

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006

In attendance:

Paula Delaney/Committee Member
Paul Dunphy/Committee Member
Bill Dwyer/Committee Member
Patrick Finn/Committee Member
Jay Meschino/Committee Member
John Reilly/Committee Member
Kevin Richardson/Committee Member
Charlie Ryder/Committee Member
Dr. John Silva/Committee Member

Jim Tobin/Committee Member
Dave Walsh/Committee Member
Debbe Bennett/Support Staff
David Twombly/Support Staff
Kathleen Tyrell/Support Staff
Jim Lampke/Support Staff
Scott Dunlap/Ai3
Troy Randall/Ai3
Scott Libby/PMA

Absent:

Cathy Bowes/Committee Member
Chris McCabe/Committee Member

The Building Committee meeting was held in the Selectmen's Office at Town Hall, and the meeting was called to order by John Reilly at 7:08pm.

1. Approval of Today's Agenda: Paul Dunphy noted as a follow up on the CO detectors discussed at the last meeting he asked that Captain Thomas be put on the top of the agenda. John Reilly stated they would do that after the minutes are approved. *The agenda as amended was approved without exception.*

2. Approval of Minutes:

- **November 2, 2006, Open Session minutes:** *Dr. Silva made a motion to approve the November 2, 2006, Open Session minutes. Dr. Delaney seconded the motion. All approved.*
- **November 2, 2006, Executive Session:** *Kevin Richardson made a motion to approve the Executive Session minutes. Charlie Ryder seconded the motion. All approved.*

John Reilly welcomed the newest SBC member, Dave Walsh who was appointed as an At Large Member of the School Building Committee by the Selectmen this week. John noted Dave's father was on the original committee that built the Jacobs School in the 1960s. John Reilly noted Dave and the other At Large Members have been sworn in prior to the meeting.

CO Detectors: Captain Thomas said the Hull Fire Department made a recommendation for installation of CO detectors at Jacobs School, they know it is not a code requirement but it is

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 2

a recommendation of the Fire Department. Captain Thomas stated Paul Dunphy talked about it at the last meeting and explained CO is caused by fossil fuel burners. In a forced hot air system the carbon monoxide can be sent throughout the rest of the school. Captain Thomas stated these furnaces have safety devices on them but they can always fail. He said it will not cost a lot of money but it will relieve a lot of anxiety. He said some teachers that are concerned about the CO levels in the school have already approached him. He noted the Fire Department tested the gas levels and during a recent test they found nothing, the test came back fine. In a house setting, carbon monoxide causes people to fall asleep once they have become overwhelmed but in a school that will not happen but it will cause headaches, dizziness, nauseous, etc. and it is a safeguard and a good idea. Captain Thomas asked if there are any questions from the Committee.

John Reilly stated the committee was pretty much in favor of the idea but would first like a price. Troy Randall said he did speak with the Engineer of Record about the discussion and identified three possible locations since they did not understand where the Fire Department wanted each device placed. The locations identified were the main kitchen, the auxiliary kitchen and the boiler room and would include six addressable detectors would be between \$2,500 and \$5,000. Modules would need to be purchased so it can communicate with the fire alarm panel. Troy Randall added they would have to sit down with the Fire Department or School Building Committee to determine the exact locations in order to get an exact cost. John Reilly noted the committee could either hold off on this or approve a not-to-exceed amount. Scott Dunlap stated it is not a complicated item to prepare so if the Committee wants to direct them they could get a firm price for the Committee to make a final decision. Pat Finn noted this is Nicole's Law. ***Pat Finn made a motion to go forward with the Fire Department recommendation for CO detectors in the Jacobs School. Paul Dunphy seconded the motion.*** Dr. Silva asked if these would be hardwired. Captain Thomas said yes they would be hardwired to the alarm panel and it would be monitored. As soon as the detectors go off it goes directly to the Fire Department. ***All approved.***

John Reilly recognized a new member of the school community, Kathleen Tyrell who is the interim principal of the Jacobs School. John Reilly said he hopes to see her at these meetings and noted her input is appreciated.

Jay Meschino thanked Captain Thomas for coming down here. John Reilly agreed it is a great idea to do it now rather than later.

John Reilly passed out to the Building Committee members a note from Dr. Delaney inviting the Committee to a meeting at Hull High School on January 3. The purpose of the meeting would be to present the School Committee with any questions regarding health and safety at Jacobs. The meeting will include the Mass Department of Public Health, Oasis Environmental, and Universal Testing. All of these agencies have been involved in monitoring the air quality in the building. Dr. Delaney said she thinks it will provide a lot of information and it is best to have the professionals do that. John Reilly informed the

Committee that there was a meeting held recently at the high school with a lot of questions regarding the air quality in the existing Jacobs School and issues related to the construction.

