

Name of Committee: Runkle School Building Committee

Meeting Date: 5 December 2011 Time: 8:30 a.m. Meeting Location: Town Hall, Selectmens Meeting Room, 6th Floor

Nancy Daly	x		
Kenneth Kaplan	x	Anthony Guigli	x
Vanessa Beauchaine	x	Charles Simmons	x
William Lupini	x		
Sean Cronin	x	Jennifer Fischer-Mueller	
Michael Shepard	x	Gregg Schroeder	x
Peter Rowe	x	Bob Bell	x
Mel Kleckner	x		
Helen Charlupski			

Others Present: Vin Pelleriti, Design Partnership of Cambridge, Ralph Gifford, Thompson Consulting Engineers, Scott Newman and Karen Breslawski, parents, David Geanakakis, Purchasing Agent, Erin Chute, Parks and Open Space, David Warner, Warner Larson

Public Present: Michael Oates, Harvey and Ariella Finkel, Roger Tackeff, Luisa Bryan abutters, Gill Fishman and Pam Lodish, neighborhood. Janice Kahn, Advisory Committee, Amy Kershaw, School Committee, numerous parents of Runkle School children.

Topic: Approval of Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes of 23 November 2011 unanimously approved.

Topic: Date of next Meetings

The date and time of the next meeting is Friday 9 December 2011 at 8:00 a.m. in Room 103, Town Hall. The next meeting after that is Friday 16 December 2011 at 8:00 a.m. in Town Hall Room 103. Among the topics of that meeting is a presentation by Engineering and the Traffic Departments as to an update and schedule of proposed traffic improvements and the permit parking plan.

Topic: Play Equipment

D. Warner provided an update on the status of the play equipment design, schedule and bidding. He began by describing the process and meetings that happened to arrive at the preferred design. The process was modeled after the Parks and Open Space method of same. The first meeting of the informal play equipment group happened on May 20, 2010, in which different types of equipment were presented and input was received from parents, Town and School staff and other interested parties. This was followed by a field

trip on June 7 to various playgrounds around Town. On June 15 the group met and arrived at a couple of alternatives for both play areas (younger and older kids), this included specifics about different types of equipment. Two more meetings were held; July 1 and July 21, when the current design was finalized.

Owing to the schedule, the design was then basically shelved until now, as it needs to be bid soon to allow for installation in the summer of 2012.

D. Warner then presented the design of the play equipment for both younger and older kids both in plan and concept drawings of what the equipment will look like. This included a detailed description of the play equipment and its functions and amenities. Some of the constraints include limited space. Some of the goals are for a climbing opportunity, swings and slides. He also showed shade studies on the equipment. The older kids equipment is designed around Landscape Structures. The younger kids equipment is designed around Compan with some Landscapes Structures. It is on the Chesham Road side of the building, is on two levels and has direct access from the Kindergarten classrooms.

Last month Warner Larson updated the pricing. While D. Warner indicates there have been some adjustments, it is all still within the budget. T. Guigli requested a detailed breakdown from the design team. A meeting was held on October 21, 2011 to confirm the equipment design and bid schedule with the informal play equipment group.

The plan is to bid the project in early January and execute a contract by the end of March 2012. D. Warner then expects 8 weeks for submittals and procurement of equipment. Installation would then begin in early May, with an eight week duration, for a finished product in July 2012.

What followed was a discussion of how to bid the project under MGL 30 39M. T. Guigli stated that the TOB would rely heavily on the design team to a) prepare a bid package that complies with the law and b) if the Town is in the position of having to make a determination on “or equal” submittals, the design team will be the expected to provide an expert and reasoned written determination for same.

Finally the Committee unanimously voted to accept the following, as presented by E. Chute Gallentine:

“Based on the Committee’s detailed analysis of the school ground’s layout and design, interviews with various user groups, consideration of views into and out of the playground areas, a commitment to a wide variety of play opportunities that can accommodate many children at once, meets specific development goals and is also of the highest quality, durability and strength, and careful review of form, function and color; the Committee votes to accept the playground and play equipment design as presented as it provides the highest level of play, aesthetic and design uniquely appropriate for each specific age group in its designated location and is therefore in the best interest of the Town and School Community”

Topic: Roof Top Equipment

N. Daly distributed a copy of a letter dated 1 December 2011 from a number of neighbors on Dean Road reiterating their concerns about the HVAC equipment on the roof and providing some conceptual solutions.

B. Bell provided elevations images of what the roof top equipment and building should look like when the current contract work is complete versus what it should look like if any of the options were accepted. He also presented elevations of how the Design Development drawings dated 9 March 2010 would appear versus the current contract work.

Option 1A lowers the unit(s) by 1'6" and was shown as either a polycarbonate top or angled top. Option 2A moves the unit 20' closer to the edge of the building.

What followed was a discussion of how the acoustic screens might be lowered and/or treated to mitigate the visual effects. It was agreed by all that noise mitigation cannot be compromised.

M. Oates then presented two options from the 1 December letter that he feels would address neighbor's concerns; Option 2A and Option 8. The Dean Road abutters felt that changes to the units to either lower them and or mitigate the screening (as described by B. Bell) will not be satisfactory.

The Committee directed the architect to a) look at the feasibility of Options 2A and Option 8 (as described by M. Oates) and provide a proposal to craft a design sufficient for contractor pricing, which would not involve delay to the project. It was noted that real costs and potential delays cannot be fully assessed until such contractor input is done.

The Committee agreed to reconvene on Friday 9 December 2011 at 8:00 a.m. to consider the proposal and hear from the architect as to feasibility.

Subsequent to the meeting, the location of the 12/9/11 meeting was determined to be Town Hall Room 103.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Guigli
Project Director