



HARRIMAN

MEETING NOTES

To

Deb Alden

From

Mark Lee, Lisa Sawin

Date

June 16, 2021

Project

RSU 10, Feasibility and Planning Study
Project No. 19536

Subject

Building Committee Meeting

Attendees

Deb Alden, Scott Holmes, Jill Bartash, Kim Fuller, Melissa Harding, Cliff Harding, Cassie Danylik, Chris Brennick, Heather Gallant, Leanne Condon, Liz Ledesma, Marianne Hutchinson, Jerry Wiley

Lisa Sawin, Mark Lee, Steve Fraser, Emilie Waugh (Harriman)

1. Sub-Committee Reports

a) Site Design and Athletic Committee Report:

- i. Chris Brennick said there was nothing new to report. They have not met as a full committee since our last BAC meeting.
- ii. Lisa Sawin said Harriman does have the document they put together and this will be part of the conversation around locally vs. state funded items.

b) Building Systems and Sustainability Committee Report:

- i. The committee hasn't met in a few weeks with all that was happening with the end of school. They will be meeting tonight. They have invited others to the meeting.
- ii. They want to get the gist of where we're going (how much we should put toward local items).
- iii. They also have a meeting with Passive Maine scheduled, and are looking to go up to Mount Blue to look at their energy systems and see how established buildings are working.
- iv. Lisa said to let us know if there are other schools we should look at as a model. Harriman will work on energy modeling too and will have feedback for the committee in the near future.

c) Ed Specs Committee Report:

- i. The committee did a ton of work recently completing the draft document. Harriman has sent it up to DOE for review. The document has been so helpful to understand how you're going to operate in this new building and helps us identify spaces, adjacencies, etc.

AUBURN

BOSTON

PORTLAND

PORTSMOUTH



- ii. Leanne Condon said they had great people doing all this work, but all these other committees haven't seen that work, so it feels disconnected. It comes together for the architects, but hasn't for the other committee members.
 - i. Lisa said we can send the document around to everyone on the building committee and summarize items we pull out to inform people.
 - ii. Deb will put the document in the folder.
 - iii. Kim likes the summary idea. She noted the committee members worked really hard on the document and thanked Leanne for all her efforts.
- d) Communications Committee Report:
 - i. Deb Alden said we recently got the green light to have the straw poll, which is going to be on June 28th. We are moving forward with that, getting the word out.
 - i. We are trying to get a banner done.
 - ii. The straw poll will be June 28th at 5:30pm, before the Board meeting. There will be a presentation and people can ask questions and then we'll take the straw poll regarding site selection.
 - iii. Deb said we can probably set it up so people could be virtual or in person.
 - iv. Chris Brennick asked if you have to check voters in at those straw polls.
 - i. Lisa said we've done a sign in sheet at the door in the past. We don't have to verify that they live there, but normally it's just the community who shows up to these.
 - ii. Mark said it's on the honor system, but it's non-binding, so it just has to be a consensus to show support.

2. Site Application Update

- a) We are still awaiting a few remaining pieces, most of which should come in this week.
 - i. Geotechnical testing was done this week, as well as some traffic counts. These were the big items that were outstanding.
- b) Lisa walked through some of the key items from the executive summary, including community priorities that drove the site selection, the three step process for final recommendations, and the building committee recommendations that were based on these items.
- c) Lisa showed the updated site plan, noting that this continues to evolve and pieces move continuously. This plan shows that all components and site features can fit on this site and work together.
 - i. Two ball fields; relocation of the existing track and field; separate parent/bus drop offs; access to the nature trail; disturbing as little natural area as possible; and the incorporation of hardscape areas, play equipment, and nature based play.
 - ii. The buildings can remain occupied while the new building is being built, then the site features will be added after.
 - iii. The parking shown is about 166-180 parking spaces. This fits the state formula for what they will fund (staff plus 15 visitors)