John Reilly noted prior to Thanksgiving all the construction work was outside but since the six classrooms were turned over they started work inside the building. He asked if we have started monitoring air quality in the area of the building construction is taking place. Scott Libby said since it went under abatement that is a service that Universal has been providing. As of tomorrow morning they will be getting a clean air sample since the abatement will be complete. John Reilly said at the high school in the occupied space there were alarms or monitors. He asked who ran those and can that be put in place at the Jacobs School. Scott Dunlap said that was Universal who did that and you can have them test the occupied space as often as you want. He said what Scott Libby was talking about regarding clean air is once all the work is complete we'll get clean air on both sides but they have tested and they will test as often as you want. The classrooms are in full containment and the assumption that you might want to test daily might not make sense. At the high school your on-site people kept an eye on it daily and if ever there was a concern there was testing through Universal. John Reilly asked what they recommend for the Jacobs. Scott Dunlap said he recommends the Town's on site management monitor it every day and understand the barriers put in place by the general contractor. He said this testing (Universal) is independent of the testing done by the contractor. Scott Dunlap said if ever there is a concern, someone should be called to test and this test would be above and beyond the testing that is done periodically. John Reilly said for next meeting he would like the exact protocol put writing because people are very frustrated about communication and we should do whatever we can do to improve that and let people know exactly what is being done. John Reilly asked for Ai3's recommendation on testing. Scott Dunlap said over and above the contractor's monitoring, it would be as needed but they would work that into a scenario. He added there is a complete indoor air quality section in the specs, which are approximately 20 pages long. It identifies all the parameters such as trucks idling, barriers, etc. John Reilly said he would like that document or a synopsis of it available for anyone who wants it. Pat Finn said he thought John asked about an alarm system at the high school. John Reilly replied there were several times they stopped to check air quality. Scott Dunlap said there might have been an alarmed device on the negative air machine that was operating during full containment and abatement. John Reilly said anything like that is expected at the Jacobs. Scott Dunlap said they had negative air during abatement at Jacobs. John Reilly said the main thing is to get this in writing or a synopsis to pass out at the meeting or put it on the website, send it home to parents, etc. so the parents know at least what the Building Committee is doing.

John Reilly asked if the modulars are completely sealed off from the main building. David Twombly said there is access through that walkway but today Jim Griffin was putting up a barrier. In addition, last week the Mass Department of Health was in checking it out and Cory Holms recommended a plastic barrier, which they did. It was put up three times but three times it got ripped down so today Jim Griffin was doing some extra work and putting up some framing and a permanent barrier. David Twombly said there has been activity in the

area. John Reilly said if the modulars are not being used why not take that connection off. David Twombly said we would have to talk to TLT because now based on the construction timeline, he does not know when that is scheduled to happen. John Reilly said he doesn't want access from the school into a contaminated area. David Twombly said he would defer to the Fire Department because he believes that is an emergency exit. Kathleen Tyrell stated it is an emergency back up egress so the containment would have to be part way down that corridor. John Reilly suggested taking part of the walkway down so when you open the door you are in an open area. He said you have to eliminate any idea or thought that it will be carried into the school. David Twombly said one of the things on the table is for TLT to take over the trailers and maybe Ai3 or PMA can check with TLT to see if they can take that walkway down now because we have no need for them. Jodi Trubia stated the custodians use that door to take trash out so if the hallway were sealed off it would not interfere with the doorway. John Reilly requested they just disconnect them from the school. John Reilly said he went to the meeting to answer questions relative to the construction project and he tried not to cross any lines into School Committee issues, however, there was some overlap. John said he wants to stress the need for communication. He said he hears that steps that are being taken but it needs to be communicated to the public. John Reilly said he would also go so far as to demand that someone finally say yes this is a healthy building. Dr. Delaney stated she thinks that is what we are going to find out on January 3.

3. **Bill Tramontana:** John Reilly said as a follow up on the last meeting the Tramontana family has some concerns regarding placement and location of the building. John reminded the Committee that at the request of the School Building Committee, Town Manger, Town Counsel and he met with Bill Tramontana, his wife and his father in-law on Tuesday of last week. As promised them, once we had the review complete, we would give him time on the agenda. Bill Tramontana asked if they could hear from PMA first. Steve Rusteika said he could summarize the report. He said PMA was asked to take a look at the current construction documents and compare them to the April 11, 2000 ones titled 100% schematic design. He said the objective of the review was to see if the back wall on the addition was any closer to the abutter. Based on a comparison of the two documents -- Steve said as a caveat -- they just compared it to one set of documents but they don't know the history and they don't know how many drawings there were so he is comparing just one set of drawings. Steve Rusteika said it does appear that that back wall is approximately 8 feet closer to the abutter's property line and the stair structure is about 10 feet closer to the property line. Steve said they did not investigate why or the history behind the drawings. John Reilly said he wanted to clarify -- the back is 8 feet closer, he thought the corner was 2 feet closer, but maybe he misunderstood. Steve said the back corner of the building is 8 feet closer and the stairs are an additional 2 feet closer. Steve Rusteika said the closest point is the back of that stair structure.

John Reilly noted the Committee went through this in Executive Session last week and would like to get Ai3's response. Scott Dunlap said PMA was asked to compare the April 11, 2000 document is one. McCullough interrupted to say they are the March 28, 2000 documents.

