



IVAN G. SMITH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
4.27.2018

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

TIME: 8:00 AM

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

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

Meeting called to order at 8:08 AM.

Motion made by David Thomson and 2nd by Todd Cormier to approve the minutes from the 2/8/18 Smith SBC meeting. Minutes were unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2: Designer Update			
Item	Responsible	Due	Date
4-27.01	Tappe	Record	4.27.18
<p>Charlie Hay of Tappe provided a PowerPoint presentation to the SBC outlining project progress and status. Charlie informed the SBC that the PDP was submitted to the MSBA on 2/16/18, and the PSR will be submitted on 6/6/18. A list of recent/upcoming meetings was shown, along with the project design schedule.</p> <p>Preliminary concept options were once again reviewed with the SBC (Options R-1, AR-1, N2, and N3). Diagrams for each plan were shown on the site with labeled floor plans. An additional slide for Option AR-1 was shown to emphasize that, due to site boundary limitations, the only possible Add/Reno configuration would involve an addition to the west side of the existing Smith School. Charlie explained that the New Construction methodology will be recommended for Schematic Design at the conclusion of the PSR; and while options N2 and N3 are similar, N3 appears to be the most advantageous for educational delivery based the educational visioning sessions with Dr. Frank Locker and discussions had during the 8 meetings with educators to date.</p> <p>Tom Flannagan asked for more detail on why Kindergarten and 5th grade classrooms are arranged differently than the classrooms for students in grades 1-4. Charlie Hay and Keith Taverna explained that this was a result of the educational visioning, and that the educators treat grades K and 5 differently as they are transition years. The 5th grade begins to follow the middle-school model of moving students between classrooms throughout</p>			



the day. Tom asked Charlie if he has seen this on other projects. Charlie confirmed that he has seen this or a similar concept to this on numerous other projects.

Bill Clark asked and Charlie pointed to where deliveries will go on option N3. Charlie explained that due to the grade there is currently no loading dock shown. SBC members requested, and Charlie agreed to evaluate loading dock options as the design develops.

Keelin Dawe pointed to the art storage space and asked where the music storage space will be located in Option N3. Keith Taverna pointed to the instrument storage on the plans.

The next portion of Tappe’s slideshow involved Site Planning and Traffic Considerations. Existing site plans, proposed layout plans, and figures showing the traffic study bounds and summarizing the existing condition findings were discussed. Charlie explained that option N3’s site design currently has 124 parking spots, while the current Smith School only has 45 parking spaces on site. The 124 parking spaces meets Danvers Zoning requirements using a 25% reduction. Charlie discussed current site circulation issues and stated that the current proposed plan removes many cars from the neighboring streets and gives them space to queue or park on site. Charlie emphasized that the traffic engineer has not recommended any roadway improvements based on the existing conditions analysis.

The final portion of Tappe’s slideshow contained labeled figures outlining conceptual phasing and logistics for all 4 options.

Agenda Item #3: OPM Update

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
4-27.02	PMA	Record	4.27.18

PMA distributed a packet to the SBC containing the following:

- PSR deliverables summary/responsibility matrix
- OPM status update report dated 4-27-18
- Project timeline
- Flyer for 5-3-18 community forum
- CM-at-Risk pros & cons list

Joe DeSantis of PMA discussed the aforementioned handouts with the SBC. Joe explained that the PSR deliverables summary/responsibility matrix was created using MSBA PSR comments from another project. This is used to help ensure that all MSBA requirements and common MSBA inquiries are addressed prior to submitting the PSR.

The OPM status update report includes text describing the purpose of the PSR, lists recent/upcoming meetings, and lists recently completed project milestones. While discussing the upcoming meetings, Joe pointed to the flyer for the community forum that was also included in the packet. The SBC discussed using a robo-call for the 5/3/18 community forum. The current cash flow was also shown. Joe explained that 100% of requested reimbursements to the MSBA have been received to date. Joe credited Lee King of the Danvers DPW for this and expressed appreciation for all of her assistance to date.



Key dates on the project schedule were discussed, including the PSR submission date of 6/6/18, SD submission date of 10/16/18, construction start date of 1/8/20, and school opening date of September 2021. Joe mentioned that this schedule is predicated on utilization of the CMR project delivery method.

Paul Queeney provided a PowerPoint presentation to the SBC regarding project delivery method. The list of pros and cons provided in the packet distributed to the SBC was created to accompany Paul’s presentation. Prior to Paul’s presentation, Charlie Hay of Tappe expressed that the CMR delivery method appears to be most advantageous for this project for multiple reasons including site congestion, project timeline, and site management. Steve Bartha expressed that him and David Lane have discussed utilization of CMR with the project team and both are comfortable with utilization of CMR on this project. Paul Queeney’s presentation is attached to these minutes.

Agenda Item #4: Future Meetings

Item	Responsible	Due	Date
4-27.03	SBC	Record	4.27.18

No new business was discussed on 4/27/18.

The next Smith SBC meeting will be on 5/25/18 at 8:00AM.

Travis Ahern made a motion to adjourn, 2nd by Keelin Dawe, and approved unanimously by the SBC.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:21AM

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: 5.17.18