBC with the OPM and someone from the design team. We need to keep to the schedule Pat advises that the committee to meet every two weeks instead of twice a month. This might add another meeting per month.

Updates by TA – BOS will allow TA to sign MSBA documents, the committee will be reappointed by the BOS

CJ motion to adjourn at 8:26 pm.

2nd BN - motion passed – 8-0