Town of Reading
Meeting Minutes

2016-09-22 LAG

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Permanent Building Committee   Killam School Building Committee

Date: 2024-05-09   Time: 5:30 PM

Building: Reading Town Hall   Location: Berger Room

Address: 16 Lowell Street   Session: Open Session

Purpose: General Business   Version: Final

Attendees: **Members - Present:**

Chair Carla Nazzaro, Vice Chair Karen Herrick (remote), John Coote, Kirk McCormick (remote), Greg Stepler (remote), Pat Tompkins (remote), Nancy Twomey (remote)

Members - Not Present:

Sarah McLaughlin, Ed Ross

Others Present:

Town Manager Matt Kraunelis, School Superintendent Thomas Milaschewski, School Finance Director Derek Pinto, Chief Financial Officer Sharon Angstrom (remote), Facilities Director Joe Huggins (remote), Assistant Facilities Director Kevin Cabuzzi (remote), LBA Project Manager Jenni Katajamaki, Colliers Project Manager Suzanna Yeung, Colliers Project Director Mike Carroll (remote), LBA Architect Leigh Sherwood (remote), Mollie O'Keeffe RMLD, Tom Ollila RMLD

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By: Jacquelyn LaVerde

Topics of Discussion:

This meeting was held in-person in the Berger Conference Room of Town Hall and remotely via Zoom.

Call to Order
Chair Carla Nazzaro called the meeting to order at 5:34 pm.
Roll call attendance: Karen Gately Herrick, John Coote, Kirk McCormick, Greg Stepler, Pat Tompkins, Nancy Twomey, Carla Nazzaro.
Not Present: Sarah McLaughlin, Ed Ross.

Public Comment
There was no comment from the public.

KSBC Liaison Reports
Chair Carla Nazzaro kicked off discussion of last week’s visits to Douglas and Gates Elementary Schools and Acton-Boxborough, and Cunniff and Hosmer Schools in Watertown. The tour at Gates was given by the Energy Director, and an Energy Manager and the Superintendent gave the tours in Watertown.

John Coote shared that the two schools in Acton were cold and dreary. and upper floors looked out over a vast roof. He stated that he felt the Watertown schools were bright, happy, and colorful.

Karen Gately Herrick stated that she was happy to hear from energy managers in both districts that the net-zero systems in place were performing at or better than the parameters they were designed for, and not having operational issues.

Facilities Director Joe Huggins noted that he and Assistant Facilities Director Kevin Cabuzzi had a discussion with the Sustainability Manager and the HVAC Manager in Acton, and they learned that the systems were meeting the targets they were designed for, but also learned of reliability problems and growing pains that they were dealing with. He shared his concerns about how well the buildings regulate the heat, and noted that electricity costs would increase. He cautioned about the cost to build a net zero building, and the impact those costs may have on educational programming. He noted that both Acton and Watertown are still under warranty, and he would like to look at a building that has been performing for five to ten years to see what the operational costs are really like.

LBA Project Manager Jenni Katajamaki thanked the Committee for their feedback and stated that she and her team would try to find another school, or institutional building, with similar geothermal systems, with a five-to-ten-year track record, and do more due diligence on geothermal and all-electric systems.

Greg Stepler noted that there are a number of competing interests that the engineers will have to address. He noted that in his experience, some clients have been more concerned with first cost, but had little consideration for long-term operating costs. Seeing proof that sustainable technology has a lower operating cost will be critical to the decision making. He stated that he is a believer in the technology and the direction the industry is going, but the Committee needs to do its due diligence.

Designer Report/Review and Discuss Feedback on Draft PDP Report

LBA Project Manager Jenni Katajamaki reviewed the tasks completed since the last meeting including: SBC site visits; completion of draft PDP report; draft of the educational program, which was included in the draft PDP report; completion of geotechnical investigation field work, with the final geotechnical report expected tomorrow; and PDP cost estimate, which was included in the PDP report. The PDP report will be approved this evening and submitted to the MSBA on May 20th. MSBA will then review the document, and there will be a district response period. In the meantime, the PSR phase will be underway, and submitted at the end of August. At the end of the PSR, the district will have a preferred option.