Scott Dunlap said regardless of the date, it is one of many different schematic design documents produced six years ago. He said it is not a document that was ever publicly presented and it was a submission document that went to the town. There were many versions of the schematic design documents. Scott Dunlap said some of them showed, if you put a scale on the document and attempted to scale the schematic documents, some of them showed the building closer to the property lines and some show it further away. It was schematic and conceptual design and many of the documents included site plans but again did not have dimensions but if put a scale on them would see a variety of set backs. Scott Dunlap said the document that PMA was asked to look at happens to be the one the shows the building probably the furthest distance away from the abutter but there were certainly other schematic drawings that if scaled, show it close to the abutters. Scott said this, again, has nothing to do with later development in 2004, 2005 and 2006 where the building as currently designed was presented a number of times. John Reilly clarified the plans PMA looked at were dated April 11, 2000. Scott Dunlap explained in 2004, 2005 and 2006 there were updated documents as the project progressed through the various stages of design, which was presented in a variety of different forms including at School Building Committee meetings that represented the most current versions at that point in time. John Reilly asked Scott to define the term schematic design. Scott Dunlap said schematic represents the stage in design where we are studying the basic building layout and early design concepts for the building in terms of it's form, shape etc. Scott explained they divide their work into three phases; schematic, design development and construction documents. Design development is when you start to get more detail and apply dimensional tolerances to the building and start to develop the details of how the building is going to be put together. Construction documents is when you take the design development and produce a set of bid documents for the project. John Reilly asked when was the contract with Ai3 was signed. Scott Dunlap said he doesn't know the exact date. John Reilly said he thought it was March 2000. The Tramontana's stated it was in February (2000). It was noted it was some time after April 11, 2000. John Reilly asked, for the sake of discussion, by the time schematic design was drawn on April 11, 2000, was any engineering or surveying performed on the grounds. Scott Dunlap said that would have been the first work in terms of development design work and noted he doesn't understand the question. John Reilly explained, the Tramontana's are saying it is closer than was presented to them so, in April 2000, was there any idea of how close it was to the property line or any references made, stakes put in or engineering done to reference the property lines. Scott Dunlap said at that stage of the project it would not have been that detailed. John Reilly asked when that work would have taken place. Scott Dunlap responded that would have been done during design development and he would have to look up the exact dates. Scott Dunlap added it is not uncommon for schematic design to not have detailed boundary and topographical information. The early conceptual work was to establish what kind of addition it was going to be, whether it continued linear across the field or the T-shape that was ultimately selected by the Town. John Reilly said the question he was given from his discussion last week is he (Mr. Tramontana) feels that he was misled, that the building is closer and the building has moved. John said he would like to get your opinions, have you changed your thoughts or would you like to make a statement. Scott

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 6

Dunlap said not at all, again, during schematic design we were adjusting the building footprint around constantly and when you are working at that early stage, eight or ten feet on a site plan is not the kind of accuracy you work with. So, until design development and construction documents, you don't really start work with that kind of accuracy. But if you take that schematic design drawing and scale that particular drawing maybe that is why it shows a difference. Scott Dunlap said in terms of being misled, the abutters meeting being referenced, he doesn't know if we are specifically discussing a meeting six years ago or the meetings that occurred in 2005 because that had a lot more detail. He said lets assume we are talking about six years ago. Scott Dunlap said at any meetings six years ago we were not holding a site plan when walking the site. They were standing on the site saying the building is going to be approximately here and approximately two stories high. Scott Dunlap said now after the fact we are trying to apply dimensions. Scott Dunlap said they never ever stood on the site and said it was going to sit back from the property line X feet during schematic design. They never presented exact footage because they did not have that kind of information then. Scott said in 2005 the reason this committee requested a presentation to the abutters and had repeated meetings on it was because we did have that kind of detail. At that time we had a discussion about the retaining wall, about the height of the retaining wall, about how far it would cut into the bank, how far it would set back from the property line, etc. This committee said we need to present this to the abutters so in March 2005 the design development plan was presented with elevations and perspectives to the abutters. That is the meeting that essentially we came back to School Building Committee with the abutters wanting to lower the academic wing, remove the tower from the front of the building and take as much of the mechanical equipment off the roof as possible -- all that rolled out in March 2005. Scott said we came to this committee and you agreed to make all those changes and they continued to move forward with the plans. That kind of detail was available at that point in time and ever since. Scott said we also discussed the back of the building and the way it was going to cut in and the access road. Scott said it is inaccurate to try to imply there was that much accuracy in 2000, there was that kind of accuracy in 2005. John Reilly asked if the meeting that Scott is referring to was the one that was recorded. He was told yes. John said he did receive a copy of the DVD and he will watch it and will either share it with the committee members or ask Peter to show it again on cable.

George McCullough asked John what recorded meeting is he talking about. John replied the meeting on March 19, 2005. George McCullough said the key to that is the recording did not include the walk with the abutters, it only includes the time in the gym, and it never got outside. Mr. McCullough said it is seven or eight people versus one. Mr. McCullough said there was never a 2000 abutters meeting and he doesn't know where that came from. There was a March 19, 2005 abutters meeting. He said what he is trying to do is look at the period of time -- apparently the drawings that PMA looked at, April 11, 2000, and the one he looked at, March 28, 2000, are the same. Those prints compared with the 2005 school addition, that building moved and that was confirmed. Mr. McCullough said the schematic was drawn on the 28th and again on April 11. The important thing is if you look at the length of the entire building before administration, in both drawings it is the same length. He wants

