

### Minutes

Present: Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Michelle Ernst, Michael Fitzgerald, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman, Elise Woodward  
Absent: Brian Miller

I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.

II. Reading of Minutes

a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Feb. 24, 2010. A motion was made by John Flaherty to accept the minutes. Jerry Wedge seconded the motion. The Motion in favor was unanimous.

III. Energy Implications of Current Design Options

a. Brian Crouse led a discussion regarding broad energy performance issues. Brian had forwarded some articles by email to the committee members on case studies regarding various sustainable energy solutions.  
b. As Brian indicated it is too early in the process to present options, however, the issue is raised for committee members to keep in mind as we advance through the process.

IV. OMR – Preferred Option

a. Michael Rosenfeld opened the discussion with a review of the meetings to date. The goals, programs, approaches, and final options were reviewed.  
b. The preferred option was presented. Total square footage is 288,800 gsf. (existing 55,300; new 233,500). There would be 6 major entry ways.  
c. Phasing was discussed. The timeline presented showed the project could be completed in an aggressive 30 months with 36 months a reasonable target. The renovation project was compared to a new construction project with timelines being similar. Phasing was discussed with visuals in the presentation showing how classrooms would be shifted to allow for a continuous learning environment. Major demolition and excavation would be completed during the summer months to alleviate major disruptions during the school year.  
d. Construction Costs were presented. (Please refer to the OMR presentation dated 3/10/10). Construction costs for this renovation project total \$83M with a total project cost of \$108M which includes all soft costs. The athletic center alone has a cost of \$10.8M. There was discussion over the reimbursement rate by MSBA on the total project cost and what is considered reimbursable.  
e. Discussion ensued regarding presentation at Town Meeting and the importance of the \$1.3M warrant article passing to get to the next stage.  
f. OMR will make their final presentation at the next meeting being held on March 24, 2010. The location to be determined.

V. Motion to Adjourn

a. A motion was made to adjourn by Jerry Wedge and was seconded by David Anderson. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Michelle Ernst, Michael Fitzgerald, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman

Absent: Elise Woodward

### I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.

### II. Reading of Minutes

a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Dec. 16, 2009. Jerry Wedge asked if the OMR presentation can be attached to the minutes. It was indicated that they could. A motion was made by Louis Salemy to accept the minutes as amended. David Anderson seconded the motion. All were in favor.

### III. MSBA Update

- a. John Flaherty updated the committee on an MSBA telephone call on Jan 4, 2010 with Diane Sullivan. The conversation was to assist in finding a dollar amount to get us through the phases. There are two phases: the first would take the project through Feasibility Study to Schematic Design; the second phase would be design development through construction. CCHS is unique as the FMP committee is currently active. Diane Sullivan compared CCHS eight other high schools going through the process and the correlation between the size of the building and the request for funding. After a conversation with Whitney Granger at OMR they came up with a number of \$1.3 million for the first phase. The region will procure services for an OPM as part of the initial schematic design phase. This translates into \$72 million in construction costs. After fees and design work it would bring the project up to \$90M. If all of the square footage were to be reimbursable using MSBA's baseline calculation of 40%, that would generate \$36M in reimbursement. Concord would be responsible for approximately 70% and Carlisle 30% of the remaining \$54M. Although most likely not all of the square footage in a project will be reimbursable, this gives an idea of how the reimbursement process works. Michael Fitzgerald asked if the district has any idea of what MSBA will reimburse. Jerry Wedge indicated that in the conversation with MSBA, MSBA compared CCHS with other high schools. Jerry Wedge indicated that MSBA is leaning heavily on the architects and engineers when deciding the level of each project. MSBA indicated they were anxious to see the results of our Master Plan Study. Jerry Wedge noted that the district is appropriating the \$1.3M, however that doesn't mean we have to spend it.
- b. It was asked if MSBA needs to agree with the final design chosen by the committee. It was indicated that the district does need to work in collaboration with MSBA.

### IV. OMR Alternative Approaches

a. Michael Rosenfeld presented various approaches for design. OMR presented Options A through G. Option A is a full renovation with a minor addition; 1 story with the existing

- north entry. Option B is a full renovation with major additions (removing the “L” building, library and lower gym) and creating an information commons area; 1-story; north entry; infill courtyard. Option C is a full renovation with major additions (remove “I”, “L”, cafeteria, library and lower gym); partial 2-story, east entry, infill courtyards to make an information commons. Option D is a major addition with a minor renovation (Keep buildings “A” and “H” and cafeteria); partial 2-story, north entry with cross axis design; partial infill of courtyards. Option E is a major addition with minor renovation (Keep building “A” and upper gym); 2 story, south entry; Beede Center plaza connecting the two buildings. Option F is a major addition/minor renovation (Keep “A” and cafeteria); 3-story; north entry. Option G is a phased new building; 3-story; north entry. A field house has been included in all of these drawings as well. The OMR presentation will be attached to these minutes.
- b. OMR was looking for feedback from the committee on a preferred option. The committee chose options C, D, and F for further development and also gave additional feedback as to the concepts they liked and didn’t like from each of those options. OMR will combine those ideas into preliminary conceptual designs for the next meeting.

V. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by Brian Crouse and was seconded by Louis Salemy. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, Brian Crouse, Michael Fitzgerald, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman,

Absent: John Boynton, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Elise Woodward

I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.

