



**IVAN G. SMITH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**2.8.2018**

**LOCATION:** Danvers Town Hall, Daniel J. Toomey Hearing Room

**TIME:** 8:00 AM

<b>ATTENDEES (Absent in italics) (See sign-in sheet)</b>				
<b>Building Committee</b>				
Steve Bartha	<i>William Clark</i>	<i>Todd Cormier</i>	Lisa Dana	Keelin Dawe
Thomas Flannagan	<i>David Lane</i>	Tracey Mara	Paul Pawlak	Mike Perham
Robin Stein	Keith Taverna	David Thomson		
<b>PMA Consultants (Owner's Project Manager)</b>				
<i>Christopher Carroll</i>	Joseph DeSantis	<i>Kevin Nigro</i>	Paul Queeney	
<b>Tappe Architects</b>				
<i>Christopher Blessen</i>	Charles Hay			
<b>Other</b>				
None				

<b>ACRONYMS USED WITHIN MINUTES</b>			
<i>OPM</i>	<i>Owner's Project Manager</i>	<i>PDP</i>	<i>Preliminary Design Program</i>
<i>SBC</i>	<i>School Building Committee</i>	<i>PSR</i>	<i>Preferred Schematic Report</i>
<i>MSBA</i>	<i>Massachusetts School Building Authority</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Schematic Design</i>
<i>DSP</i>	<i>Designer Selection Panel</i>		

Meeting called to order at 8:05 AM.

Keelin Dawe made a motion to approve the minutes from the 11/3/17 meeting, second by Thomas Flannagan. Minutes were unanimously approved.

<b>DESIGNER UPDATE OF PROCESS UNDERTAKEN TO DATE</b>			
<b>Item</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Due</b>	<b>Date</b>
2-08.01	Tappe	Record	2.8.18
<p>Charlie Hay explained that the process undertaken to date is prescribed by the MSBA. Existing conditions analyses (Fire protection/plumbing, electrical, material, structural, ACM investigation) have been conducted and these reports will be included in the PDP. They largely reiterate information that is already known by the Town. Existing conditions plans have been developed showing square footage of various areas.</p> <p>Site plans were shown to the SBC. Charlie explained that topography and utility surveys have been completed. Charlie discussed the existing site conditions analyses (civil engineer, landscape architects, site survey, geo-technical exploration, geo-environmental exploration). There are three different wetland areas on site. The civil engineer met with the DPW on site and had discussions around the sewer system and a current flooding issue. Boring locations from the preliminary geotechnical investigations were shown. Charlie explained that the ground water table is relatively high at the lower part of the site, which poses challenges during construction (dewatering), and influences the design footprint. No ledge was observed. There will be some costs associated with the unsuitable soil that will need to be replaced with structural fill.</p> <p>Traffic analysis was completed – traffic counts and visual observations. There are no conclusions or recommendations currently, but they have all the data they need.</p>			



Steve Bartha – Does this preliminary traffic study include potential future recommendations?  
 Charlie Hay – No, the next step is to project future traffic conditions, and provide future recommendations.

**DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL PLANNING**

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
2-08.02	Tappe/Lisa + Keith	Record	2.8.18

Charlie thanked the Town for their great work in putting together the educational plan and coordinating the visioning sessions.

Charlie displayed the preliminary MSBA space template and explained what each column means (current space, proposed space, MSBA guidelines). Charlie explained that the proposed design is consistent with the MSBA template in terms of recommended square footages. MSBA template gives recommendations based on number of students. We are slightly above MSBA guidelines on classrooms; however, this is common practice on MSBA elementary school projects.

Lisa Dana thanked everyone who was part of the visioning process. Lisa mentioned that Frank Locker did a great job challenging the staff. Keith Taverna mentioned that Frank Locker’s exercises challenged individuals to think critically, and it was encouraging that many individuals had similar goals for the future.

Tracey Mara discussed the outcomes of the visioning sessions including a desire for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning, student engagement, social emotional learning, and utilization of small learning communities. Tracey discussed how these goals transformed into planning a conceptual building. Highlights from the educational program were discussed, including grouping K-2 and 3-5, having flexible learning areas, wet/messy STEM projects, maker spaces, multimedia projects/presentations, etc.

Keith Taverna discussed how the educational program informs the building design. Specifically, how the K-2 and 3-5 grouping leads to a 2-story building design. Keith also mentioned the desire for oversized corridors that can be used as flexible learning areas.

Charlie showed the table of contents of the educational program to the SBC.

Charlie showed the district planning map that Tappe is currently developing. He explained that it links to census data, and it can be used to create flex zones. The capacity of each school has been analyzed, and Tappe is very comfortable that the future enrollment is accounted for at the Smith School.

