

Name of Committee: Runkle School Building Committee

Meeting Date: 7 April 2009 Time: 8:30 a.m. Meeting Location: Town Hall Room 111

Attendees indicated by x

Runkle School Renovations Building Committee

Nancy Daly	x	Joseph Connelly	x
Helen Charlupski	x	Michael Shepard	x
Glenn Cunha	x	Anthony Guigli	x
Kenneth Kaplan	x	Charles Simmons	x
Richard Kelliher		Raymond Masak	x
William Lupini	x	Julie Hackett	x
Sean Cronin	x		

Public Present: Scott Newman, Parent, Karen Breslawski, Parent, Mike Oates, abutter, Roger Tackeff, abutter, Matt D'Agostino, Runkle Extended Day, Elizabeth Childs, Parent

Others Present: Bob Bell, Design Partnership of Cambridge, Gregg Schroeder, Design Partnership of Cambridge, John Jumpe, Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA)

Topic: Approval of Meeting Minutes

- The Committee unanimously approved the minutes of March 25, 2009, with the following corrections: "Scoot Newman" changed to "Scott Newman", Scott Newman and Karen Breslawski to be listed in "Members Present".

Topic: Proposed space summary

- G. Schroeder distributed and described the "Proposed Space Summary" dated 4/2/09, which includes all program needs identified by the School Department to date. It does not include the second pre-k room under discussion with the MSBA. Including all program needs so identified, it yields a building of approximately 106K SF. The allowed design is for 560 students, and the MSBA allows 177 SF per student yielding a building of 99,180 SF. So the program yields a building approximately 6K SF over the size allowed for this building by the MSBA based on the enrollment. B. Lupini noted that approximately 3900 SF of the overage is made up of Extended Day and Early Education. G. Schroeder then stated that B. Bell would now present the concept options, all of which basically keep 50K SF of the existing building, all tear down the 10K 1988 addition and all add about 55K SF of new construction.
- B. Bell presented the concept drawings, four options all in very preliminary stages addressing the program needs of the school and all yielding a building of approximately 105-107K SF, all include demolition of the existing two story 1988 addition to the rear of the building with a three story addition in its place.

1. Option A rebuilds out closer to Clinton Road into the green space area, three floors, double loaded corridor (classrooms both sides), with a gym at the furthest point towards Clinton Road with a cafeteria and kitchen below it. The existing paved area would serve the kitchen and cafeteria area. There is a single loaded corridor (classrooms on one side) one story addition on the Chesham Road side of the building.
 2. Option B basically includes an addition that wraps around the rear of the building with three stories on the Clinton Road side, dropping to one story on the Chesham Road side, with an open courtyard in the middle of the building. It is envisioned this courtyard would be an outdoor classroom which may include student gardens or other educational uses. It allows for a main entrance from Clinton Road, has very good circulation and addresses the adjacencies described by program needs. Again, the gym is stacked over the cafeteria and kitchen. The design team is looking into whether play space can be developed on the Chesham Road side.
 3. Option C includes two three story wing additions out the back of the building with most of the classroom on the Chesham Road side. It divides classrooms not per the groupings described by program needs.
 4. Option D is a four story addition out the back of the building. It is fifteen feet above the existing construction and exceeds allowable zoning for the area. It is not as efficient as hoped for because corridors could not be double loaded easily, it does not allow for the desired adjacencies, and the gym is 2.5 stories so it cannot be built on.
- N. Daly then sought comments from those present. By and large, most preferred Option B, because it best addresses the program requirements, space adjacencies and affords good circulation. The classrooms are clustered well with none near the gym. Some concerns were that this option does not appear at first glance to allow for much play area for younger children, but as stated above the architect is looking into improvements in that regard. The other options did not offer the best circulation, classroom clusters and adjacencies. Abutters present expressed concern as to massing.
 - J. Jumpe confirms the project already has the approval of the MSBA board to move to schematic design, however the preferred option, when chosen by the Town, must be approved on a staff level at the MSBA. He notes there is a meeting on Thursday April 9 between the architect, MSBA staff and OPM to discuss schedule, enrollments, space template, etc.
 - T. Guigli requests the architect review the options with the MEP engineers soon to get their input before the concepts progress much further.
 - G. Schroeder indicates there is no data as yet received as a result of the geotechnical work that happened on site on 2 April 2009.
 - T. Guigli notes the Traffic Study proposal is \$8,500, which is \$3,500 over the project amount in the contract with DPC. A contract amendment for the difference will be presented to the Building Commission, School Committee and Board of Selectmen.

- Runkle School Building Committee unanimously votes to accept DPC proposal of \$14,300 for the survey work, with comments by Peter Ditto as to scope incorporated.
- Next meetings of the Runkle School Building Committee on 30 April 2009 at 9:00 a.m. in Room 103 Town Hall and 6 May 2009 at 8:30 a.m. in the Selectmens' Conference Room, 6th Floor, Town Hall. The next community meeting is 18 May 2009 at 7:00 p.m. Runkle School Library.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Guigli
Project Director