II. Reading of Minutes

a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Dec. 9, 2009. No changes were noted. A motion was made by Louis Salemy to accept the minutes as amended. Bill Tice seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. Existing Conditions of CCHS by OMR

- a. Michael Rosenfeld turned over the discussion to Jeanne Roberts for an overview of tonight's meeting. OMR will take information accumulated over the past few weeks and prepare design options. Tonight they will get into site and building existing conditions. There will also be discussion on sustainability issues as well as a small presentation on displacement ventilation. Jeanne asked the consultant team to introduce themselves: Steven Ventresca – Nitsch Engineering (civil site); Domenic Puniello – Garcia, Galuska, DeSousa, Inc. (HVAC/mechanical); John Buhl – Foley Buhl Roberts Assoc. (structural); Chris Garcia – Garcia, Galusaka, DeSousa, Inc. (plumbing/fire protection), Carlos DeSousa – Garcia, Galuska, DeSousa Inc. (electrical); Wagdy Anis – Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. (building envelope); Ann Coleman – Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates Inc. (building envelope). The committee then introduced themselves.
- b. Michael Rosenfeld reviewed the existing site as it is now presenting with a slideshow.
- c. Steve Ventresca reviewed the main components of the site. Water and sewer system would remain the same, although pipes would have to be reviewed for replacement. The storm water system would have to be upgraded to current standards. Gas distribution may need to be updated depending on what renovations are complete. Transmission lines would need to be reviewed and upgraded as necessary.
- d. John Buhl discussed existing structural systems and the ramifications of building onto it.
- e. Ann Coleman discussed the building enclosure, including thermal continuity and roof issues. Efficient HVAC operation requires enclosure heat, air, and moisture management. The idea is to try to minimize the amount of building enclosure surface area. The 1970's enclosures would need major interior and exterior modifications. The 1992 enclosure would need further improvements.
- f. Domenic Puniello reviewed the mechanical issues. The boilers, and pumps are near the end of their service life as well as the chillers and pumps. Piping systems are near the end of their useful life as well. Classroom ventilators are outdated, noisy, and inefficient. Central air handling systems and automatic temperature controls were reviewed. It was asked if any of the equipment could be reused. Mr. Puniello indicated the current equipment is outdated and it wouldn't be advisable to reuse.
- g. Carlos DeSousa reviewed the electrical issues. These systems have not been touched since the original construction with the exception of some updates in 1972. Original

- panels are severely corroded. Emergency lighting was discussed. The fire alarm system has been replaced in all but two areas and can currently be expanded.
- h. Chris Garcia – plumbing and fire protection. Plumbing, drainage, gas, and fire protection issues were discussed. The building is not fully protected by sprinkler systems and upgrades to the existing system would be required with a renovation.
  - i. Sustainability goals were reviewed.
  - j. Lisa Pecora-Ryan summarized. Details of the above are included in the PowerPoint presentation which will be distributed (and attached as part of these minutes).
  - k. Michael Rosenfeld reviewed with their cost estimators current costs to build a new school building and came up with \$255/sq.ft. for construction only. The estimate for building “I” would be \$165/sq. ft. not including any program upgrades, or hazard material abatement. The cost to renovate the S building would be approx. \$100/sq. ft. with the same exclusions. The reason for the difference is because the exterior walls on “S” have been replaced. Building “L” \$295/sq.ft. because you would have to redo all the exterior walls. These estimates are to give the committee a range as we move forward. The “H” and “A” buildings are somewhat similar to the “S” building.
  - l. A displacement ventilation system presentation was given as it will impact the decisions presented at the next meeting. For example there needs to be 9’ clearance to utilize this type of system.
  - m. Brian Miller read a list of requests from students of areas they would like to see in a newly renovated building.

IV. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by Diana Rigby and was seconded by Peter Badalament. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Michael Fitzgerald, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman, Elise Woodward

Absent: Michelle Ernst, Bill Tice

I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.

II. Reading of Minutes

a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Nov. 18, 2009. No changes were noted. A motion was made by Jerry Wedge to accept the minutes as amended. Dave Anderson seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. Program Design

- a. Jeanne Roberts modified the schedule so that next week they can discuss the conditions of the building. Tonight they will focus on the existing space utilization of the building and then work on the space program of the building, ending with organization diagrams.
- b. Will look at the plan with existing programmatic conditions, then look at program study, organization diagrams, and at the building as a whole and how that can be changed over time with various learning centers.
- c. OMR reviewed the Preliminary Space Summary Comparison with the committee. Discussion ensued.
- d. OMR reviewed building organizational diagrams with the committee. Discussion ensued.

IV. MSBA Update

- a. John Flaherty indicated the district received some information from MSBA, including application for Owner's Project Manager, ICC (Initial Compliance Certification) application, composition of the Feasibility Committee, and warrant article language that needs to be used at town meeting.
- b. Both Concord and Carlisle must demonstrate a commitment to funding through approval at town meeting. A specific amount of dollars must be specified on the warrant articles. Warrant articles for Concord are due Jan 4<sup>th</sup>. Analysis must be done over the next couple of weeks to quantify the dollars needed. The district will continue to work with MSBA. John Flaherty spoke with Diane Sullivan of MSBA who indicated she would be hearing from the construction group with a rough estimate of the balance of work remaining.

