## **MINUTES**

School Building Committee Meeting - 6/17/13 5:00 pm Paul Revere Room, Minuteman High School

Attendees: Ford Spalding, Dr. Ed Bouquillon, Kevin Mahoney, Don Lowe, Dana Ham, Alice DeLuca, Simon Bunyard, Peter Sugar, Frank Cannon, David Frizzell, Jack Weis, Ernie Houle, Bill Blake, Tony Lionetta, Mary Anne Cooley, OPM-Mary Ann Williams, Skanska, Designer Team - KBA - Brian Solywoda, Larry Trim, Joe Milani, and Educational Planner - Dr. Frank Locker

#### Approval of Meeting Minutes of May 20, 2013:

Move by A. DeLuca, 2nd by D. Frizzell 8 in favor, 0 opposed Abstentions: Ford Spalding, Don Lowe, Frank Cannon

### Approval of Bills:

Skanska - Invoice 6 for \$15,120 - Made by Alice DeLuca, 2nd Dana Ham - voted unanimously Kaestle Boos - Invoice 2 for \$27,400 - Made by Alice DeLuca, 2nd Dana Ham - voted unanimously

Brian Solywoda, KBA: Introduced the Educational Programming and Planning consultant team working (Dr. Frank Locker, Educational Planner, Joe Milani and Larry Trim, KBA and Mary Ann Williams, Skanska) with the Minuteman Educational Executive Management team.

Joe Milani, KBA made a power point summary presentation of the Existing Conditions Report findings:

## **Existing Conditions Site Issues:**

KBA discussed results of borings performed and the limitations on certain areas of campus due to wetlands and soil characterization. Peat was found underneath the parking areas. There is also evidence of cracking and deterioration in parking areas shows evidence of unstable substrate. Accessibility into the building is also an issue –path to entry is not to code (stairs/ramp). A summary of initial recommendations was distributed in advance of the meeting.

## **Existing Conditions Exterior Shell:**

The existing building structure is comprised of steel columns and beams with concrete floors and roof. The seismic analysis determined that even though the as built drawings of the building showed expansion joints, it was not built that way in a number of places evidenced by welded plates at expansion joints that are meant to slide. The roof is in poor condition. Water leaking in to the building around roof drains. Roofing membrane is delaminating evidenced by uplift of membrane and overlap of insulation that should be adhered to the roof slab.

## Existing Conditions Accessibility Issues:

Accessibility is a major issue throughout the building. Bathrooms, height and type of door hardware, elevator and transition to other spaces are not to code.

## **Existing Conditions Egress Issues:**

Handrails are not compliant as they have large openings and no balusters. Stairways are not fire rated and are open at the top to other areas. Non-compliant hardware and rating of doors are an issue and in need of an upgrade for egress to comply.

# **Existing Conditions MEP Issues:**

Examples shown of fan cut into stairwell, ductwork obstructing corridor and areas not assessable or clear on what to do in the case of an emergency.

# <u>Cost Triggered Code Requirements:</u>

Reviewed cost thresholds as it relates to Accessibility (ADA/MAAB) compliance, Fire Protection and Life Safety in the building. Currently estimators are working on pricing up the cost of repairs based on "Insured Value" of the building rather than "assessed value".

- "Repairs" is a scope of work that can be performed by school maintenance and is described as "non-permitted work". You will have a usable facility that addresses life safety and comfort issues. The Estimate from 2 years ago for Repair Costs was \$22 Million. However, this does not address seismic issues and does not include addressing the issues identified in the structural analysis. Also, you would need to add 3% for escalation for each of the last 2 years. Then you would need to carry 5% escalation for each year prior to the start of the repair work.
- "Major Renovations" is permitted work and includes renovation of a major portion of HVAC,
  Plumbing or Electrical Systems, ceiling replacement, wall demolition, door or stair renovation. If
  the renovation is more than 33% of the assessed value of the building then Fire Protection is
  required. There is a "Domino" affect:
  - You have the value of recent construction
  - o Add Roof Replacement and required Code Upgrades is a cost trigger for Fire Protection
  - Add Fire Protection with ceilings, lighting and other MEP upgrades is a cost trigger for Accessibility

### Maintenance vs. Major Renovation:

J Weis Question: Who if anybody says we need to be accountable to for ADA accessibility? Answer: The American with Disabilities Act is a Federal Law. The threshold on a Municipal Building is low. The issue of lack of access can be raised in a law suit by a parent for example. With a Cost Triggered Code Requirement, we need to follow locally the requirements of the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (MAAB).