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 7

to look at the two-month period between March 28 to June 1 (2000), it was only 50-60 days. Mr. McCullough said they have a synopsis of minutes to the meeting under architect's report. He said they are trying to get the facts out of the architects since June relative to how far the addition was going from the existing school. On May 23, 2000 at a Building Committee meeting, an abutter, Mrs. Sloan asked how far back the building addition was going from the old school and Scott Dunlap responded 60 feet but he did not have the exact numbers. George McCullough said it turned out to be 120 feet. On March 19, 2005 at the only abutters meeting that ever took place, Scott Dunlap walked the property with the abutters and Dr. Silva was there. He pointed out where the new addition was going to end. In 2006 at a continuation of the SBC meeting that took place on the Jacobs site, he (Mr. McCullough) asked seven abutters where they were told the school would end and they said ten feet beyond the pine trees. Dr. Silva was asked and he said a spot 20 feet from the tree line. It is important to note that the 10 feet from the tree line translates to the new addition extending 80 feet from the old school line. Approximately 30 witnesses can swear to the above. Mr. McCullough said he raised the point in June that the building moved based on the March 28, 2000 versus the 2005 blueprints and both were done by Ai3. He said besides the 10-foot addition, a 12-½ foot access road was added and a retaining wall was added in 2005, which ended up being only 12-15 feet from the abutter's property. In March 2000 to June 2000 the 60-day window when the plans were submitted to the State. The minutes from April 11, 2000, which was the first meeting after the March 28 drawings it says, "to preserve as much green as possible". Keep the 2nd story addition low. Parking increased by approximately 25-30 (Mr. McCullough added by moving the addition back 10 feet). The bus drop off area will remain at the same but will be paved for additional play area. A separate parent drop off area will be located at the front of the building. A play structure will be relocated with a resilient surface and storm drain will be added. The primary entrance to the Jacobs School will remain the same. A full elevator will be added and thoughts were expressed about adding a third floor. Mr. McCullough said nowhere in these ten things did it mention moving that building. He said in the April 25, 2000 SBC minutes it mentions the curriculum planning room and parent room have been located closer to the media center and preparing it for a third floor addition. Mr. McCullough said the May 9, 2000 SBC minutes say Scott Dunlap reiterated that Ai3 dedicated more hours than most architects during construction to guarantee the work is done the way it is intended. Mr. McCullough said there is your guarantee; they are claiming the school roof blew off because the right material wasn't used underneath it. Mr. McCullough said from March 28, 2000 to June 1, 2000 the subject of moving that addition was never brought up at any public meetings. He said that Scott Dunlap said the March 28, 2000 blueprint was an early early blueprint but the length of the building did not change and it was moved for a bloody parking lot. Bill Tramontana approached the front of the room. He said he wanted to thank his father in-law for all the homework he has done on it. Mr. Tramontana said his main gripe is they say that they educated us and all of you. When the question was asked by Mrs. Sloan (5/23/00) how far back from the existing building the addition would be he answered her 60 feet but said he did not have the approximate detail. That's fine but in the 2005 abutters meeting, it was 80 feet, today it is 115 feet. Mr. Tramontana asked how did it go from 60 to 80 to 115 feet. He said

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 8

they say they floated balloons, and said we should have been involved. They say they spent the time but they didn't because you were all shocked -- the School Building Committee, School Committee and the Selectmen. This is a \$28 million project that people do not know the footprints of. Mr. Tramontana said he made a phone call to this gentleman (Scott Dunlap) and after the phone call was placed, this letter was produced (dated July 24, 2006). Mr. Tramontana said it was a CYA letter. He said this says he educated us but the day those stakes were driven Bill and everyone was shocked. Mr. Tramontana said this building has affected the quality of life of his family but they have dealt with the rodents, exhaust, noise, and vibrations. He said we have done our job, in good faith as abutters and neighbor and expected the respect of knowing where a project costing this much was going. During the phone call with Scott Dunlap there were two people on his property and Scott was very unprofessional. He (Tramontana) acknowledged he was excited himself. Mr. Tramontana said all he would like to say is they did not educate you or us and he would also like that phone call addressed.

John Reilly told Bill Tramontana that when they talked last week Bill asked for accountability for several things and John asked him if they were prepared to share that with the committee. Bill Tramontana said they are in the process of getting an appraisal. He said you have had about five months to review the plans and they have had only about a week and they are waiting for the results of the appraisal to come back. John Reilly invited them to come back when they would like to. Jim Lampke asked for clarification from Bill Tramontana or George McCullough about at what point do they feel the plans changed. He asked what approximate date do they think the plans changed to their detriment because it would help the support staff when we are looking at information. George McCullough responded during the 60-day window between March 28 (2000) to June 1 (2000) when the plans were submitted to the State, that is when the plans changed. He said if you look at the blueprints, the whole configuration of the school changed -- the interior. The hallway comes down from the existing school and they had to jury rig that and it is now completely different. It changed in that 60-day period but it was never mentioned. He said there were many different items covered and moving the building ten feet should have been mentioned. Mr. McCullough said this is a cover-up.

Scott Dunlap said he doesn't have the advantage of having looked at whatever video might be available from the March 19 (2005) meeting but he knows that the site plan presented at that meeting accurately represents what is being constructed today. It was also noted at that meeting that the building would be carved into the side of the hill, we discussed the retaining wall. That meeting was specifically set up to inform the abutters. Scott said there have been a lot of dimensions mentioned tonight, most of which don't make sense to him. He does not understand what the reference point was, or what point was trying to be made, whether it is the current speculation or the 2000 speculation. Just because the minutes from tonight show somebody made a statement of 10 or 20 feet from the tree line or 120 feet from an existing building, he does not know where that information came from. He said, for the record, he

doesn't know what is being referenced when those dimensions are being discussed and put out there.

Dave Walsh said on a job this size it should not be that difficult to pin point exactly when the footprint or the as-builts was known. He said you don't over night drive trucks in and drive stakes in the ground. The people doing the excavating and the contractor need time to look over the plans. Somewhere in some records there has to be some documentation of an exact date of when things went out to bid and we should easily be able to ascertain what these timelines are. Scott Dunlap responded, in March 2005 design development was complete enough that the plan was accurate at that point in time so everything presented from that time forward would have exactly shown where the building was, what the footprint was and that footprint was presented in these meetings a number of times and is included in the construction document. Dave Walsh asked if the building, as it sits, is exactly where it was drawn in 2005. Scott Dunlap said that is correct.

