



Penn Brook School Building Committee Meeting Notes

January 17, 2012

7:00 PM

Georgetown Town Hall, 3rd Floor Meeting Room

Committee:

| <u>Voting Member</u> | <u>Representing</u> | <u>Present</u> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Ellie Sinkewicz | Building Committee Co-Chair | X |
| Michelle Smith | Building Committee Co-Chair | X |
| Alan Aulson Jr. | Citizen | X |
| John Bonazoli | Finance Committee | |
| Glenn Clohecy | Citizen | |
| George Comiskey | Citizen | X |
| Peter Durkee | Highway Surveyor | X |
| Tillie Evangelista | Planning Board | X |
| Rob Hoover | School Committee | X |
| Kerry Stauss | Citizen | X |
| C. David Surface | Chairman, Board of Selectmen | |
| Eric Zadina | Citizen | |
| Jeff Wade | Citizen | X |
| <u>Non-Voting Members</u> | | |
| Carol Jacobs | Superintendent | X |
| Michael Farrell | Town Administrator | |
| Dr. Donna Tanner | Principal, Penn Brook School | |
| <u>Other Attendees:</u> | | |
| Carl Franceschi | DRA | X |
| Paul Brown | DRA | X |
| Pat Saitta | Municipal Building Consultants | X |
| Dave Conway | Nitsch Engineering | X |
| Dave Warner | Warner Larsen | X |
| Doug Morse | Warner Larsen | X |
| Courtney Ufnal | DRA | X |

1. Approval of invoices

- Municipal Building Consultants, Inc. – Dec 2012 - \$7,620

Motion – George , Second – Tillie, - vote to approve - unanimous

- DRA - Dec 2012 - \$69,135 – Motion – Jeff, Second – Tillie – approved unanimous
- Postage School Dept - \$29.48 Motion – Michelle, Second – George – approve unanimous

2. Review of minutes needing approval – minutes of 11/8/11, 11/16/11, 11/22/11 and 12/20/11 were reviewed for approval.

11/8/11 minutes – George indicated that 4 motions on the Preferred Options were acted on – 2 on grade configuration and 2 on location – only one noted. Hold approval for correction/s.

11/16/11 minutes – Tillie provided written comments to the minutes regarding the appearance of Harry LaCortiglia who appeared as a citizen and not as a member of the Planning Board and noted his comments. Rob asked for verification with budget numbers referenced by David Surface and noted his concerns for Ms. Johnson regarding construction access around her property. Rob clarified John B's "sticker shock" statement to read clearly. Attachment noted in meeting minutes were missing. Hold approval for corrections

11/22/11 minutes – Tillie noted that the reference to the final survey in the Item 3 – DRA update with respect to "a portion of the access driveway" should read "appears to be the neighbor's property". Hold for correction/s.

12/20/11 minutes – it was noted that Peter Durkee arrived late but was present. Rob suggested that the work "building" be introduced before the work "design" in paragraph 2 of Item 4. Motion made by Jeff to approve with the above changes – second by George – approved unanimous.

Correction of minutes procedure – It was agreed that any corrections to the minutes be made in writing (preferably before the meeting to allow for corrections) to insure the accuracy of the changes and to economize on the effort. Corrections to the above will be made when the information is received. Tillie did provide a written memo to the 11/16/12 minutes which will be used in the correction of the minutes.

3. **DRA Presentation of Schematic Design update and Options:**

DRA presented members of their site engineering team and each were self introduced.

Carl proceeded to present modifications to the site and building plans reflecting suggestions made by the various committee members, school administration and faculty and explained the ongoing activity involved with the Schematic Design submission due 2/2/12 which will be acted on at the MSBA March Board meeting.

- Cost estimating is in progress but estimates due with the submission won't be available until shortly before the submission date. Suggestion is to use the preferred option budget for approval by the BOS and SC of the schematic submission which is a reasonable option at this time. Rob questioned the cost that the SC will be asked to approve and the suggestion to use the preferred option was reinforced. Pat indicated that both estimating firms are working on the schematic design costs and information would be provided as soon as possible before the submission.
- Paul referred to the Preferred Option budget figures in response to the a question on the project cost which for the K- 6 in the woods is construction costs -

\$38,207,636 and total project costs - \$47,715,358. Kerry questioned what the cost to Georgetown was based on MSBA's reimbursement – based on the Preferred Options assumption – cost to Georgetown \$26,431,296

- Rob expressed concern with costs, i.e. offsite work, site improvements, retaining walls, etc. and requested a breakdown. Pat noted the preferred option budget contained a breakdown for Site, building, offsite, soft, FF&E, Technology, etc.
- Pat explained that following design phases after town approval included Design Development, 60% update and 90% update that all require cost updates and value engineering to “hold costs”. The phases also allow for refinement of material and systems as design progresses.
- Carl answered general questions i.e. new building will have more parking and cueing, two way drives will be 24’, one way – 16’. George question the possible use of permeable pavers – Carl noted maintenance concerns but will investigate. Michelle – question on # of parking spaces – Carl 80 spaces exist – new building currently designed for 216
- Carl reviews building and site modifications considered in the layout to be presented, i.e. inside layout suggestions, classroom cluster arrangement (not enough rooms to modify), playground proximity to school, hallway length (design currently compact)
- DRA distributed site plans consisting of three site options with revised building layouts A, B and C.
- Option A –
 1. Layout put the building approximately 80’ closer to the existing building and fields
 2. Road layout more direct main entry and adds a playground
 3. New building layout with Y shaped classroom wings
- Option B -
 1. Layout move building closer to the existing building and fields
 2. Building layout is similar to Option A but rotated 90 degrees
 3. Parking layout puts all parking in front of the building (poss. negative)
 4. Roadways move closer to exit saving \$
 5. Building has one main entry and a looped bus route behind
 6. All support spaces except the library are located on the first floor
 7. No kindergarten drop off
 8. Carol – concerned about the Bus drop-off travel path over portion of play areas and travel routes. Rob – consider moving bus loop to rear of play ground.
- Option C –