- iv. We are looking at elongating the building for ideal solar gain.
 - v. The footprint will morph as we layout the building.
- d) Scott Holmes asked if a lot of earthwork will need to be done for the ball fields in the parking lot area. That is quite an elevation difference.
 - i. Frank, Harriman's civil engineer, looked at placing the building at the same elevation as the existing track. There is a lot of earthwork that will happen, but we are looking at balancing the site on a cut and fill and minimizing retaining walls and sloped areas as much as possible. There is an embankment by the track (you can sit on it).
- e) Cliff Harding said it will be important to have two entrances (younger vs. older kids).
 - i. Lisa said that is something we will talk to DOE about. They tend to want to have one entry for safety and security reasons.
 - ii. Cliff said they really don't want the young ones meeting the older kids in the building.
 - iii. Deb and Kim noted that the different ages all come in on the same busses, so they interact presently.
 - iv. Mark said something to keep in mind is that this is all very schematic. Pieces are just arranged and as we get into more conversations with DOE, we will work out more details.
- f) Chris asked if the future addition is just a placeholder.
 - i. That is a requirement of DOE that we plan the school with a future addition in mind in the event you have to add square footage in the future, so we think about systems and how easy it is to tie those in (usually this is a classroom addition).
 - ii. We designed Westbrook Middle School with a future addition factored into the project and less than ten years later they ended up needing to build it.
- g) Jill asked, with some of the building being on the higher side of the site, are any of the building spaces planned to be below grade.
 - i. At this point, they're not. Depending on how the grades work out, there may be times we step the building, but we try not to put any occupied spaces below ground. We want to avoid not having daylight.

3. Programming Update

- a) The draft Ed Specs are complete and have been sent up to the state for review. Harriman will provide a summary of what we saw in there.
- b) We got some great feedback from Deb on the draft SAW (Space Allocation Workbook), which is a lengthy excel document that lists every type of space with the square footage and how that aligns with what the state will support. This helps us make sure we have all the programs accommodated in the future school.
- c) We had a detailed programming meeting with the SPED director (the last one we hadn't met with) and will continue to refine those spaces.
- d) Next steps with this committee will be looking at floor plans as they start to develop.



4. Locally Funded Items

- a) One of the things we need to consider with this committee is what items the local community will support that may not be supported by DOE.
- b) Mark ran through the list of items we've heard from the committees and District staff then asked participants to complete a survey ranking these local items in terms of priority.
- c) Jill noted that the existing track has lighting and fencing.
 - i. Mark said the figure we've carried is for the full field with brand new lighting. We could defer some of that cost because of what you have now.
- d) Kim asked if our field would be to compliment Hausner Field or replace it. She said this seems like a lot for a K-8. If it will become where people go for athletics, then okay.
 - i. Deb noted that the District doesn't own Hausner Field. Our high school pays Rumford for use of Hausner Field.
 - ii. In order to host any track/field events you have to have an eight lane track. Hausner Field is only 5-6, so they don't hold events there.
 - iii. Chris thinks the high priority items would be the ticket/concessions booth and score board. He would advocate having 1-2 toilets at the field to eliminate security concerns in the building. Otherwise you have to get a porta potty.
 - iv. We pay \$5,000 for use of the fields at Mexico Rec.
- e) Scott noted he has one employee on grounds at the moment. To keep up with mowing the lawns at the school if we added two additional ball fields, he would have to hire some extra help.
- f) The group ranked items as follows (without having seen pricing):
 - i. Geothermal Heating/Cooling (*50% cost sharing*)
 - ii. Passive House Strategies (*TBD*)
 - iii. Parking above DOE Supported spaces (*appx. 150*)
 - iv. Outdoor Classroom
 - v. MS Auditorium (*350 seats, 4,000 SF*)
 - vi. Nature Based Play Area (*School Ground Greening Coalition*)
 - vii. Score Board (this was decided to be eliminated because they already have a new one)
 - viii. Community Stair (*400 SF*)
 - ix. Outdoor Maintenance/Storage Building
 - x. Gymnasium (*4,000 SF additional for regulation size*)
 - xi. Air Conditioning
 - xii. ES Auditorium (*750 seats, 7,500 SF*)
 - xiii. Outdoor Athletic Equipment Storage Building **TIED** Fitness Room (*2,500 SF*)
 - xiv. Concessions Building
 - xv. Additional 4 Track Lanes **TIED** Concrete Walkways beyond 50'
 - xvi. Security/Admissions Gate Fencing