Bill Dwyer asked if the elevator shaft that was added affected the length or width of the building. Scott Dunlap said in 2005 administration and all the other changes were put in. At that point in time and all those things were known and the footprint was set in terms of the administration area and knowing exactly where the retaining wall would be located, all those things. John Reilly asked what the total length of the building addition was before administration was added. Scott Dunlap said he doesn't know. John Reilly said Mr. McCullough said the length of the addition did not change but if you looked at it from an aerial point of view looking down it is t-shaped. He asked if that attachment point of the old and new structure changed or shifted. Scott Dunlap said not from March 2005 but the point about schematic design is it changed a lot, they had plans without administration, the gym was made larger and made smaller, it changed continually and we locked it in and put it somewhere to give a submission to SBA and reserve your grant. There were a lot of versions of schematic design and the building is quite a bit different then schematic design but that is not unusual, it happens on every single project.

Jay Meschino said he thinks that part of the issue is the first plans the public saw was this April 2000 document. Scott Dunlap asked where he saw that as a public document because he thought he heard someone earlier say there was never a year 2000 abutter meeting, which surprised him. Jay Meschino said there wasn't, he is certain about that because he is an abutter and was never a part of a meeting. Jay Meschino said at some point that document was used directly or indirectly to represent to us what the project would look like. He said he thinks he understands that things change and that was schematic but the point is it was shown to us by the board or by the architects at a meeting and told that was going to be the design. Then at the first abutters meeting in March 2005 we walked the perimeter and he was left with a specific impression of where the building would end. He said he did not have a tape or measuring devise, he did not scale the drawings but they walked that meeting with the objective to know where the building would end up and how it was going to affect them. Jay said they left that meeting with an understanding of where the building would end and

we discussed that and it is reflected in the minutes with a reference to the pine trees and the drainage ditch that is near those pine trees. He said that is why he was stunned when he saw the stakes go in. He saw an image originally and was given the impression that that was the project and then we did a walk thru and agrees there were a lot of changes that went back and forth. However, in the walk thru they were left with an impression of where the building was going to end and then when the stakes went in all three things were different. Jay Meschino added he agrees there was misrepresentation but does not know if it was with intent or not, he is not saying that. Jay Meschino asked if they realized there had been a change, would that have been brought forward. Scott Dunlap stated there was no change, the project was on hold for four years and the only thing that was done initially was the schematic design work and then enough work to get the State grant. In 2005 administration was added and various program changes were included. There is no comparison of the floor plans between 2000 and 2005 because it became a real project in 2005. That is reason it was presented every other week to this Committee and the abutters meeting was held. Scott said he absolutely is certain at the meeting in the gym at Jacobs School he talked about that the addition was going to cut into the side of that hill. Jay Meschino asked if that means in 2005 they started from scratch. Scott Dunlap said pretty much -- they even changed the CAD software they use by that time. Jay Meschino said the pivotal point was that meeting in the gym and then they walked down to that point where those trees were, and at the point it touches the hill. He noted there also were changes to the access road and that affected the retaining wall. Jay Meschino said from his perspective, as the general public, he felt from that meeting that was where it was going to stop.

Scott Dunlap told Jay when he personally got involved in this project we discussed the retaining wall and how much it would cut into the hill and that was in 2005. Scott said that is what is so confusing to him, there was so much discussion at that point in time about the retaining wall and the access road and that it was going to cause the hill to fall away, etc. He said there was extensive discussion about it and it is shocking to him to now be sitting here, seemingly accused that someone is hiding something or that area was glossed over. There was meeting after meeting discussing that area of the building, set backs, fencing, retaining wall, etc. that it does not make sense to them to suggest that this wasn't an open forum.

Jay Meschino said at two points there are retaining walls, he asked if originally the more significant one in height was at the other end of the school. Scott Dunlap said the one directly behind the addition has always been the more significant of the two. Jay Meschino asked if he means in terms of height. Scott said yes. Jay said he doesn't know how he can say that because the distance between the existing building at his end is much shorter and the need for that access road to be cut it. Jay Meschino said they talked about the one at his end being in the low teens and Bill Tramontana's end was three, four or five feet originally. Scott Dunlap said it has always been significant and always the one that was discussed the most. This committee asked them (A13) to go back to the Fire Department and Police Department on two different occasions to discuss that area and see if it can be eliminated.

One time was early on and the other was when the project was under construction. It was determined it is needed for safety.

Scott said he is not sure what plan it is being suggested was presented a long time ago if there was never a meeting to present it a long time ago. He asked what plan in 2000 was locked into your mind if there was never a meeting in 2000. Jay Meschino said they saw the plans presented at meetings so it was the documents from that. He said they saw them in meetings that preceded the abutters meeting. Jay said there was a town meeting where all three were presented and he is not sure if they are the same documents. Jay Meschino asked if Ai3 could produce all these documents and a history of every document. Scott Dunlap said yes and the town will have that also. Scott Dunlap said at the completion of design development they submitted the 100% design development in March or April 2005 and that plans would definitively show the building was located exactly where it ended up being constructed in 2006.

Dave Walsh said the abutters followed the project closely and asked if there is a stamped set of plans that shows, from the existing school, the building coming out 50 feet, 60 feet or 100 feet. He asked if it has been surveyed to show it is exactly where it was supposed to be. He said we have abutters claiming there is a ten-foot mistake, he asked if the survey has been redone. Scott Dunlap said it has been checked and there is no mistake, it is exactly where it was shown in the 2005 design development plans and the 2006 construction documents. The ten-foot discrepancy they are talking about is if you go all the way back to six years ago to some of those conceptual or schematic documents. They are suggesting a ten-foot difference from some of those documents to the 2005-06 documents. David Walsh said on the schematic drawing it would not say on there approximately 60 or 80 feet even though it is not done with a scale rule. Scott Dunlap said it was a scale drawing and you could put a scale on it. He is just saying it was an early documentation and did not have a dimension on it because it was schematic design.