1. New building layout – classroom layout similar to "A" but rotated 90 Degrees and the Café and Gym split into a Y configuration.
 2. Parking is dispersed placing a portion closer to the existing fields over the existing septic system and eliminating removal of certain tree clusters.
 3. Layout addresses several staff concerns on location of certain spaces. Carol concerned about hallway length – Carl explains the compact design. Jeff comments that the Administration space is centrally located and advantageous to the travel distances.
 4. Music room and Platform on same level
 5. Building has one main entry and a rear and side playground
- Teacher feedback – Ellie and Michelle indicated that they have received positive feedback from the presentation made by DRA. Carl – made changes to play proximity, work rooms, door access, music / platform proximity, teachers dining, etc. Additional meeting with Carol, staff and DRA will be conducted at 7:00 AM on 1/19/12 to review design and solicit other comments.
 - DRA passed out building floor plans for A, B and C and PowerPoint presentations for A and B. Power point for C was not yet available
 - General Discussion on the 3 options:
 1. Peter – are there standards for parking spaces for schools – Carl – generally staff/visitor requirements and special event calculations – new layout has considerably more even when considering the expanded size.
 2. Jeff – could use additional study on parking and layout
 3. Rob – concern about value engineering that may be required cutting site landscaping and site improvement budget.
 4. Jeff – can loop road around building be unpaved – but maintenance issue
 5. Tillie – requested an update on the geotech report – DRA will respond
 6. Ellie – more borings required – Carl – possibly if required by engineers
 7. Peter – lower fields have two layers of topsoil indicating some filling over the lower layer
 - Civil Engineering Presentation by Dave Conway, Nitsch Engineering
 1. Existing septic system is over 40 years old and needs replacement. Current thinking is to locate the new system in the existing fields utilizing a pressurized pumped system. Phasing of the new and removal of the existing system will be determined during future design phases.
 2. Drainage system will be designed to contain storm water as required by all regulatory bodies. Phasing of systems will be required between existing and new. George – any “triggers” for permits – Dave – yes due to size
 3. Storm detention could be placed under pavement but not septic
 4. Rain water collection is possibility for irrigation but insufficient for field irrigation due to insufficient roof area. Possible well to supplement – to be checked.

5. Water to be looped to Elm down second means of egress to improve pressure.
 6. Secondary access could be a full time pedestrian access
 7. George – drainage design – Dave 100 year storm design
- Landscaping Presentation by Dave Larsen, Warner Larsen
 1. General review of design to date i.e. fields, site improvements, landscaping
 2. Goal is meeting program objectives while reducing impact to the site.
 3. W-L involved with the “Boston School Yard” initiative and Dave passionate with the program.
 4. George – questioned site plan review status and regulations used in design. W-L indicated they retrieved the regulations from the Georgetown Web site. George indicated that changes to the regulations may not have been updated on the web site. W-L to check.

4. **Discussion on Options and Vote:**

- DRA and MBC noted that a decision on a preferred option or maintaining the original layout in the wood was required to make the 2/2/12 submission date.
- Tilly – prefers option B – less exterior wall, further from the vernal pool and more economical
- Rob – B site functions the best
- Carl – B and C site are interchangeable and can be modified. C building fits on B site
- Kerri – prefers C
- Michelle – prefers C
- Jeff – B or C with conditions but close – likes original layout and mid level entry but thinks the advantages of the new layouts offset the conditions.
- Peter – B or C OK
- Alan – prefers C
- Ellie – prefers C but B or C OK
- Rob – any response from MSBA on the K approval – Pat – no response yet.
- Carol – Gym size – any chance we can use overall space savings (we’re under the total SF allocation) to add to the Gym – Carl – spaces are compared to each area requirements and our gym is close to limit
- Formal vote taken as follows;
 1. Original layout in woods (in preferred submission) none in favor
 2. Option A - none in favor
 3. Option B – Tilly , George
 4. Option C – Michelle, Ellie, Kerri. Peter, Jeff, George (voted for B & C), Rob, Alan
- Vote results – Based on the Building Committee vote above, DRA was authorize to proceed with the schematic design based on site and building layout C with some modifications to the site layout between B and C.

- Pete suggested that the secondary means of access may not be necessary since the parking area is closer to the exits. Rob still felt it was necessary due to safety concerns and emergency vehicle access.

5 Next Steps:

- MBC will review the Town's schematic submission requirements (MSBA module 4) with the Committee chairs and Carol for proper preparation
 - DRA will forward the Option C information to the SC for approval action at the 1/26/12 meeting
 - Community forum @ Penn Brook 1/23/12 @ 6:30 PM
 - Selectmen meeting @ Town Hall 1/23/12 @ 7:00 PM (Split coverage)
 - Building Committee meeting @ Penn Brook 1/25/12 @ 7:00 PM
 - School committee meeting Town Hall 1/26/12 @ 7:00 Pm
 - Ellie passed out a memo from Rob dated 1/17 for information
6. Motion to adjourn made by George, seconded by Peter and all voted to adjourn. Meeting concluded at 10:35PM