Permanent Building Committee
Meeting of May 14, 2020
Online Meeting Via Zoom, YouTube, and Conference Line 7:30PM
Approved

A duly called and posted meeting of the Permanent Building Committee held via online mediums, 7:30PM, May 14, 2020.
PBC Present: T Goemaat (TG), D Grissino (DG), M King (MK), S Littlefield (SL), M. Tauer (MT)
Staff: S. Gagosian (SG), A. La Francesca (AL), K. Kennedy (KK)
Liaisons/Proponents: M. Freiman (BOS), N. Goins (NG-Advisory), S. Gray (ShG-SC), M. Martin (MM-SC),
Presenters: SMMA: A. Pitkin (AP), K. Olsen (KO), A. Oldeman (AO)
Compass: J. D’Amico (JD), L. Westman (LW)

Citizens speak
• None

Hunnewell
• SMMA and Compass presented targeted items relative to previous PBC questions and updates pertaining
to previous PBC feedback.
• JD reported that the PV numbers $1.2M are on top of current $47.5M, held outside of the budget, and
being tracked separately as they work with MLP.
• AP presented preliminary value engineering (VE) recommendations
  o including laminated glazing on interior glass at classrooms
  o putting wood structure aside until CM is onboard
• TG clarified that damp-proofing the foundation is essential and cautioned on using $600/sq. foot as many
components do not fit that price point.
• DG raised the gymnasium curtain as an area to understand the usage and cost implications so that they
may discuss impact to use. TG added that, in this example, the usage may include after school and youth
athletic programs which echoes the need for cost implications and context for programming impact. AP
agreed to clarify.
• AP VE continued options and SL requested a detailed walk through with cursor for visual guidance:
  o Refine floorplan to 90 degree angles, relocate kitchen/servery, reduces lobby area, relocates
    media center, reduces 2-story cafetorium space, and brings the electrical room down to the first
    floor
  o Lower ceiling for quiet lunch space, move table and chair storage to back of stage, entry to
    cafetorium through either vestibule, stair on SE side pulled in and more space/screening for
    dumpster
  o Options on location of Media center, Art, and Music include considerations such as: adjacency,
    access to light, visibility from entry vestibule, acoustics, and access to stairs and elevators. MK
    inquired about music room shape and low roof reflection into space to which AP responded that
    their acoustical consultant advised on the music room shape and that they’d advise light gray
    roofing and no equipment to reduce reflection and acknowledge aesthetic view.
• TG inquired about benchmarking square footage comparatively to other communities to which AP
  responded that this school includes a specialized program (TLC) and basic functions like the elevator take
up the same square footage which skews the numbers on smaller schools. ShG added that they have a
spreadsheet of number of classrooms and square footage for the district, they are a bit higher because of
the specialized programs and gym for Hunnewell, but that they are commensurate with MSBA programs.
• AP indicated that they will further address the wood columns and roof structure when a CM is onboard and
  they are working on furniture layouts for educational studies.
• MK requested attention to landscaping buffers on the back and side of the building relative to Brook path.
• SL offered appreciation to the design team for tightening up, working a better functioning design, and that
  she likes the direction it is going. DG echoed those sentiments.
• AO reviewed the 4 options for all electric HVAC systems, conducted refinements on lifecycle costs, and
  looked at replacement, maintenance, energy, installation costs, and projections for ownership with VRF
being the lowest cost estimate. DG asked about the associated risks of each to which AO replied that the
main driver is the expected useful life of each system. AO added that VRF doesn’t include displacement
ventilation which FMD prefers for its efficiency and delivery for occupants and that geothermal appears to
be cost prohibitive. VRF relies on refrigerant piping which could leak and FMD has reservations about
radiant due to odors/potential repairs and geothermal due to demolition required to fix anything. ShG
asked about repair access to refrigerant to which AO responded that this school it would run in the ceiling and be accessible like hot water piping.

- TG asked if their costing model were based on buying renewable energy from MLP and AO replied that it is based on current average kWh from MLP.
- DG raised the FMD recommendation letter in their materials which indicates that FMD prefers the base option to which SG noted that the stiff premium for geothermal can't be justified for the benefit of the overall system and that comments from TG and AP raise an interesting concept of a combination of all electric displacement ventilation with perimeter radiant heating hybrid.
- MK expressed concerns about viewing a mechanical system over 50 years and that displacement seems like a better system.
- TG inquired about air change rate to which AO responded that displacement ventilation delivers more efficient CFM (cubic feet per minute) than code.
- SG asked if the Committee had a path they’d like the designers to pursue to which they responded to pursue displacement with perimeter radiant heating and removing geothermal.
- JD reported that they received proposals for commissioning consultants on MEP (mechanical, electrical, plumbing) and Envelope and will bring leveling sheets and recommendations at the next meeting to which the Committee had no questions.

The Committee requested inclusion of Agostini based on previous successful work and they agreed to review the top 5 under the assumption they wouldn't have to interview all 5.

**Middle School Building Systems (MSBS)**

- SG presented his OPM update sheet and Shawmut’s contract as reviewed and approved by Town Counsel. The Committee had no additional final comments.

It was moved and 2nd to approve the pre-construction contract for Shawmut in the amount of $99,000.00, it was approved via roll call vote 6-0.

- SG requested feedback on the draft of the DRB PowerPoint to which DG noted that a slide referencing existing flues should indicate that they had previously been approved.
- SG and MK clarified that the purpose of an arch flash study is to conduct a hazard analysis and ensure safe working perimeters through testing currents through feeders, equipment, and devices. MK confirmed that the estimate is in a valid range and it may either be required or preferred by the inspector. SG will have Harriman create a more formal proposal for review.
- SG updated that there were robust downloads of documents for various trades.
PBC Administrative Business
It was moved and 2nd to approve the minutes from 4/23/20, approved via roll call 5-0.
It was moved and 2nd to approve the invoices as presented, approved via roll call 5-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:39PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Abbie La Francesca
Projects Assistant

Posted 6/2/20 10:25AM