

Permanent Building Committee
Meeting of October 24, 2019
Town Hall 7:30PM

Approved

A duly called and posted meeting of the Permanent Building Committee was held at the Town Hall, 7:30PM, October 24, 2019.

Present: T Goemaat (TG), D Grissino (DG), M King (MK), S Littlefield (SL), M. Tauer (MT)

Others: S. Gagosian (SG), ~~A. La Francesca (AL)~~, K. Kennedy (KK), M. Martin (MM-SC), ~~M. Freiman (BOS)~~, ~~R. Foster (RF-MKA)~~, ~~S. Kirby (SK-Vortex)~~, N. Goins (NG-Advisory), S. Gray (ShG-SC), A. Pitkin (AP-SMMA), K. Olsen (KO-SMMA), J. D'Amico (JD-Compass), T. Ulfelder (TU-BOS), ~~M. Jop (MJ-Executive Director)~~, ~~E. Quirk (EQ-Hunnewell)~~, ~~C. Heep (CH-Town Counsel)~~, ~~I. Fried (IF-Town Counsel)~~, F. Bungler (FB-SEC)

Citizens speak

- Fred Bungler (1 Curve St) as a Sustainable Energy Committee (SEC) member, spoke in favor of the Hunnewell project and its emphasis on being a Net Zero Ready (NZR) building.
- This design falls in line with the intent of the SEC's guidelines (in DRAFT form) for new construction.

Hunnewell

- AP reviewed two new slides that overlaid the current and proposed Hunnewell footprints and the relation of these footprints to the zoning setbacks. AP reviewed the areas on the existing site that are being defined as "disturbed". DG stated that his initial concerns from the first presentation have generally been addressed.
- DG asked if the proposed permitting plan for Hunnewell is reflected in the budget and schedule. AP responded as feeling comfortable that permitting is covered. MK wondered if there were enough meetings reflected for the historical elements. JD feels as though there is enough of a bank of meetings to draw from the various Boards and Commissions.
- MK expressed concerns about SMMA's stipulation to multiple design options requested by CM not in the scope. KO explained that they would perform these requests within the scope as long as they were not significant changes in building design and were not constantly requested. JD stated that there is opportunity for "realignment" of the budget if this becomes an issue but it is not envisioned. MK asked if any early packages were envisioned such as demolition, environmental or structural steel. JD believed the permitting process would serve as the early package float and that filed sub bids would be most likely available leading to the TM request.
- DG asked what the wetland impacts are and what the process would be. AP said most of the discussion would center around disturbed verses non-disturbed land in that all activity is clear of the wetlands.
- SL expressed concern about parking overflow for a mid-day school event that would attract parents while the Library is open. ShG reviewed the existing and future parking procedures for the school. AP stated that the design has been "conservative" with the parking plan and that areas such as the proposed lay-bys have not been counted in calculations but are certainly legitimate parking locations. SL asked if the emergency loop road around the school could ever be used for parking or bus line. AP said that would not be a preferable solution.
- ShG asked the Members for feedback regarding the proposed Town Meeting motion language. The motion describes Hunnewell "as an all-electric, net-zero ready facility including photovoltaic panels".
- MK expressed concern about Net Zero Ready (NZR) moving from a goal to a must have and that less detail is better. TG disagreed and would like to see more specific direction. TG would like to see an actual metric to eliminate any ambiguity in the process. AP stated that an Energy Use Intensity (EUI) of 30 was a directive in the project's original Request for Proposal. TG thought that would be helpful to have to design to. AP thought that 30 could be a "not to exceed" number and the project would most likely end up lower, the design is currently projected at an EUI of 26.4. MT thought using the EUI was good for giving the PBC it's marching orders. MK is concerned that using this would create an all or nothing moment at Town Meeting.

