

Name of Committee: Runkle School Building Committee

Meeting Date: March 12, 2010 Time: 8:30am Meeting Location: Town Hall Room:
Selectmens Conference Room

Runkle School Renovations Building Committee

Nancy Daly	x	Joseph Connelly	x
Helen Charlupski	x	Charles Simmons	
Glenn Cunha	x	Jennifer Fischer-Mueller	
Kenneth Kaplan			
Richard Kelliher	x	Anthony Guigli	x
William Lupini	x		
Sean Cronin	x		
Michael Shepard	x		
Peter Rowe	x		

Public Present: Raymond Masak, Project Manager, Gregg Schroeder, Design Partnership of Cambridge, Bob Bell, , Design Partnership of Cambridge, Karen Breslawski, parent Michael Oates, Abutter , Amy Hummel, PTO, Dasha Weir, parent, Erin Chute Gallentine, Dir of Parks and Open Space, Ann Blair, Landscape Planner/Architect, Dave Warner, Warner/Larsen Architects

Topic: **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Committee voted unanimously to approve the Meeting Minutes of 22 February 2010, with one (1) abstention (H Charlupski)

Topic: **Design Development Cost Estimate**

G Schroeder presented the design development estimate. He stated that estimate had gone down by ~\$200,000 and that the architect's estimate compared favorably with the Town's estimate. G Schroeder stated that reconciliation was ongoing and that based on a question from H Charlupski that the reconciliation should be completed within the next week. G Schroeder then presented a list of additions which were value engineered out of the project which could be considered as possible add backs to the project based on the favorable news regarding the estimate.

- Roof – G Schroeder stated that they did an existing roof survey and the roof was in good shape and has the potential life span of an additional 20 years. N Daly questioned the viability of keeping the roof based on the number of penetrations and the protection of the roof during construction. GSchroeder stated that based on the good condition of the roof, the Town could consider the addition of a new roof over the existing roof. S Cronin

questioned the presentation of the budget numbers in the handout. It was also stated that the town would get a MA-CHP point with a new roof

- Boilers – G Schroeder that the Town should consider higher efficiency boilers which burn gas only. This would add \$15,000 in added costs with a potential of gaining a MA-CHP point and saving \$5,000 in operational costs. T Guigli stated that the added costs did not take into account abandoning the existing oil tank. M Shepherd spoke on the philosophy of having dual fuel: there are reliability issues with the gas supply in Town; dual fuel burners give the Town flexibility based on the pricing of each commodity. There was general consensus not to move forward with this option.
- Ceramic Tile - .H. Charlupski would like this to be considered. TGuigli asked whether there was a price difference relative to using wainscoting rather than tile. G Schroeder suggested that the numbers should be comparable.
- Irrigation- G Schroeder stated that the Town would lose a MA-CHP point if we irrigate the ornamental flower beds. E. Chute Gallentine stated that from a functional standpoint the irrigation is needed based on the location of the beds. It was suggested that provisions be added in the contract to allow this work to move forward in the future and to insure we have the mandatory 34 MA-CHP points so that we do not lose the \$600,000 in funding.

B. Lupini stated that ultimately the criteria for any add backs need to be durability. Prior to any further discussion on this issue, the architect needs to provide their written recommendation on this issue. S Cronin stated that bid alternates would not be funded by the SBA and that this issue needed to be reviewed carefully.

Topic: **Exterior Elevation Options**

Bob Bell presented six (6) exterior elevation wall options that abut the neighbors including potential material selections. B Bell noted that at a prior meeting the Building Commission did not like the newer materials presented as they felt some of the material presented had an institutional feeling and were not in keeping with the neighborhood. Based on the overall consensus of the meeting attendees, options 1A and 1B were preferred. It was agreed to forward the options to the neighbors as a PDF file for further input. The architect was also requested to study the interior/ exterior lighting and landscape buffers to minimize the impacts to the abutters as well as study the day lighting of the windows in the gym. M. Shepherd noted that the durability of the windows should be reviewed in this area as well concerning their proximity to the basketball court.

Topic: **Courtyard**

Dave Warner gave a short presentation on the courtyard stating that his firm had incorporated the functionality issues based on the input of various user groups.

He stated that the landscaping would meet the following objectives: a natural setting, it would create an opportunity as a learning space and that the maintenance envisioned by the Town would be minimal with no gas powered equipment being used. D Warner informed the group that there were three (3) points of access and that the design will take into account the high degree of the shading the area will experience. E. Chute Gallentine and A Blair stated they felt the courtyard design had the potential to grow into a high maintenance space if not used as envisioned by the school system (parent group to maintain). However, they stated the design was a well balanced and had changed substantially from the original presentation which predominantly used hardscapes.

Topic: **Landscape Buffers**

Dave Warner gave a short presentation on the two (2) small planting buffers abutting the neighborhood yards. N. Daly stated that the planting materials should be durable. H Charlupski voiced a concern that the landscaping should address shading issues with neighbors. M Oates would like to break up the mass of the existing building. Based on further discussion, the buffer zone should be maintainable and should be a more natural setting. N. Daly would like additional neighborhood input and suggested a meeting to discuss this topic further. It was agreed that the abutters meeting would be on-site on Tuesday March 23rd, 2010 at 9am.

Topic: **Transportation and Parking**

H. Charlupski stated that prior to the end of the school year that the new parking plan should be in place on a trial basis to insure that it would be workable when the students and faculty returned to the newly renovated school.

Topic: **Proposed Meetings**

The next meeting of the Runkle School Building Committee is Wednesday March 24, 2010 at 8:30 am in a location to be determined.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Guigli
Project Director

Mar8min.doc