- Present:Jeff Adams, Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, Walter Birge, Stan Durlacher, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty,
Karla Johnson, John Lindner, Brian Miller, Joseph Morahan, Peter Nobile, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy,
Sergio Siani, Bill Tice, Margaret Waterman, Richard Waterman, Jerry Wedge, Elise Woodward
- Also Present: David Saindon, KVA, Jeanne Roberts, Whitney Granger, Leland Koehler/Rice, Michael Rosenfeld, Lisa Pecora-Ryan, Meghan Burke from OMR

Absent: Tim Hult, Charlie Sample, Chris Whelan

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Jerry Wedge at 6:05 PM. Jerry welcomed the Concord-Carlisle School Committee who will be observing our meeting and will meet later to vote on the Ed Specs.

II. Reading of Minutes

Jerry Wedge asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of March 9, 2011. A motion was made to approve the March 9, 2011 minutes by Jerry Wedge and seconded by Brian Miller. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. Discuss Educational Specifications – Jeanne Roberts & Leland Koehler/Rice & Report on March 10th Meeting with MSBA - Diana Rigby

Jeanne Roberts introduced two more members of the OMR team; Lisa Pecora-Ryan and Meghan Burke. Jeanne reviewed the revised goals & values; tonight we will discuss the space summary and will look for a recommendation for approval for the School Committee and also talk about the concepts and look for a recommendation for approval on them also. Looking at the Feasibility Study Schedule we are still aiming for the early submittal date at the end of May to the MSBA. OMR will be joining the Sustainability Subcommittee tomorrow in order to prepare for the next building committee meeting in two weeks to brainstorm about sustainability goals and net zero options. Jeanne introduced Leland Koehler/Rice who will talk about the Educational Specifications.

Leland went over the Program Summary and compared the School's Proposed Program with the MSBA Guidelines and made some comparisons in the major categories and started to group them or balancing some of the Delta differences between the MSBA and the proposed program.

Diana then gave us a brief update on the March 10th MSBA meeting that she went to with Karla Johnson, Louis Salemy, Jeanne Roberts and David Saindon. The purpose of the meeting was to review the program space summary and get some feedback; the viewpoint of MSBA is that they expect the delta to be zero. They discussed with MSBA what we currently have in programmatic space is what we currently need. The feedback to this was that if this is your current program then we need to justify why MSBA would provide the same amount of space since we are considerably over the square footage. One challenge area is the health & PE space; we currently have five PE teachers and five PE stations. MSBA expects us to have one performance gym and typically four teaching stations. We therefore need to justify why MSBA would provide that same amount of space. Diana distributed the narrative of the PDP which describes the utilization chart and the narrative explaining what the programmatic features are of our health & PE program. Our goal is for MSBA to allow the extra space which will support both our athletic space and PE space. MSBA could say they might fund some of it or none of it and it would be the responsibility of the two towns. The second challenge area is admin & guidance; six counselors are typical for our size school but we have nine. The narrative describes the need for nine counselors but from the MSBA's perspective you only need space for six counselors. There is a good chance they will allow the space for nine counselors but will not fund it and the communities will fund the extra spaces. It's the same situation with the learning commons.

After a discussion it was agreed that we should move forward with the gross area of 247,241 square feet without the field house

IV. Discuss Project Options – Leland Koehler/Rice and Lisa Pecora-Ryan

Leland went over the Space Adjacency Diagram. This will give us some kind of visual queue on how the spaces relate to one another before we move into the options and Lisa went over the analysis of the existing campus. The existing buildings were built in three different periods; in 1958 buildings A, H, upper gym, most of the cafeteria and part of building S, in 1964 the rest of building S, and in 1973 building I, L, the two-story library space, the connection to the cafeteria and the lower gym; 1990 the building was renovated and there was a new building envelope that was put on building H, A, S, and the front side of the cafeteria. The Master Plan Study showed that buildings H, A, and S were in the best condition.

Moving on to the options, Jerry stated that we will be looking at ten options. The state requires us to look at several options ranging from do nothing but renovate to the extreme of building new. The Committee needs to narrow the ten options down to three recommendations that will be submitted next week to the state. Leland explained each of the options. After the conclusion of the explanation of options, the committee decided to go with Options 4, 6 and a combination of 9 & 10.

V. Action Items:

- A motion was made by Elise Woodward and seconded by Walter Birge that we recommend moving forward with the Educational Specifications proposed program with the gross area of 247,241 square feet. The motion was unanimously approved.
- A motion was made by Sergio Siani and seconded by Dave Anderson that we approve Options 4, 6 and some modified form of 9 & 10. The motion was unanimously approved.

VI. Additional Items

David Saindon talked about the Invoice Approval Process. The original invoices are sent to John's office, John will forward them to KVA who will recommend approval and KVA will put together an invoice summary sheet.

VII. Public Comments

None

VIII Adjourn

A motion was made to adjourn by Karla Johnson and seconded by Jerry Wedge at 7:55 PM. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted, Leona Palmaccio

Approved: 4/6/11