- SL wondered if this could become a part of the Education Plan. TG liked the idea of including the EUI in the guiding educational principles. SL asked what if we couldn't meet the program. TG asked if the EUI and Ed Plan could be merged. ShG wanted to hear from the School Committee Chair. MM thought it would hard to combine these two different goals equally.
- TG wants to set expectations so when the PBC starts questioning design elements or materials it will not be affecting a critical design element. TG would like direction with "go or no go" and not "do your best". TG asked for feedback regarding the SEC's view of the EUI maximum of 30 for the project. FB thought that an EUI of 30 would deliver a NZR building with a tight envelope. AP thought keeping "maximum EUI of 30" is very reasonable and obtainable.
- DG asked if the EUI of 30 and the Education Plan were both "baked into the plan" from the beginning? ShG said yes, it was 30 EUI from the very beginning of the process. SL was concerned about being too far "ahead of the wave" with these standards. AP reminded the members that this would be built 4 years from now.
- MK thought that the motion should not mention the 30 EUI goal. DG felt comfortable with both the Education Plan and EUI being in, and clear drivers of, the design. JD mentioned that at Town Meeting the lower EUI of 26.4 will be on display. TG thought it would be fine to state a 26.4 EUI and cap it at a maximum of 30 EUI.
- DG wants to be a part of developing the language of the motion. ShG asked to send it to DG. DG said yes and to the other PBC members as well. ShG is if she should leave the sustainability directive out for now. MK thought this type of language is not familiar to Town Meeting members. MM thought the language was responsive to PBC concerns so if there are none, it can come out.
- SL asked who would be presenting at Town Meeting. SG said the design team will be presenting the bulk of the information. MK stated that PBC usually presents the numbers and schedule at the end. SL suggested the SBC get as much info into Advisory's booklet as possible to educate members.
- DG asked if any members had thoughts on the Project Budget. JD handed out revised numbers in two formats (PBC and COMPASS). JD said that the COMPASS format has more detail and aligns better with the MSBA budget format. PBC members liked the COMPASS format and agreed to move forward with such. JD walked the members through some budget tweaks. The Geothermal Test Well line item is going away since this use is not ideal for the use of that technology (minimal use during the summer). Those funds (\$80,000) are being kept in the budget but dispersed to other times such as PV Consultant, Wetlands, Photo Archival and Traffic Consultant.
- MK was concerned that Traffic Consultants can be required to attend more meetings than anticipated. JD stated that they are carrying 6 meeting currently. DG agreed with reallocation of funds and not removal. SL suggested removing the Geothermal Test Well line item now that it is empty.
- MK asked about the Utilities line item. JD stated that their experience is all of the design and construction cost is expected in the Design Phase. KK will look into how the Municipal Light and Power deals with this.
- MK asked if this is the format at Town Meeting. JD stated no, we have a more generic version to use. MK asked if \$180,000 is enough for CM at Risk Design. JD this is a bit of a "lost leader" for them but yes.
- TG asked if the Construction Site Manager for COMPASS is a Clerk of the Works? JD this person is more than a Clerk and would be the eyes and ears on the site during construction. TG was concerned about spending \$500,000 for this person if they have a limited authority on-site. TG thought we could find better options for that cost. JD stated that this can be worked later and that this individual comes on at construction and Town Meeting is just requesting Design funding.
- ShG asked if MK would be attending the Advisory Committee meeting on 11/6. MK said yes.
- JD asked if PBC was good with presenting this budget to Advisory. DG asked if a formal vote was needed right now. SG said no. JD agreed the Design budget is ready. TG still has concerns about the Construction portion of the project budget.

- JD asked when the PBC would like to start the CM at Risk selection process. DG stated that has yet to be a discussion but needs to be right after Town Meeting. SG will look into how to transfer the existing contracts of SMMA and COMPASS from the SBC to the PBC. MT suggested Town Council.

Middle School Piping

- KK provided a project update: new boilers running via Metasys and Punch List being developed. Running the system on Metasys has revealed lost points and functions of the steam plant that will need to be addressed with this project. Custodial OT ends this week.

School Security

- SG provided a project update and indicated that closeout documents are in process and the expectation is to wrap up shortly.

Middle School Bundle

- SG reminded members that the CM at Risk interviews are schedule for Tuesday 10/29 at 7:30pm in the Great Hall. The order will be Agostini first and Shawmut second.
- SL asked if the future meal locations (6 schools verses 7 schools) are being considered? SG said yes.
- SL asked if the design load for the auditorium AC is based on max occupancy PLUS a full stage of students? SG will look into.

Tolles Parsons Center

- TG reported a request from the Interim Director of the TPC to install an automatic door opener at the HC bathroom on the first floor. DG thought this made sense and to proceed with getting information on it.
- TG stated that some design would be needed. SG thought FMD can handle this.

Town Hall Annex

- KK provided an update on additional work that is being requested on Schwartz Silver Architects. The work is to investigate additional departments added to Annex, more material options & increased efficiency.
- KK said this work will be completed prior to Thanksgiving to go back to the BOS, PBC and to go to Advisory. The request for Design funding at ATM in 2020 is still on track.
- DG was glad to see this work continuing and being looked at closer.

Town Hall Interior

- KK provided an update on a proposed request for cash capital funds at the 2020 ATM for a Supplemental Feasibility Study. This would be a reduced scope of work, minimize relocation of departments and a closer look at required MAAB work.
- TG was concerned that there does not seem to be a program for the use of Town Hall. DG thought a real vision of the spaces is needed. SG shared that the TH Working Group feels the Town Hall needs to become a center for meetings and civic engagement.
- MK was concerned about moving forward with the Annex without the Town Hall as its justification.
- DG was glad to see the fresh approach.

Town Hall Envelope

- SG provided an update on the progress on the project and introduced new PCOs.
- DG expressed concern about the source of some of the materials being used in the project. SG stated all material purchased is consistent with approved submittals.
- SG stated that the project is still maintaining an adequate contingency.

PBC Administrative Business

TG asked if CMs received 100% drawings with RFP. SG to check.

It was moved and 2nd to approve the minutes from 10/10/19 as amended, approved 5-0.

It was moved and 2nd to approve the invoices as listed, approved 5-0.

SG confirmed the 11/28 meeting will be moved to 12/5 at 7:30pm. The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin Kennedy,
Project Manager

Posted 11/15/19 12:20PM