

Present: Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, Stan Durlacher, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Tim Hult, Karla Johnson, John Lindner, Brian Miller Peter Nobile, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Bill Tice, Richard Waterman, Chris Whelan, Elise Woodward

Also Present: Brian Dakin, Frank Vanzler, KVA, Jeanne Roberts, Leland Koehler/Rice, Michael Rosenfeld, OMR, Maureen Kirkpatrick, Jim Liddick, Turner Construction

Absent: Jeff Adams, Walter Birge, Joseph Morahan, Sergio Siani

I. Call to Order

Stan Durlacher called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM and noted there is a quorum.

II. Reading of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the June 27, 2012 minutes by John Flaherty and seconded by Bill Tice. The motion was unanimously approved. The minutes of July 5, 2012 will not be voted on since there is not enough detail on the citizens who offered comments with their names and addresses.

III. Correspondence:

Diana stated she received two letters from two citizens. The first letter is from Bill Plummer of Arena Terrace, the second letter is from Lissa & Chris McKinney of Hayward Mill Road with 30 other families signing the letter.

IV. KVA Update:

- Brian Dakin did a general recap on the OPM MSBA reports. These reports have been issued since January 2011; the last report is #18 for the month of June. They are submitted two ways, electronically on the MSBA website and also in print. The print report is divided into four sections; Executive Summary, Project Schedule, Financial and Construction Activities (none as of this time).
- Brian gave an overview of the information that was delivered to the MSBA on July 26 which resulted from the June 26 MSBA letter.
- Brian then gave a current budget update summary. We are reporting to MSBA that with the current set of drawings and the accepted VE Turner is under the PFA by \$1,714 and the DG Jones estimate is \$205,640 over the PFA. At this point we are comfortable proceeding with these numbers and this is what will be recorded to the MSBA in the July report.

V. OMR Update:

Jeanne discussed the accomplishments since the last time we met: issued revised Design Development Estimate Submission for Pricing, met with town authorities and town engineering department on separate occasions, met with MSBA, we received the estimates, reconciled the estimates and had a value engineering number of meetings to get to where we are today, we submitted the response to the MSBA and yesterday we issued the draft ZBA application and drawings to the town. Moving forward we'll be meeting with staff of the town DPW and planning departments, will be preparing the site model to be ready for the ZBA hearing in September. The next meeting with the building committee will be August 14, the day before we issue the design development drawings to the MSBA. On the same day we'll issue the final ZBA application to the town and all of the departments. If the project is approved on August 14 to go forward to the MSBA then we will begin the construction document phase on August 16th. The construction document phase will be all about detailing everything we've seen, not changing just detailing. In late August to late September we will issue the early site package for Turner to start constructing in the fall, the early site work only. In early September we'll be meeting with the Planning Board, Public Works Committee, and Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing.

Jeanne talked about the project and went through a number of slides showing a picture of what the project was at the Project Funding Agreement phase from February, 2012 and comparing it to the August design development drawings that meet the \$74+million dollar construction budget. What we are looking at today: the site access, orientation, building entries and service access are as originally envisioned, building remains 4 stories with the lower level set into the north facing slope, all departments are in the same original locations with administration slightly adjusted internal to the building but maintains a similar relationship to the center of the building and outside visual access, the program spaces are within +1-5% of the SD space summary (except minor deviations in a few admin, miscellaneous, storage & locker room, conference rooms and offices are smaller), the learning & dining commons remain in the heart of the building, the DESE spaces are on program per the January 2012 DESE approved submission, the building is filled with natural light and meets the educational needs of the District, achieving at least 59 MA CHPS points and energy model has continuously improved in performance, the parking quantity remains while the site distribution is flipped to save on construction costs and facilitate community use, the base building meets the 225,826 GSF, town financed alternate gym building is detached and reduced in square footage to meet construction costs, and the project is still on schedule to move in by September 2015.

The entire Team is committed to delivering an August 2012 DD package that will meet the SD/PFA budget.

VI. Action Items:

We will not seek a vote on the project scope & budget for the DD Submission at this time. We will hold the vote until the August 14th meeting in anticipation of the submission to the MSBA on August 15th.

VII. Communication:

Michelle added a news section to the website. There will be another community forum after school starts but before construction begins.

VIII. Subcommittees:

Stan and Diana have discussed the subcommittee structure and have decided to take every other building committee meeting and have a monthly meeting of the building committee at large and then every other meeting have subcommittee meetings subject to the OML. Stan asked the building committee members to sign up for a subcommittee.

Karla (Design Subcommittee) reported that Elise, Peter and Brian looked at the goals of the project and came up with about ten questions that were forwarded to the architects.

IX. Additional Items:

The next meeting will be August 14, 2012 and will be a joint meeting with the School Committee.

X. Public Comments:

Nancy Burnham, 84 Bristers Hill Road, Concord – Asked for clarification on Jeanne Robert's comments when describing the alternative gym. I thought I heard her say that they (OMR) had reduced the size of the alternate gym to save money that could then be used for the High School. My understanding of the vote in November of last year is that we approved one amount of money to pay for the new high school and a separate amount of money to pay for the alternate gym. My understanding is that the alternate gym is a separate project in all aspects including its finances such that if the gym is built under budget, the remainder of the budget legally must be turned back to the taxpayers and cannot be used for the high school project. In other words, the alternate gym is one project with its own funding and bookkeeping as is the high school and the funds from one cannot legally be used for the other and each needs to keep its own books. I believe that we have had at least one past school building project (one of the elementary schools) that came in under budget. I'd appreciate your clarifying what the presenter meant.

I would like to understand, with detailed numbers of feet, what the impact of the change in the high school's footprint (it is now smaller) along with the smaller drive (no parking spaces on the drive around the school) is now on the area currently used for transportation. It appears that with these changes, the footprint of the project no longer impacts the footprint of the area currently occupied by the Transportation department.

David Allen, 316 Heaths Bridge Road, Concord – real concern is trust; you need the trust of the citizens.

Stan Lucks, 165 Indian Spring Road, Concord – Concerned with the \$17-22 million dollars over budget; poorly served by KVA & OMR that worked with the committee to end up with a budget that was so out of whack; concerned with 5% contingency. Mr. Lucks also wanted to know what the District was doing to recover back the money spent on OMR/KVA for the plans that lead to the \$17 million over run.

Phil Benincasa, 108 Commerford Road, Concord – We need to focus on the need for communication. Phil Benincasa asked questions of Michelle Ernst about why she wasn't posting to public and observed that important information for citizens should be posted. He stated she should not let OML prevent her from posting on the BC web sites. Michelle said she had spoken to Anita Tekle who told her what she should post or not. Phil also said he would call Anita about it to determine what could be posted consistent with OML and Public Records.

XI. Adjourn:

A motion was made to adjourn by Tim Hult and seconded by Peter Badalament at 7:21 PM. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Leona Palmaccio

Approved: 8/14/12