George McCullough asked Scott Dunlap, if working with March 28 or April 11 (2000) drawings, nowhere in the minutes during the 60-day period did you say that this was happening and you wouldn't say that you moved the building 50 days before filing with the State. He said that outline is exactly as it was on June 1, 2000. From March 28 there were 15 different things that changed but he never mentioned the building moved and he asked why. Scott Dunlap said he doesn't understand the question. George McCullough said why didn't you mention the building moved between March 28 (2000)/April 11 and June 1, 2000. Scott Dunlap said there are two specific drawings you are talking about. John Reilly said he would end the discussion now unless the Tramontana's are ready to move forward with the other options we are going in circles.

George McCullough said they were given the run around for six months. Mr. McCullough said Dr. Silva was at the abutters meeting and where Dr. Silva pointed out was nowhere near the stakes that he saw in 2006. Dr. Silva said he pointed to a spot 20 feet away. The abutters

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 12

pointed to a spot about 10 feet away. George McCullough said the difference was the stairwell. Mr. McCullough said he had the impression from the architect's meeting that that building was about 90 feet from the existing building. Dr. Silva said the thing that surprised him was where the stairs were. Mr. McCullough said what Dr. Silva pointed out as where the building was going to end was around 80 feet and it ended up being 115 or 120 feet. Dr. Silva said what he has in the minutes was correct, but he does not want him putting words in his mouth – he pointed to a spot 20 feet from the tree line.

Pat Finn said there are a lot of things that go on that don't make the minutes but a picture is worth a 1,000 words. The architect presents plans and this committee approved the plans of the building that is there now. Because it does not say in the minutes it is ten feet closer in comparison to 2000 is not a misrepresentation or does not mean something is being hidden even though PMA said there is a difference. George McCullough said moving the building toward the abutters is an important issue, it is encroachment. It should be mentioned in the minutes because Debbe does a heck of job. The minutes mention the bus drop off area will remain the same. He asked if that is more important than moving the building or adding a full size elevator, there is no mention of moving the building. Mr. McCullough said there are 15 items mentioned in that 60-day period. Scott Dunlap asked if he is talking about six years ago between March and April 2000 because he is not certain. George McCullough said he is asking one thing, why didn't you say the building moved when talking about these 15 other items. Scott Dunlap asked if he means between March to June. He asked if they are looking at a March 28 and a June 1 plan. John Reilly asked if Scott Dunlap could answer the question. Scott Dunlap replied he does not understand the question. George McCullough said from the April 11 (2000), which is the same as the March 28 drawing of the school addition, and then you submitted plans to the State, did that building move between those points. Scott Dunlap said he thought Mr. McCullough said the April 11 plans were submitted on June 1. Mr. McCullough said he did not say that. Scott Dunlap said so many different documents were produced during the schematic phase, he does not know if from the plans he is talking about, if it did move or not.

John Reilly said he doesn't hear anything new, we heard from PMA, Ai3, Mr. McCullough and Mr. Tramontana, so unless they want to tell us what action they want, the discussion should end. He said the school is there, there is no motion to stop or change the location of the school so right now it is back to you unless you want to come forward with a demand. Mr. McCullough agreed it is in their court and said Ai3 (Scott) will not answer the question because he knows it was a cover up. Bill Tramontana said they waited patiently for five months for the PMA result and what they found. Mr. Tramontana said his gripe is they (Ai3) said they took their time at the abutters meeting because they were going to be affected. They said they walked the building boundaries and that all abutters understood where the footprint was but this July when the stakes went in there was a discrepancy. So either there was a miscommunication or they just didn't do the work. If they took the time to educate the abutters, why did they even show up. John Reilly said we could sit here for two more hours so unless there is new information it is back to you to present something to the Committee.

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 13

He said it should first be presented to Town Counsel or Town Manger to present it to the Committee. John Reilly also cautioned the committee members for all comments to go through Town Counsel as well because we don't know what direction this would head.

George McCullough said this firm has collected and billed millions of dollars to this town and it is insulting to ask this man a question and he thinks the committee should demand he answer it. John Reilly said he does not understand the question and asked him to rephrase it but think about it first.

Janette MacDonald, 8 Harborview Road, said she was at the abutters meeting and they were walked the property line by the pine trees but when the stakes went in she was shocked, it wasn't the same area. She said there were several abutters that walked the site and the back of the building never came into the elevation of the hill where the Tramontana shed was.

Dr. Silva asked how many schematic designs were drawn up. Scott Dunlap said during the schematic phase they probably presented 8-10 drawings. Dr. Silva asked if they are available. Scott Dunlap said he is sure they have them all. Dr. Silva asked if we have compared the measurements to all schematics, to see if they are all the same. Dr. Silva said Paul Dunphy mentioned at the last meeting that schematic is cartoonish. If all schematic designs had the exact same dimensions as McCullough pointed out he would have a strong point but if there were differences in the schematic design in areas and distances from hills and houses it would seem to support Ai3's argument, so why haven't we looked at all of them. Scott Dunlap responded he doesn't see the point since from 2005 it remained consistently a different project with a different program and footprint. It was presented over and over and it is confusing why we are discussing schematic and conceptual drawings from six years ago. Janette MacDonald said the image they had from the walk thru was one way and the stakes were different. Scott Dunlap said there seems to be a lack of interest in the specifics of the taped presentation of that day because they did discuss that it would cut into the side of the hill and did show an accurate site plan of exactly where the building would be located.