V. State Ethics Commission

- a. John Flaherty handed out the State Ethics Commission guidelines with a sign-off sheet to be signed by all committee members.

VI. Citizens Comments

- a. None

VII. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by Jerry Wedge and was seconded by Karla Johnson. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman

Absent: Dave Anderson, Brian Crouse, Michael Fitzgerald, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Charlie Sample, Elise Woodward

- I. Call to Order and Greeting
  - a. The meeting was called to order by Diana Rigby.
  
- II. Reading of Minutes
  - a. Diana Rigby asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Nov. 12, 2009. A change to *Sect. V.* was recommended. All were in favor and a motion was made by Jerry Wedge to accept the minutes as amended. John Flaherty seconded the motion. All were in favor.
  
- III. Debriefing on Saturday's Visioning Session
  - a. Diana asked for the committee's reactions and comments on Saturday's session. Positive comments were received on the participant's involvement and Jay's ability to engage the group. Diana thanked Jerry Wedge for connecting this committee to Jay Vogt.
  - b. Participant's comments were compiled and handed out to the committee.
  
- IV. Debrief on Frank Locker's Seminar
  - a. Diana Rigby asked for the committee's reactions and comments regarding Frank Locker's session.
  - b. Discussion ensued regarding topics initiated from the seminar.
  
- V. OMR – Discuss/Draft Space Program
  - a. Jeanne Roberts reviewed the project schedule. An all day session is scheduled with Diana Rigby and Peter Badalament on Nov. 24<sup>th</sup> to go through the high school. Dave Anderson will be meeting with OMR and the MEP's the week of Nov. 30<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. The goals and values were reviewed noting some changes from the last meeting. Jeanne will send the goals to Michelle Ernst for posting on the website.
  - c. Jeanne Roberts asked if there were any goals that should be added as a result of the community session. Discussion ensued regarding other program areas, performing arts center, field house, and other community uses.
  - d. The goals will be updated and distributed.
  
- VI. Motion to Adjourn
  - a. A motion was made to adjourn by John Flaherty and was seconded by Karla Johnson. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Dave Anderson, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman

Absent: Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Bill Tice, Elise Woodward

- I. Call to Order and Greeting
  - a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.
- II. Reading of Minutes
  - a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Oct. 28, 2009. A change to *Sect. V.e.* was recommended. All were in favor and a motion was made to accept the minutes as amended.
- III. November 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting with Frank Locker – Educational Planner
  - a. Diana Rigby announced that there will be a meeting with Frank Locker, Educational Planner at the Ripley Building, Conference room #1 from 9:00am until 12:00pm. All Facilities Master Plan Committee members are welcome.
- IV. November 14<sup>th</sup> Visioning Session – Jay Vogt
  - a. The visioning session is all set and will be held at the Willard school cafeteria on Saturday, November 14<sup>th</sup>, from 8:45 until 1:00pm.
  - b. Diana Rigby handed out the packets provided by Jay for the committee to view before the session. The groups are formed and will be divided among eight tables.
- V. OMR – Goals and Values
  - a. Jeanne Roberts from OMR went through the Goals that they put together based on the committee's input from the last meeting.
  - b. The goals were reviewed with the committee and changes were noted by OMR.
- VI. Additional Items
  - a. It was noted that the next meeting is set for Wednesday, November 18, 2009.
- VII. Motion to Adjourn
  - a. A motion was made to adjourn by Jerry Wedge and was seconded by John Flaherty. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

---

## Minutes

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman, Elise Woodward

Absent: Brian Crouse, Michelle Ernst, Bill Tice

### I. Call to Order and Greeting

- a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.

### II. Reading of Minutes

- a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Oct. 14, 2009. Jerry Wedge recommended changes. Changes were noted and minutes will be amended. All were in favor of the amended minutes and a motion was made by Jerry Wedge and seconded by Karla Johnson to accept the minutes.

### III. Review Committee's Charge

- a. Diana Rigby asked to have members review the charge in relation to the subcommittees they would want to form.

### IV. Subcommittee Assignments

- a. *Community Outreach Subcommittee.* Louis Salemy will develop a presentation to post on the website as soon as possible. Once the presentation is complete, we can have community forums. Community Outreach will also handle public relations. Assigned: Louis Salemy, Michelle Ernst, Joe Morahan.
- b. *Communication Subcommittee.* Elise Woodward suggested intentional interactions with both town's Board of Selectmen. It would be a wonderful opportunity to reach community through televised media. As a selectman, she would like to hear a progress report from Michael Fitzgerald, as chair, as far as where the committee is in the process, etc. Progress reports should be completed in December and February. It would be useful to have a separate subcommittee focused on the financial piece. Assigned: Michael Fitzgerald
- c. *Finance/Funding Subcommittee.* Michael Fitzgerald asked if we need a subset of this committee going through all the financial impacts, i.e. one smaller group charged and focused on having a good understanding of what's going on and report back to this committee. John Boynton indicated given the importance of costs, it would make sense to have such a committee. Elise Woodward thinks the message to the community will be stronger if there is someone from the committee other than just John Flaherty and the schools. Diana Rigby asked if some of this could be the private/public partnerships? John Boynton has started some brainstorming towards this. We need to look in every possible direction for money. Private funding is worth some serious investigation. Assigned: John Flaherty; John Boynton; Louis Salemy; Michael Fitzgerald; Charlie Sample
- d. *MSBA Interface Subcommittee.* Assigned: Diana Rigby; John Flaherty; Michael Fitzgerald; Jerry Wedge; David Anderson.
- e. *Design Subcommittee.* Need a small group to interact with OMR so that when a need arises, they can contact this subset without having to wait for a full committee meeting. Assigned: Peter Badalament; Diana Rigby; John Flaherty; Jerry Wedge; David Anderson; Karla Johnson; Brian Miller
- f. *Sustainable Subcommittee.* Assigned: Brian Crouse, Dave Anderson