- xvii. Greenhouse
 - xviii. Landscaping/Garden Beds
 - xix. Press Box
 - xx. Field Lighting at Football/Soccer Field
 - xxi. Rainwater Harvesting for Garden Program
 - xxii. LEED Certification (*Administrative Costs*)
 - xxiii. Cross Country Trails
 - xxiv. Bleachers (*1,000 seats*)
 - xxv. Athletic Field Irrigation (*Baseball, Softball, Football-50-75k per field*)
 - xxvi. Artificial Turf at Football/Soccer Field
- g) Lisa asked for reactions from the group about the rankings.
- i. Deb said different people might rank things in different ways.
 - ii. Scott said, coming from the building systems sub committee, he's glad to see that is high on the list.
 - iii. Jill agreed with Scott and said she thinks the things that ranked highest would be harder or impossible to add later, but we can add things like nature trails any time.
 - iv. Deb agreed and said that over time you can raise money to have more bleachers.
 - v. Kim agrees, we should benefit the building up front, then add in other stuff later.
 - vi. Cliff said the cost for passive houses might be well more than 50%. If DOE is already going to pay for a good window, wall, etc. with a better R value than we have now, that will shrink our geothermal cost. When you build a passive model, it's easy to heat and cool. That's where you're saving money. You have to understand the long term savings.
- h) Mark then presented the list of local items, showing the costs associated with them. He noted the numbers might seem large as these are total project costs, including associated overhead costs, not just construction costs. We are also projecting a bit forward in time.
- i. Jill said she was surprised about the cost of the concessions stand. You can buy a prefab building for a lot less.
 - i. When we send these items to the contractor and they factor in things like getting utilities over to the buildings, constructing with durable materials that are code compliant, the cost runs up a lot.
 - ii. Scott was surprised about the cost for adding additional parking spaces. Last summer he chewed up an entire parking area and resurfaced it for a lot less.
 - i. This cost includes grading, stormwater management, curbing, asphalt, lighting, plus the soft costs.
 - iii. Chris asked how locally funded items get voted on—is it one number that goes to the taxpayer and if one fails, all fail?



- i. A lot of strategy goes into how we word the referendum. It's unusual to have 30 different items on it. It would also be difficult to develop the design with all the different options. Typically things are grouped together, so there's a base question as to whether people support the building with no local costs. Then you include anything else in an additional question. But you run the risk that if enough people vote against one item, you lose everything in that package.
- iv. Cliff said these are commercial numbers, so they shouldn't scare us. We need to leave room for the community to come in after and critique things. We could do something like a greenhouse after for way less and we could include the kids as a learning experience.
- v. Jill asked if there are things within the building systems that will be greater cost that we may want to do?
 - i. Mark said yes there are additional spaces for things like mechanical equipment that could be included to promote longevity of systems. DOE typically will pay for those systems to be in a rooftop location because including them in the building is expensive, but it helps the systems to last longer.
- vi. Chris asked if the auditoriums are just seating or if it includes things like lighting.
 - i. It's very light audio—no theatrical lighting/sound. It's mostly the cost for the structure, ventilation/heating, seating, acoustical treatments, and fire alarm.
- vii. Scott asked what is the return on investment when it comes to heating and cooling?
 - i. Usually 7-10 years on the full cost of geothermal. If you're only paying half of it, then 3-6 year payback on that.
 - ii. Scott thinks that would have to be a selling point for taxpayers.
- viii. The ranking of local items (knowing the costs of each item) were as follows:
 - i. Geothermal Heating/Cooling (*50% cost sharing*)
 - ii. Passive House Strategies (*TBD*)
 - iii. Parking above DOE Supported spaces (*appx. 150*)
 - iv. Outdoor Classroom
 - v. MS Auditorium (*350 seats, 4,000 SF*)
 - vi. Community Stair (*400 SF*)
 - vii. Fitness Room (*2,500 SF*)
 - viii. Concrete Walkways beyond 50'
 - ix. Nature Based Play Area (*School Ground Greening Coalition*)
 - x. Air Conditioning
 - xi. Score Board (this was decided to be eliminated because they already have a new one)
 - xii. Gymnasium (*4,000 SF additional for regulation size*)



- xiii. ES Auditorium (750 seats, 7,500 SF)
- xiv. Outdoor Maintenance/Storage Building
- xv. Concessions Building
- xvi. Additional 4 Track Lanes **TIED** Outdoor Athletic Equipment Storage Building
- xvii. Greenhouse
- xviii. Security/Admissions Gate Fencing
- xix. Press Box
- xx. Landscaping/Garden Beds
- xxi. Rainwater Harvesting for Garden Program
- xxii. Field Lighting at Football/Soccer Field **TIED** LEED Certification (Administrative Costs)
- xxiii. Cross Country Trails
- xxiv. Bleachers (1,000 seats)
- xxv. Athletic Field Irrigation (Baseball, Softball, Football-50-75k per field)
- xxvi. Artificial Turf at Football/Soccer Field

5. Next Meetings

- a) We meet with DOE on June 24th.
- b) The next BAC meeting date is TBD as Deb is on vacation on July 14th.
 - i. Deb said any day the following week works.
- c) The straw poll is June 28th.

If written notice is not received within two weeks of receipt, the above meeting notes represent an accurate summary of the meeting and its conclusions.