Scott Dunlap explained he thought PMA's charge was to determine if the building moved from April 2000 to the current plan in 2006. They said yes, they were asked to look at one version of the schematic design and it did have an adjustment, so he thought the question being asked was between some plan in April 2000 and June 2000 and that was never discussed before and now he does not know which two plans we are talking about, because there were a number of them during schematic design, without showing him the exact two plans being talked about. The building was adjusted slightly during that time period so unless you show him the exact two plans and the exact period of time and the decisions that were made, he can not tell you what was discussed six years ago and why shifts were made.

George McCullough said the 2005 plans show where the building is right now, and asked if the June 1, 2000 plan has the same dimensions and offsets. He asked if it is 115 or 105 feet

from the existing building. Scott Dunlap said the 2005 plans are different in a lot of ways from schematic design. George McCullough asked if it was 105 feet or 115 feet from the existing building. Scott Dunlap said he doesn't know the answer without looking at the plans. John Reilly told the Tramontana family to use Town Counsel as a point person to come back to the Committee.

John Reilly noted there was a discussion about an abutter meeting in 2000 but there wasn't an abutters meeting per se at the Jacobs School but there were many meetings the abutters came to back in 2000 in this room.

- 3. Owner's Project Manager Report:** Scott Libby updated the Committee on what has happened during the last couple of weeks. He said the steel erection for the C and D building is at or about 95% completed. The slab on grade for the deck has been poured. This has allowed them to begin the exterior framing of building C and masonry started last week. They will begin the sheathing of the exterior studs and they would temporarily heat the interior. Layout of interior stud of building C and laying some track down. The building is taking shape and you can get sense of the full footprint. The roofing material is being delivered and they will start the roof next week on building C to make it weather tight.

The flow of the job is picking up and manpower has increased to an average of 17 workers per day. The biggest change is the cash flow; on second page of the report the green curve is early finish and red is the late finish (which does not mean past substantial completion date) and black is a measurement of where we are in time from a cost aspect of the schedule. A schedule of activities is included in the packet. That black line is where we are today and shows we are ahead of schedule. That is evidenced by what you see out there, the slab was a big milestone, which allows the start of the interior work.

Scott Libby said the budget has been updated to include tonight's warrants and he noted he works with Debbe Bennett pretty much daily to approve invoices. Scott Libby stated we are currently 12.18% complete from a cost point of view and under 18% in total billings. The total project budget includes fees for PMA, testing agencies, architects, etc. which are trending where you would typically see them and are billing against the project at the same pace as the construction is moving forward. Scott Libby noted the only change in contingency was for Keyspan who did install the gas line this past Saturday, and the contractor is in the process of tying into that to get the temporary heaters going to provide a nice environment for the workers and for the products that need a certain temperature. Scott said it is all falling into place.

Paul Dunphy stated this is great chart and asked if it means we are spending a little more money than we should be. Scott Libby said this is based on the construction project and we are getting work done earlier. Eric Lowther added there are some change order dollars that would also push it up. Paul Dunphy asked who is paying for the temporary heat. Scott Libby said it is under the general contractor; he has separate metering and will be billed

directly. Charlie Ryder asked if they have changed the gas meter that was installed backwards. David Twombly said he spoke to Bill Foley at Keyspan and they will come out next week to correct it. Scott Libby added Keyspan said they did not have a problem reading the meter but they will send a service man out to make the adjustment for the school. Charlie Ryder said his feeling is we should withhold the \$43,000 until that is done. Scott Libby said he knows it is in the process. Charlie Ryder said the problem was they came out on a Saturday when no one was on the site and put it in backwards. David Twombly said one option is to approve the payment and then hold the check until it is complete because it could be done tomorrow. Jim Lampke recommended if the Committee plans to withhold funds that it be in proportion to the value of the error, not the entire \$43,000. David Twombly noted Keyspan got the meter in ten days earlier than it should have been. Scott Libby added the meter does work and that piece of work is less than 2% of the value. He said as long as the gas is up and running the workers have temporary heat.

Bill Dwyer asked if TLT was involved in the sewer problem. Scott Libby said it was not involved with construction at all but they did try to assist. David Twombly said TLT had a high pressure hose that was used to assist but it was all on the school end. Scott Libby said they have been very good to work with and the things that come up daily they have been cooperative to work with. He said it is a team environment and they are very responsive to the concerns of teachers and the community. Pat Finn asked if they could attend a School Building Committee meeting. Scott Libby said he could request that but noted they are not obligated to do so. He said he would mention it to them.

Eric Lowther noted one attachment is the critical path for phase 1 and phase 2 completions. He noted on the first page about 2/3 of the way down the page it shows a substantial completion of phase 1 as August 23, 2007 and the transition to phase 2. The second list is the Two-Month Look Ahead, which details construction activities expected only during December and January. Eric Lowther said the last three pages show the construction activities completed to date. Eric said there are still some schedule issues they are working out.

Jay Meschino asked if the progress bar represents where PMA thinks they are or where TLT thinks they are. Eric Lowther said both Ai3 and PMA think this accurately reflects where TLT is to date in the field and they are comfortable with what is reflected here. Every month they are required to include updates, which includes revising any future work and PMA reviews that monthly. The first submission included the cost broken out with the activities and it will represent the yardstick going forward. Scott Libby said it has been a contemporaneous effort by all parties involved. We confirm the actualized schedule and we consider the actual schedule. When the schedule comments are provided they compare it but we validate it.