V. OMR Contract

- a. John Flaherty announced that the District and OMR has signed a contract for a Master Plan Study. A contract was signed in the amount of \$210,000. A motion was made to authorize John Flaherty to initiate a contract in the amount of \$210,000. The motion was made by Diana Rigby and seconded by Louis Salemy. All were in favor. It should be noted that the remaining amount of \$40,000 appropriated is for incidentals associated with this process. Also noted is that \$20,000 of that is already encumbered.
- b. Whitney Granger from OMR handed out a CCHS Master Plan Work Plan outlining the meeting dates and the objectives of each meeting. The outline was reviewed and discussed.
- c. A discussion ensued regarding putting a placeholder on the warrant for funding. A placeholder for the warrant articles would have to be submitted in December for January. The committee may need two placeholders; one for MSBA and one for a debt exclusion.
- d. The major milestones outlined for this project are: Master Plan Study; Feasibility Study; Schematic Design; Request funding for Construction project.
- e. Whitney Granger had another handout on the Goals of this committee. The Goals were reviewed. It was suggested to change the first goal into "Envision a plan that transforms the existing 'Old, Old CCHS' campus into a school to meet the needs of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning." It was also suggested to add that it should include a financially acceptable plan. The committee came up with a list of goals that will be incorporated into some broader goals by OMR and discussed at the next meeting.

VI. School and Community Education Visioning Process

- a. Jay Vogt, a facilitator who works with non-profits to assist with mission statements, visioning, etc., has volunteered his time to help this group with visioning for CCHS. There will be a community visioning session held on Sat. Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> from 8:45-1:00, with breakout sessions from 9:30-12:45.
- b. The overall purpose is to obtain community input for high school facility design and to build community support for the project. Desired outcomes: a.) input on desired learning outcomes; b.) input on community needs that this building could meet; c.) input on community values that should inform the building design. Questions 1.) What are the values that this community holds for a new building project? 2.) What are the needs for these 2 communities in the next 50 years that this building can meet? 3.) What are the expectations for student learning in the next 50 years? The hope is that the community responds to these questions.
- c. The session will be held at Willard and will be for approximately 80 people. Jay Vogt likes to work in sets of 8 people who work together throughout the day. Each member of this committee is being asked to bring two additional people to this session, someone similar to whom they represent on this committee.

VII. Add Meeting Dates

- a. Meeting dates for the FMP committee were added. They are Nov. 12<sup>th</sup> and Dec. 16<sup>th</sup>.

VIII. Citizen's Comments

- a. Walter Birge commented that money needs to be part of the issue, however, the committee should not let it make them hesitate in moving forward. Secondly, he recommended not having a lot of town officials at Saturday's session, as they would most naturally put on their official hats and it may skew some of the visioning.

IX. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by Jerry Wedge and was seconded by John Flaherty. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Dave Anderson, Brian Crouse, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge, Margaret Waterman, Elise Woodward

Absent: Peter Badalament, John Boynton

I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald. The Executive Session was eliminated from the agenda.

II. Reading of Minutes

a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of Sept. 9, 2009. No changes were noted. All were in favor and a motion was made by Elise Woodward and seconded by Jerry Wedge to accept the minutes.

III. Report on MSBA Meeting and Teleconference

a. Michael Fitzgerald reviewed that MSBA invited CCRSD into a Feasibility Study for a repair project. There was a meeting held at MSBA on Sept. 30<sup>th</sup> and John Flaherty, Diana Rigby, Jerry Wedge, and Michael Fitzgerald were in attendance. A dialogue began today between MSBA and the district, via teleconference.

b. Jerry Wedge indicated the conference call was with Diane Sullivan, Mary Pichetti, John Jump, and Katie DiChristiforo. The call began with questions by the district. Katherine Craven put out a number of \$37M two weeks ago. It was concluded that this was the baseline of the 2005 study. This is the largest repair project that MSBA has considered. The district discussed the process that is now in place with the Facilities Master Plan. There was much discussion on how to repurpose the \$250K that has been put towards the master plan study. There was some confusion by MSBA over the \$250K appropriated. MSBA thought the full article amount of \$750K was appropriated, which was hopefully cleared up. To start working with the MSBA, this committee would need to initiate a phase to identify the scope of the work. The development of the scope would be over the next 5-6 months, before going to town meeting. The district would seek funds for the feasibility study and schematic design. If approved, the district would hire an owner's project manager then procure design services in collaboration with the MSBA designer selection process. A designer selection committee would be made up of 15 members, 3 of which can be from the community. Mary Pichetti said we are about 5-6 months ahead of them in our process.

c. Diana Rigby said what we are trying to clarify is if there are any downsides to continuing this committee. Mary Pichetti at MSBA clearly said no. The FMP committee can continue with this process. The district will send out a letter confirming this with MSBA.

