

Name of Committee: Runkle School Building Committee

Meeting Date: 30 April 2009 Time: 9:00 a.m. Meeting Location: Town Hall Room 111
Runkle School Renovations Building Committee

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

Public Present: Karen Breslawski, Parent, Scott Newman, Parent, Mike Oates, abutter, Roger Tackeff, abutter, Matt D'Agostino, Runkle Extended Day, Chad Ellis, Parent, Harvey Finkel, abutter, Ariella Finkel, abutter, Michael Leabman, architect, Sandy Costello, parent, Dascha Weir, parent, Dru Krishnan, parent, Christina Suh, parent, Rosemary McElroy, parent

Others Present: Erin Gallentine, Parks & Recreation, Ralph Gifford, TCI Engineers, David Warner, Warner Larson

Topic: Approval of Meeting Minutes

- The Committee unanimously approved the minutes of April 7, 2009.

Topic: Conceptual Designs

- B. Bell presented again 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. He reviewed again for the committee the pros and cons of each option, as had been presented in the previous meeting.
- B. Bell then presented two variations on "Option B" called "B1" and "B2".
- "B1" includes straightening out the gym/cafeteria wall in relation to the property lines on Dean Road, and straightening out the classroom wing relative to Clinton Road. This results in pulling the mass of the building away from Dean Road to approximately 70 feet from the property line and preserves the existing basketball court. It opens up the proposed court yard to more light. It has a one story kindergarten wing and a three story addition to the rear of the building and on the Dean Road side of the site. D. Warner spoke about the site under these scenarios noting at 45 foot approximate grade change from Druce Street to Clinton Road.
- "B2" is similar to "B1" with the gym dropped to the lower level effectively creating a two story addition, with two stories at the kindergarten wing. This requires rebuilding the existing one story existing kindergarten area.

- B. Bell stated that Design Partnership of Cambridge (DPC) would create shadow and massing models of B1 and B2.
- G. Schroeder presented the cost estimates. The estimate was based on “Option B” with a look at other options to determine differences. In all options, the area to be renovated is the same, the area of new construction varies. He reviewed the “trade costs” and noted that the costs are escalated to the midpoint of construction as per MSBA requirements. He discussed the contingencies and indirect expenses.
- G. Schroeder presented the various scope options including what is included in the base cost estimates and suggested possible scope additions and deletions. All scope deletions would have to be accepted to bring the cost of the project down to the \$26.4 million dollar project cost currently carried in the Town of Brookline Capital Improvements Program (CIP).
- G. Schroeder notes that the Town would have to justify to the MSBA all square footage of program over the 99,180 SF as the result of their guidelines. There has been some suggestion the Authority may be sensitive to the SPED programs offered by the school program and the fact that this will be a 3 classroom per grade program.
- There was discussion of the engineering scope options including the issue of ducted air systems verses univentilators and the construction of the building envelope. The 10’10” floor to floor ceiling height in the existing building does not leave enough room for horizontal ducts in the opinion of the design team. This would result in horizontal runs on the roof with screening, insulation, roof penetrations and vertical ducts down through the building. This would also effectively preclude the possibility of not replacing the existing roof. The downside of univentilators is increased noise, operating and maintenance costs and the need to determine if they are MASSCHIPS qualified.
- G. Schroeder suggested the design team would need decisions on the Value Engineering items and preferred scope option in 2-4 weeks in order to stay on schedule.
- It was agreed the design team would provide a cost benefit analysis of the univentilators verses the ducted system and that the design team would provide a list of recommended value engineering items.
- S. Cronin reviewed the reimbursement rates for the project.
- Next meeting of the Runkle School Building Committee meeting is 13 May at 8:30 a.m. in Room 111, Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Guigli
Project Director