Ms. Katajamaki provided a summary of the preliminary findings of the geotechnical investigation. One finding that was not great, but not unexpected, was organic soils found between the depths of two feet and eight feet, which means that soil is not suitable for structural fill, and cannot be underneath the building footprint. That soil will need to be removed and replaced with structural fill. The cost of that soil replacement has been incorporated into this first cost estimate. Groundwater was found six feet below grade. The preliminary foundation recommendation is a shallow foundation.

Ms. Katajamaki also reviewed the summary of the PDP report, which included: the project directory and schedule; educational program; initial space summary; evaluation of existing conditions; site development narrative; site plan options; preliminary evaluation of alternatives; metrics to evaluate the alternatives; the letter from the district approving the submission; meeting agendas, minutes, and list of meeting dates; appendices including the educational visioning report, meeting minutes from programming, various other reports, and the cost estimate.

The Committee had the opportunity to review the draft of the PDP and submit comments prior to the meeting. Ms. Katajamaki reviewed and discussed many of the comments with the Committee including: adding the selection of materials that are recyclable at their end of life to sustainability goals, researching whether a geothermal system is viable during the PSR phase, potentially needing swing space for students during construction, and educational programming.

Ms. Katajamaki reviewed the nine options for evaluations of alternatives, which included full and partial pre-K versions of an addition/renovation, a compact/three-story building, a two-story building that will require no demolition of the existing building, a two-story building that will involve some demolition of the existing building, and a two-story option that will require extensive demolition of the existing building. The preliminary criteria were developed based on the project charter and would reveal a difference between the options and include: being built around the student putting education first in the design, success of classroom neighborhoods, success of educational spaces, community centered, cost-value balance, appropriateness of the building for the neighborhood context, quality of outdoor space, responsible sustainability, energy efficiency, ease of maintenance and life cycle cost, safety and health, traffic and access, safe and secure building, phasing and disruption, a sense of belonging, warm and welcoming, and scale and character.

Next steps include the submission of the PDP to the MSBA on May 20th, a presentation to the Select Board on May 21st, and Sustainability subcommittee meetings May 21st and July 9th. The next SBC meetings will continue the discussion on evaluation of alternatives, PSR cost estimate, joint meeting with Town committees, revised cost estimates for the PSR, and the preferred solution. Upcoming community meetings are scheduled for July 15th and August 8th.

Vote to Approve PDP Submittal

On a motion by Carla Nazzaro, seconded by Karen Gately Herrick, the Killam School Building Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the PDP submission.
Roll call vote: Karen Gately Herrick – Yes, John Coote – Yes, Kirk McCormick – Yes, Greg Stepler – Yes, Pat Tompkins – Yes, Nancy Twomey – Yes, Carla Nazzaro – Yes.

OPM Report

Financials

Colliers Project Manager Suzanna Yeung noted that there were no budget adjustments. There were two invoices for March: one for $20,000 for Colliers, and one for $121,000 for LBA. Colliers Project Director Mike Carroll noted that the project is still on schedule and under budget.

Warrant/ Invoices

On a motion by Carla Nazzaro, seconded by Karen Gately Herrick, the Killam School Building Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the project invoicing from April 8, 2024, through April 10, 2024.
Roll call vote: Karen Gately Herrick – Yes, John Coote – Yes, Kirk McCormick – Yes, Greg Stepler – Yes, Pat Tompkins – Yes, Nancy Twomey – Yes, Carla Nazzaro – Yes.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

On a motion by Carla Nazzaro, seconded by Karen Gately Herrick, the Killam School Building Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the meeting minutes of April 8, 2024.
Roll call vote: Karen Gately Herrick – Yes, John Coote – Yes, Kirk McCormick – Yes, Greg Stepler – Yes, Pat Tompkins – Yes, Nancy Twomey – Yes, Carla Nazzaro – Yes.

Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Dates

The next Killam School Building Committee meeting is scheduled for June 17th, 2024. The agenda will be to continue the discussion on the evaluation of alternatives. The next community meeting is scheduled for July 15th, which will also discuss the evaluation of alternatives.

On a motion by Karen Gately Herrick, seconded by Pat Tompkins, the Killam School Building Committee voted 7-0-0 to adjourn at 6:57 pm.

Roll call vote: Karen Gately Herrick – Yes, John Coote – Yes, Kirk McCormick – Yes, Greg Stepler – Yes. Pat Tompkins – Yes, Nancy Twomey – Yes, Carla Nazzaro – Yes.