IV. Discussion Regarding Facilities Master Plan Study and Feasibility Study

a. Michael Fitzgerald wants to know if this committee continues, will MSBA be performing a parallel process? Jerry Wedge indicated some communities end up jumping up from a repair project to a renovation project. However, MSBA did give a clear description of what

- repair means. MSBA has had situations where they redistribute spaces within a building under a repair project. However, repair means there are no additional spaces added.
- b. The question arose whether the \$37M project could be wrapped into a larger project. That is the hope of this committee. MSBA assumes districts have completed a master plan study before entering into this phase. MSBA will review our RFP so they can review this effort to compare to the intended output of their feasibility study. The District was told by MSBA that continuing with the Master Plan study would not jeopardize funding by MSBA.
  - c. John Flaherty noted that a renovation project could arise out of this repair project category. This master plan study can feed into the feasibility study.
  - d. Diana Rigby recommended continuing with this project and at the same time continue working with MSBA. Continuing with the Master Plan study will not jeopardize receiving money from MSBA.
  - e. Michael Fitzgerald recommended that John Flaherty move forward with the contract negotiations with OMR. Authorization was given by the committee to proceed forward with the contract negotiations.
  - f. The district is in the process of getting the application for the Owners Project Manager from MSBA. The district would like to recommend David Anderson, Facilities Manager, listed as the OPM.
  - g. Oct. 28<sup>th</sup> will be the kickoff meeting to move forward with the Facilities Master Plan.
  - h. Michael Rosenfeld thanked the committee for selecting OMR and they are looking forward to moving forward.

V. Determine Items for Next Agenda

- a. Should try to build a consensus with the public to move forward and the necessity to do so. The issue of a water pipe break at the school was discussed.
- b. Sub committee's should be set up to talk to the finance committee's of each town.
- c. Set up some community outreach and some dates to receive feedback.
- d. Review the charge of this committee.
- e. Discuss this committee breaking out into smaller groups with specific tasks. Committee members should think of the areas that they would be interested in participating.
- f. It was suggested to possibly put some focus on green options to inform the committee as well as the community of sustainable options.

VI. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by John Flaherty and was seconded by Bill Tice. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge, Elise Woodward

Absent: Karla Johnson, Charlie Sample

I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.

II. Reading of Minutes

a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes. John Flaherty made a motion to approve the minutes. Seconded by Peter Badalament. The Motion in favor was unanimous.

III. Summary Presentation of "Students to Learners"

a. Peter Badalament provided a summary of the "Students to Learners" presentation he attended over the summer.

IV. Matrix Results

- a. John Flaherty presented the compiled results of each committee member's rankings of the proposals submitted in response to the RFP.
- b. The committee narrowed the firms down to four finalists: Design Partnerships; Office of Michael Rosenfeld; Perry, Dean, Rogers; S/L/A/M Collaborative.
- c. A motion was made to invite these four firms to interview for the Master Plan Study. The motion was approved unanimously.
- d. Jerry Wedge noted with full disclosure that he had worked for OMR in the past. Elise Woodward noted she had worked for Perry, Dean over 30 years ago.
- e. Interview dates were chosen: September 21<sup>st</sup> and September 23<sup>rd</sup> at 6:00pm and 7:15pm each evening. The presentation will consist of a 45 min presentation, 15 minute Q&A. The rooms to be used are the Library 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor and the Little Theater.
- f. The interview guidelines for the architects should be: 1. Focus on designs, new ideas, and creativity relevant to the high school instead of a review of their portfolio. 2. We would like to see the principal in charge at the presentation. 3. What is their strategy for moving a Master Plan through the Town Meeting process? 4. What is their vision for a 21<sup>st</sup> century school? 5. What is the firm's early thinking on what CCHS would look like?
- g. John Flaherty will send thank you letters to the firms not invited back for presentations.
- h. There was some discussion and it was decided that both interview sessions will be open meetings.
- i. A finalist will be chosen after the September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

V. Motion to Adjourn

a. A motion was made to adjourn by Bill Tice and was seconded by Peter Badalament. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Dave Anderson, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge

Absent: Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Diana Rigby, Elise Woodward

I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald.

II. Reading of Minutes

a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes. John Flaherty made a motion to approve the minutes. Seconded by Bill Tice. All in favor.

III. Update on RFP and Master Plan Website

- a. It was noted that 36 firms have requested RFP's. A list of the firms was read by John Flaherty.
- b. It was noted that the website is up and running and able to accept proposals. The committee's webmaster will be able to download off the server and onto laptops. All supporting documents are up on the website. Enrollment projections will be added.
- c. Discussion ensued as to whether or not the walk-through is mandatory and if the legal notice, RFP, and e-mails were clear. An addendum will be issued stating that the walk-through is strongly encouraged and not mandatory.
- d. A deadline was set for Friday 8/21/09 to receive any questions. Responses to the questions will be sent to all requestors in accordance with the resources and time available to the district.
- e. It was suggested to put the meeting dates on the website.

