

DALE STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – MEDFIELD, MA	MEETING MINUTES
--	------------------------

DALE STREET SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 31	June 30, 2021
Location:	Online Meeting
Time:	7:00 PM

Attendees:

Name	Assoc.	Present
	<i>School Building Committee</i>	
<i>Mike Quinlan</i>	Chair, Medfield School Building Committee/PBC	Y
<i>Tom Erb</i>	SBC member/PBC	Y
<i>Michael Weber</i>	SBC member/PBC	N
<i>Walter Kincaid</i>	SBC member/PBC	Y
<i>Timothy Bonfatti</i>	SBC member/PBC	Y
<i>Michael Marcucci</i>	SBC member/Board of Selectman	Y
<i>Leo Brehm</i>	SBC member/School Committee	N
<i>Anna Mae O'Shea-Brooke</i>	SBC member/School Committee	Y
<i>Jeffrey Marsden</i>	SBC member/School District - Superintendent	Y
Kristine Trierweiler	SBC member/Town Administrator	Y
Michael LaFrancesca	SBC member/School District – Dir. of Finance and Operations	Y
Stephen Grenham	SBC member/Principal – Dale Street School	Y
Amy Colleran	SBC member/Town of Medfield - Director of Facilities	Y
Bob Sliney	SBC member/Warrant Committee	Y
Lynn Stapleton	LeftField Project Management	Y
Gina Gomes-Cruz	LeftField Project Management	Y
Tim Baker	LeftField Project Management	Y
Jim Rogers	LeftField Project Management	Y

Laurence Spang	Arrowstreet Architect	Y
Tina T. Soo Hoo	Arrowstreet Architect	Y
Claes Andreasen	Arrowstreet Architect	Y
Emily Grandstaff-Rice	Arrowstreet Architect	Y

Bold/Italics = SBC Voting Member

A Dale Street Elementary School Building Committee (SBC) Meeting was held to discuss: Administrative Actions; SD Design Update; Cost Review and Budget Discussion; Communications Subcommittee update and Project Schedule. The following was noted:

Mike Quinlan called the SBC meeting to order at 7:20 PM. A quorum was in attendance.

It was stated that the virtual meeting was being recorded and was in accordance with the Governor's Executive Order issued on March 12, 2020, which suspends certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law.

I. Administrative

Vote on Approval of June 23, 2021, Dale Street School Building Committee Meeting Minutes.

1. This item was tabled until the next SBC meeting.

II. SD Design Update

2. Tina presented the interior renderings along with Claes and Kate Hesperheide.
3. Interior perspectives included: Entry Corridor; hallway heading toward Gym and a perspective from the Gym looking toward the Main Office; Band Room; Media Center and Library; Cafetorium; and the Leaning Stair.
4. Kate discussed materials and how they reflect the design concepts.
5. Comments:
 - a. Tim Bonfatti asked if there were plans to do something in the entry corridor where there are large amounts of white painted drywall in direct sunlight. Claes responded that they will be breaking up the area by introducing wall graphics. Mike Q added that this area needs further development. Jeff added that this would be a good opportunity to add graphics showing the schools core values.
 - b. Tim Bonfatti commented that the flooring in the hallway heading toward the gym was understated. It was agreed that it is a placeholder. Kate added that what is missing from these renderings are display cases which will add to the space.
 - c. Tim Bonfatti asked if the exposed metal will be painted with intumescent paint? Tina responded that they are being selective where they have intumescent paint as it is expensive. Tim added that the application of intumescent paint can be challenging and special attention needs to be taken or else it won't look very good.
 - d. It was confirmed that the Cafetorium design will be looked at by the Acoustical Engineer.
 - e. Mike Weber asked if there will be theatrical lighting introduced at the stage. Tina responded that simple lighting controls will be introduced.

III. Cost Estimate Review and Budget Discussion

6. Tina presented a recap of where the June 23rd SBC meeting left off by quickly presenting the Cost Estimate Comparison and Value Engineering slides.
7. Mike Q added that the initial cost estimates were high and asked the Design Team to produce a list of VE items. Mike Q confirmed that the most of these items listed have minimal impact on the operation or function of the building or the long term maintenance of the building and does not require making great sacrifices.
8. VE Recommendations, after review with the Design Team and Jeff, are categorized as **Yes** - considered low hanging fruit, easy to take to help lower cost and does not impact function or educational program; **Maybe** - to be reviewed tonight and to keep some items in our back pocket in the event we need to get back to budget later

down the road, and **No** - some items may have a minor or major impact to the function of the building and programming.