## <u>Discussion on Educational Programming (Larry Trim/Dr. Locker):</u>

Background discussion on process and space use planning – First step was to confirm and document how each of the rooms in the building are used in the existing program. The consulting team has been working with the Minuteman Educational Executive Management team application of 6 indicators for program planning. The summary analysis will be posted on the website.

### Federal Funding requires that we look at:

- X factor which is gender balance
- Y factor pubic interface
- Programs were then summarized by enrollment levels of 435, 670 & 800

435 students with a class size of 435/40 (20 in class/20 in vocational lab) could offer 11 Programs

670 students with a class size of 670/40 (20 in class/20 in vocational lab) could offer 17 Programs 800 students with a class size of 800/40 (20 in class/20 in vocational lab) could offer 20 Programs

J Weis questioned whether 40 students per program is an appropriate number – and why would we have fewer programs than what we already have now?

F Locker is designing programs based on full capacity but not creating too many programs to in order to comply with state guidelines. The State wants to make sure that you are not building spaces that are not utilized so we account for all spaces and programs based on enrollment.

J Weis - Are we locking in to programs based on the cluster design?

F Locker - Not locking in, but honing in. Future-proofing is based on access, high-bay vs. low-bay, fire requirement, etc.

J Milani - These are recommendations, and not intended to tell the district what to do

S Bunyard - Curriculum is a big factor; does not want SBC getting into curriculum decisions MA Williams – We have been meeting with the educators of the school. Program meeting minutes were distributed as requested to the SBC in advance of the meeting for SBC review. You will find the participants listed in the Meeting Minutes (Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent of Finance, Director of Curriculum – Instruction and Assessment, Special Education Director, Ed Tech Director, CTE Director and Principal).

S Bunyard - When decisions are made, we need to have curriculum folks involved

F Spalding - Administration has been at the table during all of these discussions

J Weis - Definitely need consultation on programs from administration, but the School Committee needs to do the job with the consultation of are member towns. We are not there yet.

F Locker - this is a work in process

F Spalding - The work needs to work forward.

MA Williams – We are meeting with the School Committee tomorrow night and there is a joint SC/SBC meeting being planned for the week of August 27<sup>th</sup>. This work is being conducted in a manner that is following the guidelines of the MSBA. We need all parties to be informed and engaged so that informed decisions can be made and everyone involved in this process is up to date and educates themselves on what we are doing.

J Weis - Where did the 670 enrollment number come from? Is it midpoint between 435 and 800? B Solywoda – Yes

MA Williams - Under the renovation model for enrollment of 435, the size of the existing building is especially a challenge given the enrollment numbers compared to the current size of Minuteman High School at 310,000SF. In the smaller school option we leverage the greatest number of majors. The School Committee will need to give us some direction on how many out of District slots should be accounted for.

#### Overview of Space Summary analysis:

F Locker reviewed the relationship diagram with the committee.

There are 4 Major Program Area Clusters:

- 1. Construction Technology and Trades
- 2. Bio-Sciences and Life Sciences

- 3. Health and Personal Services
- 4. Engineering Cluster

Each cluster is autonomous learning center and a constellation of classes.

J Weis - Does this structure limit involvement in student life? Looks like Silos.

F Locker – Most progressive educational thinking shows smaller learning communities – teachers know their students well; State-of the- art learning; allows personal expression from teaching staff. This is much like "hi-tech High"; and does not "silo" students. There are breaks in the schedule that allow socialization. We have many common areas for connection. We know kids get lost at large schools.

## MA Williams - Module 3 & Module 4

A one page snap shot of the process for Module 3 and 4 layered with the agreed upon schedule over it to establish deliverables based on our meeting with MSBA - described the 1 page format. This will help communities understand the process, the points in time when decisions are to be made, when to have joint meetings with SBC and SC, and understanding the timing of the recommendation submissions for the preferred schematic solution and at a point in time enrollment will be understood. We are looking to be in alignment with the work being done by the Regional Agreement Amendment Subcommittee.

An invitation has been sent to the 16 Member Communities Town Managers/Administrators for a meeting June 28<sup>th</sup> at 12:30pm at Minuteman. Also, this group needs to put together a communications committee so that the communities understand exactly what we are doing on this project.

Proposing concepts: Would like to have a joint SC/SBC meeting to discuss concepts and discuss the issue of out-of-district tuition.

Next meeting - 7/15 @ 5:00pm.

Adjourned @ 6:10pm - D Frizzell 2nd by D Ham - voted unanimous.

Mary Ann Williams, Recorder	