IV. Reports from High School Faculty

- a. Joe Pickman from the Visual Arts department discussed his Educational Vision for the Art/Applied Technology Department. His presentation included General Department Needs, Photography Room, Ceramics Room, Architecture/Sculpture Room, and Two Dimensional Room. A prepared document outline will be emailed to all committee members.
- b. A question was raised as to how the committee will take all the department data and consolidate it into something useful. It was determined that this is part of the architect's scope of work.
- c. Discussion ensued as to the best avenue for disseminating "needs" information.
- d. The 2005 study as well as other documents is available at the Business Office for review if the committee would like to review before receiving proposals.
- e. Michael Fitzgerald indicated that he was going to write a letter to both the Concord Journal and the Carlisle Mosquito giving them an update on the committee's progress.

V. Review of Evaluation Matrix

- a. An Evaluation Matrix for reviewing the proposals was presented by John Flaherty. The review process was discussed and the date of the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting was determined as the date to review the results of the completed matrixes and choose the firms to interview.
- b. At least three to five architects will be invited back for interviews, unless none of the proposals meet our needs.
- c. The Business Office will complete the Quality Requirements for each proposal.
- d. A list of walk-through attendees will be distributed.
- e. The dollar amount appropriated for the Facilities Master Plan study was determined as "not to exceed \$250,000".
- f. Tentative dates for the scheduling of firm interviews were set as Monday, September 21<sup>st</sup> and Wednesday, September 23<sup>rd</sup>.

VI. MSBA Statement of Interest

- a. Michael Fitzgerald handed out a letter from MSBA regarding submitting an updated Statement of Interest for the Concord-Carlisle High School. He indicated that the sole purpose of resubmitting the SOI is to keep the high school on their radar. It was agreed that it should be up to the School Committee to decide whether to resubmit.

VII. Other Items

- a. Jerry Wedge raised the issue of coordinating meetings with the Finance Committees from Concord and Carlisle. It was recommended that this committee try to get on the agenda, possibly contacting Chris Whalen at the Town House.

VIII. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by Bill Tice and was seconded by John Flaherty. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Charlie Sample, Jerry Wedge

Absent: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Louis Salemy, Bill Tice, Elise Woodward

I. Call to Order and Greeting

a. The meeting was called to order by Jerry Wedge.

II. Reading of Minutes

a. Jerry Wedge asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes. Brian Miller made a motion to approve the minutes. Seconded by Diana Rigby. The Motion in favor was unanimous.

III. Introduction of CCHS Dept Chairs

a. The Department Chairs in attendance were introduced: Iolanda Volpe – Foreign Language; Bea Loprete – Dept. Chair English; Anthony Beckwith – Dept. Chair Math; Mike Vela – Dept. Chair Science. Each department chair will provide a summary of the needs of the department.

IV. Department Presentations

- a. Mike Vela presented an overview of the needs of the Science dept. He provided a handout to the committee identifying the current conditions, general needs, and needs of each area within the Science dept.
- b. Anthony Beckwith presented an overview of the needs of the Math dept. Needs identified were more workspace, a private space for teachers to make phone calls to parents, book storage space, tutor space, more electrical outlets for laptops, etc.
- c. Bea Loprete presented an overview of the needs of the English dept. Needs identified were more bookspace, shelves, a private space for teachers to make phone calls to parents or to have sensitive conversations, a community space for teachers in different departments to meet, possibility of an on-site daycare, a classroom design conducive to individual work as well as group work.
- d. Iolanda Volpe presented an overview of the needs of the Foreign Language department. They would like more space similar to the current language lab. Needs identified were more space for students making up work, space for the teachers to meet with students who need extra help, private space to call parents, and a community lunch area.
- e. Robin Cicchetti presented an overview of the needs of the Library. She prepared a document which she will distribute to the committee. Needs identified were a place for collaborative work, a design that would allow for the ability to deliver up-to-date technology, and limited storage.

V. Review of Evaluation Matrix

- a. The Evaluation Matrix will be sent out to all committee members to be completed and sent back to Eileen Curtin in the Business Office by September 9<sup>th</sup> at 12:00pm for tabulation with results to be distributed at the committee meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup>. The architects will be listed in order of submission. A list of all RFP requesters and who attended the walk-through will also be distributed.

VI. Review of RFP Questions and Responses

- a. Questions received via email in response to the RFP were reviewed by John Flaherty. The answers provided were sent via email to all RFP requesters and were also read to the committee by John Flaherty.

VII. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by John Flaherty and was seconded by Peter Badalament. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Charlie Sample, Jerry Wedge, Elise Woodward (departed after tour)

Absent: Louis Salemy, Doug Stevenson

### I. Call to Order and Greeting

The meeting was called to order by Michael Fitzgerald at 6:00pm. Peter Badalament introduced the department chairs in attendance. They included; Cynthia Bent – Foreign Language, Robin Cicchetti- Library, Al Dentino – Performing Arts, Neil Lynch- Humanities, Joseph Pickman- Visual Arts, and Mike Vela - Science