9. Tina presented the list of VE items. If someone wanted to “hold” an item. These items were reviewed at the end. (See Arrowstreet Presentation dated: June 30, 2021, for complete list of Value Engineering (VE) items)

10. Comments (“Yes” items for review):

a. 2.22-2.25 Mike Weber asked where these costs came from, the numbers seem low. Tina stated that these costs are allowances only. (Leave as is)

b. 2.27 Tim Bonfatti expressed concern over losing the environmental graphics and how much square feet is left when you remove 1000 SF. Tina responded that the 1000 SF is less than half. Mike Q added that AST stated that there would still be an adequate budget to do some great things. (Leave as is)

c. 3.13 Tim Bonfatti asked what the impact would be with this elimination. Tina responded that GGD recommended this. (Leave as is)

d. 4.8 Anna Mae asked if the irrigation would be done. Mike Q responded that the specifications would state that the contractor is responsible for watering for a year and making sure plants are established and this would be done by means of the hose bibb or bringing in a water truck. It was also stated that there would be 1 year maintenance required and 1 year warrantee (the 2nd year the school is responsible for watering). (Leave as is)

11. Comments (“Maybe” items for review)

a. 1.5A Tom Erb stated that this could be an option to save many. (Leave as is)

b. 1.12 Tom Erb expressed concern over moisture issues, especially when using porcelain tile, and suggested making this a “NO”. Everyone agreed to make this a “NO”.

c. Mike Q. stated that the “Maybe” list will be kept through the Design Development estimate and if prices come in higher than expected we will have options. They are not bid alternates yet, that will come later in the process. (Leave as is)

d. 2.6 Mike Q. stated that the operable partition is a sizable number and asked if the net divider could be an option. Jeff responded on behalf of the staff and stated that having an operable partition would be preferred. (Leave as is)

e. MEP/FP Mike Q. agreed to keep items in these categories as “Maybe” until looking further in to net zero goals.

f. 3.6 Jeff expressed concern over not having a UPS system. Mike Weber felt it should be a “Yes” but will be kept here for now. (Leave as is)

g. 2.11 Mike Weber asked if toilet rooms and drinking fountains could be broken out separately. Tina confirmed that this could be done. (Leave as is)

h. 4.3B Mike Weber stated that concrete would be better in the front entry and asphalt in other pathways. (Leave as is)

i. 4.9 Jeff would like to have some sort of shade structure. (Leave as is)

j. 4.10 Mike Weber stated that this should be a “NO”

k. 4.11 Mike Q stated that deferred maintenance could mean that it would not be done. (Leave as is)

l. 4.22 Mike Q and Mike Weber agreed that it would not be a good idea. Item will be moved to “No”

13. It was agreed that the “Yes” items will be moved into the base project and “Maybe” will be kept for future phases if needed.

IV. Communications Subcommittee Update

14. No discussion

V. Project Schedule

15. No discussion

VI. Other Business/Discussions

16. No discussion

VII. Next Meeting

17. July 14, 2021

VIII. Adjournment

18. The following motion to adjourn and vote were made:

MOTION: Tom Erb moved, seconded by Anna Mae O'Shea Brooke, that the Dale Street School Building Committee vote to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 PM.

Discussion:

None

VOTE: The Dale Street School Building Committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 PM.

Roll call was taken:

Tom Erb – in favor
Michael Marcucci – in favor
Mike Weber – in favor
Anna Mae O'Shea Brooke – In favor
Jeffrey Marsden - In favor
Tim Bonfatti – in favor
Walt Kincaid – in favor
Mike Quinlan – In favor

In Favor: 8 Against: 0 Abstained: 0 The motion passed.

IX. Meeting Materials

The following materials were presented at the June 30, 2021 SBC Meeting:

- Arrowstreet Presentation dated: June 30, 2021.
- Meeting Materials are located on the School Project website at <https://www.medfield.net/o/medfield-public-schools/page/elementary-school-project> and at the Town of Medfield's website at [https://www.town.medfield.net/AgendaCenter/Search/?term=&CIDs=69,&startDate=&endDate=&dateRange=&dateSelector=.](https://www.town.medfield.net/AgendaCenter/Search/?term=&CIDs=69,&startDate=&endDate=&dateRange=&dateSelector=)
- The School Building Committee Meeting recordings which include the Architect's presentation can be found at <https://www.medfield.tv/schools/>