**PRELIMINARY OPTIONS**

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
2-08.03	Tappe	Record	2.8.18

Tappe reviewed all preliminary options (listed below), and discussed the pros and cons of each. Charlie explained that the MSBA requires the designer to consider alternative sites and leasing space.

The options are the following:

- Option R-1: Renovation Only
- Option AR-1: Add/Reno
- Option N-1: New Construction
- Option N-2: New Construction
- Option N-3: New Construction
- Option N-4: New Construction

Option R-1 is a renovation only. It involves adding walls, which would lower capacity compared to today. Charlie explained that there is no way to accommodate the 465 students that the MSBA has approved, and there is no

way to meet the educational goals that the district has set forth. Option R-1 will be further studied in the PSR phase, per MSBA requirements.

Option AR-1 is an addition/renovation. The location of the addition would be to the west of the existing building. This option turns the existing gym into a cafeteria, turns the existing art room into a kitchen, and provides separate mechanical room space. The existing school would be operational while the addition is built, then the kids would be moved into the addition, and the renovation of the existing Smith School could be performed. This is majorly disruptive to students, and may leave times where there is no space for administration and the kitchen. The building footprint will be large, causing site issues. Option AR-1 will be further studied in the PSR phase, per MSBA requirements.

Option N-1 is the first of four new construction options. All new construction options are located at approximately the same location on site. Option N-1 is C-shaped, with a centralized entrance. It is located closely to the existing building, which is a concern during construction as it limits access to the existing school. It does not accommodate the goals that were determined during the educational visioning.

Option N-2 is compact, less close to the existing building, and zones public spaces to the front. Option N-2 is a two-story plan, which is ideal per the educational plan. It is a split-level plan. Hallways are oversized, providing shared pullout spaces for kids. Site circulation needs further development.

Keelin Dawe – I am concerned that the music and gymnasium are right near each other on most options.

Charlie Hay – The rationale behind the adjacency is because the instruments can be staged in the gym.

Keeling Dawe – As long as there is appropriate sound proofing this will work.

Option N-3 is similar to N-2, with a less compact building footprint. It has longer classroom wings, implying there are less collaboration spaces. Option N-3 is a two-story plan. This option is less flexible than N-2 in terms of classroom arrangement.

Option N-4 is similar to N-3, but is a three-story plan. This provides a smaller building footprint; however, three floors does not satisfy educational plan. There are also concerns about a three-story building for young students.

Tappe displayed an evaluation matrix summarizing all pros and cons and weighing the options against one another. The matrix is color coded, and out of an 85 point scale. The evaluation matrix considers the following factors: site, education planning, concept design, construction logistics & phasing.

The renovation and addition/renovation scored the lowest overall. Out of the new construction options, N-2 received the best score and N-1 received the worst score. Options N-3 and N-4 received the same grade, but for different reasons. Options N-2 and N-3 appear to be the best options, and ultimately may be combined into one option. As we move into the next phase, Tappe recommends that we rule our options N-1 and N-4.

**VOTE: Paul Pawlak made motion, second by Keelin Dawe, to continue studying options R-1, AR-1, N-2, and N-3 in the next project phase. The motion was approved unanimously. Vote: 9 – 0.**



**REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM CONTENTS**

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
2-08.04	Tappe	Record	2.8.18

Tappe presented the table of contents of the PDP and discussed each item. PMA mentioned that a Dropbox link will be sent to the SBC containing the final draft of the PDP.

**OPM UPDATE**

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
2-08.05	PMA	Record	2.8.18

PMA distributed a preliminary project schedule showing high-level, key milestone dates that are upcoming. PMA also distributed an OPM Status Update Report highlighting the majority of tasks undertaken to date. The status report also shows the current cash flow, and MSBA grant information. PMA explained that a school opening date of September 2021. Keith Taverna mentioned that a January 2019 special town meeting is planned.

**VOTE FOR PDP**

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
2-08.06	SBC	Record	2.8.18

**VOTE: Motion made by Keelin Dawe, and second by Thomas Flannagan, to authorize PMA to submit the PDP package to MSBA, inclusive of the preliminary work plan, educational plan/accompanying space summary, preliminary options, local actions and approvals, and all reports contained within. Motion passed unanimously. Vote: 9-0.**

**NEW BUSINESS / OTHER TOPICS**

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
2-08.07	SBC	Record	2.8.18

No new business was discussed on 2/8/18.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:15AM**

**The date for the next meeting will be determined and communicated to the Building Committee.**

PMA Consultants assumes, to the best of our knowledge, that the above content of these Meeting Minutes depict all that transpired during this Project meeting. All attendees are requested to communicate any omissions, errors or inconsistencies in the reporting of these Meeting Minutes to the writer.

**Prepared By: Joseph DeSantis**

**Date: 2.9.18**