### II. Tour of Building

- a. A Tour of the building ensued. The areas and main issues were as follows:
  - i. Library – limited storage, impedes ability to deliver up-to-date technology.
  - ii. Guidance/Special Ed – more office suites, conference rooms, crisis rooms, records storage space
  - iii. Traditional Classroom – technology now requires larger classrooms, better use of space.
  - iv. Little Theatre – area where 2 to 3 classes could get together at one time. The type of space Peter Badalament would like to see more of. Need more professional space for faculty to meet and talk, such as a collaborative workroom.
  - v. Science – Really need double the classroom space. The laboratory space is quite undersized. Current recommendation is about 1440 sq.ft. for 24 students. Teachers can't schedule labs when they need to. Students don't have the room to perform individual labs experiments, instead it is necessary to perform in groups of 3 or more.
  - vi. Foreign Language – currently have space for two classrooms. They use this space quite a bit and would like to see more space like this. It is also centrally located which is convenient. Every bit of space is used, and could use more space also as their class sizes are increasing.
  - vii. Band/Orchestra/Chorus Room – Air circulation is inadequate. This room is multi-use, open 6:30am – 9:30 pm. Estimate 1,000 students enter this room each day. Lockers used (and valued) by seniors. Need approx. 1/3 more space at minimum.
  - viii. Auditorium – currently cannot fit half of the school in the auditorium at one time. The auditorium currently seats 600. CCHS has been rejected as a site for regional groups to meet as the auditorium does not meet the needs. Cannot fit Town Meeting appropriately. The wings of the Auditorium stage do not allow for rolling of scenery. There is in fact no place for the scenery to be built, so it is typically built on the stage.
  - ix. Art – Air quality is an issue. The art spaces are very disjointed. The spaces are too small – they would like to increase the class sizes, but are currently unable.

- x. Foyer – Indistinguishable as a main entrance. Visitors currently have a hard time finding the main entrance. The main offices aren't located near the entrance, so they cannot monitor very well. There are 54 doors on this building. They would like to see an area where the kids can congregate. Would like to see the wings of the building separated for security purposes, i.e. public areas such as auditorium or gymnasium that can be shut off from the rest of the building for night/weekend use.
- xi. Gymnasium – Health and Fitness doesn't have adequate space for innovative classroom teaching. Fitness Center is small – space is an issue.

III. Meeting resumed in Library

- a. Peter Badalament thanked everyone for participating. John Boynton noted that the building has been kept up in good shape, yet it clearly has deficiencies. The current administration initiated upgrades, mostly safety and health issue improvements. It was noted that the lack of space is affecting learning capabilities.

IV. Approval of Minutes

- a. Michael Fitzgerald asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes. Sect. 5a) add Faculty. Jerry Wedge made a motion to approve the minutes. Seconded by John Boynton. All in favor.

V. Committees Charge

- a. No questions or concerns noted.

VI. RFP Comments

- a. Discussion ensued regarding particular wording of the RFP. Elise Woodward has volunteered to rework the RFP. The committee will make notations for changes and turn over to her for final draft.
- b. It was noted that the RFP should indicate a request for various options. Committee would like to see a cost estimate as well as phasing.
- c. The issue of requesting a schematic design was raised. Jerry Wedge indicated that a request for schematic design was not requested as there isn't enough money appropriated for schematic design at this time.
- d. Posting requirements were discussed to meet Mass General Law posting requirements.
- e. Inclusion of SOMWBA requirement in RFP was noted.
- f. Discussion ensued regarding feasibility of posting proposals to a website to save on paper copies. A minimum of three (3) hard copies should be requested.
- g. It was agreed that posting of the RFP should be in the Central Register in the August 5<sup>th</sup> edition, allowing close to four weeks for proposal submissions, making proposals due on September 1<sup>st</sup>. This would give the committee until Sept. 9<sup>th</sup> to review proposals and narrow it down to three firms by the Sept. 9<sup>th</sup> committee meeting date.
- h. Discussion regarding proposal review matrix. John Flaherty will provide Michael Fitzgerald with the 2005 matrix that was used as a guideline. The matrix would be comprised of qualitative items as well as quantitative items.
- i. Michael Fitzgerald formed a Subcommittee to review the draft RFP. The subcommittee will be comprised of: Jerry Wedge, Elise Woodward, Karla Johnson, Michael Fitzgerald, Diana Rigby, John Flaherty, and Dave Anderson.
- j. All comments discussed in this meeting will be compiled and send to Elise Woodward for finalization and then distribution to the subcommittee.
- k. It was asked if there were any perceived conflicts of interest in regards to the RFP process. Jerry Wedge noted that he worked for OMR (The Office of Michael Rosenfeld) ten years ago.

- I. Discussion on putting together a website for the dissemination of information to citizens. Michelle Ernst volunteered to work with John Boynton on developing a website. It was noted that the committee can use district resources to distribute information to citizens, however another body should answer questions or organize anything outside the scope of the committee.

VII. Other Items

- a. Diana Rigby handed out an article written by David Holdorf as well as a presentation on high performance schools.
- b. Site visits to other schools. It was agreed this would be beneficial, however, seeing the schools with students in it is much better.

VIII. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by Brian Miller and was seconded by Peter Badalament. The Motion in favor was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin

## Minutes

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (Chair); Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, John Boynton, Brian Crouse, Karla Johnson, Brian Miller, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Doug Stevenson, Jerry Wedge, Elise Woodward

Absent: Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Joseph Morahan

I. CALL TO ORDER AND GREETING

The meeting was called to order by Diana Rigby at 6:00pm. Diana asked committee members to introduce themselves and how they have an interest in the school.

II. Review of Meeting Dates

The Committee will be meeting at the high school starting with the next meeting.

III. Seat Committee Chair

a. Diana asked to take nominations for Committee Chair. Jerry Wedge nominated Michael Fitzgerald as Chair. Doug Stevenson seconded the motion. All voted unanimously to appoint Michael Fitzgerald as Chair of the CCHS Facilities Master Plan Committee.

IV. Review of Charge

- a. Michael Fitzgerald reviewed the charge indicating that the role of the committee is to find a plan to meet the needs of the school.
- b. Jerry Wedge gave a history of the 2000 and 2002 studies. The last study identified deficiencies, but a financial crisis at the State left no appetite for moving forward with a construction project. In 2005 they tried again, however by the time the study ended the SBA (School Building Authority) had stopped funding and put a moratorium on school construction projects.
- c. The hope is to develop a master plan that provides the communities with options for implementation. If the state decides to support the project, the community may decide to build it all at one time. However, if the State decides not to support it in whole, we can start attacking the master plan piece by piece in a way that can be supported individually. The possibility of seeking private funding was discussed.
- d. A question was asked as to what are the glaring deficiencies in the building? Jerry Wedge answered in order they are Science, Performing Arts, Athletics, Special Education, Guidance, and additional learning space for all departments.
- e. Time given to review charge.

V. Swearing in by Anita Tekle

a. All Concord, administration and faculty members were sworn in.

VI. Questions on Charge

a. Questions were answered based on specifics in the document. Phase II #2 was asked to be explained.

- b. Jerry Wedge explained that as the 2005 study proposed a new building, we would like to do a check on this study to make sure that this proposal will not cost more than a new building. If the committee proposes a piecemeal plan the individual projects will be less because it won't be done all at once.
- c. John Boynton asked what the MSBA outlook is today and their current attitude. Diana gave a brief history of the high school project with MSBA. The MSBA standards are very different from ours. Louis Salemy indicated it is easier to receive funds for repairs and remodels because they are tracked separately. They also want to design schools as economically as possible to save costs and meet a lot of needs. MSBA has helped fund the Carlisle and Concord elementary schools and they may feel their obligation is satisfied. Michael Fitzgerald indicated the likelihood of us receiving funds from the state when there are so many other needy communities is unlikely. Jerry Wedge indicated there is potential to look at grants for funding.
- d. An issue was raised as to how the committee should approach this project. From an implementation point of view or from a big picture angle. This also brings up the thought of how to approach it – from an academic point of view, financial, space, etc. Maybe there is an innovative approach? Green construction possibilities. Fundraising – we should be thinking out of the box, grants, etc.
- e. A discussion arose as to how the committee should assess what is acceptable. The committee should be thinking about the environment they want and then think of a building that supports that. Elise Woodward suggested getting a feel from the town as to what they have to work with for finances, what triggers an override, etc. How to approach the project? To meet the charge in this time frame, the committee needs to come up with simultaneous avenues. There was a general consensus that the community is supportive. It was reiterated that the committee should be looking at the academic needs first and go from there. Are there good examples across the country of what other schools have done? Recommend to view [www.case21.org](http://www.case21.org) as a link to ideas for schools.
- f. It was recommended that the committee take a tour of the high school at the next meeting. Peter Badalament said he would arrange for that. The committee would like to get a sense of what areas work and which don't, and also to talk about some of the academic issues.
- g. Enrollment was discussed. Enrollment has stayed flat for the past 5 years. Private school enrollments have stayed the same at approx. 20%
- h. What approach to take to devise a way to go about the next step? What is the direction of the committee? The committee should finalize the RFP. Jerry Wedge reiterated the goal of the committee is to develop a master plan for the existing campus with renovations and additions.
- i. Elise Woodward suggested targeting the next meeting to be ready to issue the RFP and offered to help draft it. Elise excused herself from the meeting.
- j. Public meeting laws were discussed.
- k. There is at least two weeks between the time an RFP is issued and an architect is chosen. Time must be allowed for public posting, review of proposals, etc. The committee has been appropriated \$250,000 for this study. Discussion ensued regarding choosing an architect. Dave Anderson suggested making sure the architect has a good MEP (Mechanical/Electrical) as they make up 50% of the project. Committee members should review the RFP and come up with any suggestions and changes at the next meeting.
- l. The next meeting will consist of:
  - i. Tour of the building
  - ii. Assess academic needs
  - iii. Review RFP comments. Comments to be sent to Eileen Curtin at [ecurtin@colonial.net](mailto:ecurtin@colonial.net) with comments to be distributed before next meeting.
- m. Peter Badalament passed around a Special Report to the NEASC.

- n. Jerry Wedge suggested setting up a highly communicative website for this committee for the whole community to access. It was suggested to talk to faculty, support staff, students, etc. regarding what they see as current needs. Peter Badalament will arrange this. It was also suggested to tour/view other schools.

VII. Public Comments

- a. David Holdorf, 441 Garfield Road, Concord commented that he sees the high school campus as the center of the community and therefore a community asset. We should sell it as a community project.

VIII. Motion to Adjourn

- a. A motion was made to adjourn by Louis Salemy and was seconded. The Motion was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Curtin