Paul Dunphy noted the photos are dated as he requested. Paul Dunphy said in looking at the line items and progress to date, he asked if any training for the staff is happening and when

we would see it happen. He was told closer to the turnover. Paul Dunphy said he really doesn't want to wait that long, if we can get Jim Griffin training now that would be beneficial, even if it is off site. He said if Jim could see the systems go in, there will be a clear correlation with any training he gets especially on HVAC. Paul asked if there is any opportunity for that early on. Scott Libby said to do that now would be premature and he does not have another active job with the same equipment. Scott said he thinks it would be better to do as they get installed. Paul Dunphy said even if he is just walking with the electrical and mechanical contractors to see the different items being put together. We want him to be well aware of the different mechanical systems before the end of the job. Scott said he could attend the weekly construction meetings. Dr. Delaney said that is a good idea but right now Jim Griffin is working hard to keep the Jacobs in shape so he does not have a lot of time during phase 1 but during phase 2 it will likely be different. David Twombly said right now he is trying to write a RFP for the commissioning agent but he would assume that would be in place for the first phase. Scott Libby said the commissioning agent would be needed at the end of phase 1 and the end of the phase 2, so it is like two separate jobs. Scott Libby said he can work with TLT and PMA to allow Jim to stand over their shoulders but noted there is a formal training that is part of the contract. He said it is helpful to walk the project and he doesn't see any reason why that can't happen. When we get more involved in the job he will set up an appointment to have Jim Griffin come down. Paul Dunphy asked who is going to make sure this gets taken care of. David Twombly said it will be a coordinated effort, he will alert Jim Griffin when he might want to start coming to the construction meetings. Scott Libby said that will be the April/May timeframe. Steve Rusteika said when the commissioning agent is brought in depends on the scope of work so that is important to figure out. David Twombly said the Committee talked about having it after construction and he hopes to get the RFP out in the next month or so. Scott Libby said if the Town does bring a commissioning agent in, that person would lead the charge for Jim to get his training and most firms are used to working with the owner. Paul Dunphy said during the high school project he doesn't think Jim got all the training due to us and did not get a lot of as built and owners manuals, etc. Jay Meschino asked if we are setting up two RFPs for commissioning and if we have any idea of the cost. Scott Libby said the cost depends on how detailed the RFP is. It should itemize the items wanted and then the town can determine what they can spend. Scott Libby added the Town would hire one individual to do both phases. Scott Libby said the length of the project is short and they would work the schedule and pricing accordingly.

Pat Finn noted on the project budget, in the right column, there are items in red like under Ai3 additional services and he asked for an explanation. Scott Libby said there were additional services throughout design for doing things like the constructability review and incorporating the recommendations named and anything else that was over and above the base contract. Pat Finn said we paid PMA \$15,000.00 to do the review and then we paid Ai3 for making changes. Scott Dunlap pointed out that items like the topographical survey done on Battery Road would pass through them and would end up in that category.

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 17

4. Architect Report:

- **Jacobs School**

- **TLT Application Payment #5 (\$617,779.94):** Troy Randall informed the Committee that PMA and Ai3 have reviewed the application for payment and would recommend approval.
- **Other:** Troy informed the Committee that a Change Order would be presented at the next meeting related to existing masonry within the sound booth at the high school auditorium. They are reviewing the proposal and will present the Change Order and full report at the next meeting.

Paul Dunphy asked if there is anything on the high school roof. John Reilly noted that subject would be included in the Punch List Update.

- *Punch list Update:* Troy Randall distributed correspondence to the committee the occurred today between Ai3 and Vertex Engineering in response to our request for an updated proposal. Troy said it is self-explanatory but in summary, we are still requesting and requiring the revised proposal from Vertex and a revised proposal has not been submitted. Troy Randall said there were a number of inconsistencies or factually incorrect items in Mike Pellegrini's e-mail when he referenced the conference call with Vertex, Ai3 and Gale. We (Ai3) responded to him stating the inaccuracies and clarified them based on the discussion in the November 30 call and still requested that Vertex and the bonding company provide a more detailed revised proposal.

Jay Meschino said it is alarming and asked if it is Troy's understanding that they were going to revise this. He said it seems like we haven't asked them to revise it and is that what they were thinking when they sent this. Troy Randall said it was very clear in the discussion that they would provide a revised proposal. That was identified during the conversation and in the Gale report. They were going to go back to get technical assistance from GenFlex in order to prepare a more detailed proposal -- that is one of the inaccuracies of Mike's e-mail. Jay Meschino asked if this document is what they claim is their original proposal (11/29/06). Troy Randall said that is what was received by the Town as a revised proposal from their initial proposal. Troy Randall said that is the first comprehensive bullet point, clear documentation of what they were going to provide. Troy Randall said the teleconference described in the e-mails was as a result of them submitting that proposal. Jay Meschino said they state they intend not to replace the missing insulation and asked if that is what prompted that e-mail and what are we doing about that. Jay Meschino said it reads, non-insulated areas along the low gym roof will not be remediated, however, above the classrooms will have to be removed and replaced. Jay Meschino said the Gale report included the infrared and shows significant areas that are not insulated. Troy Randall said that is correct, we submitted documentation to the members of the committee and other Town members stating that was designed intentionally in the low gym area to provide minimal thermal transmittance because it is a

location that has a high likelihood of snowdrifts. If it is not designed that way there could be significant snow loads on the structure. Troy Randall added the classroom wing is another story. Troy Randall said Gale is asking Vertex to respond to their proposed fix for the classroom wing situation. Pat Finn said that was explained at the last meeting. Pat Finn asked if there are any leaks where there is no insulation. Troy Randall said not that he is aware of. Pat asked if there are any issues with the roof there. Charlie Ryder asked David Twombly if there are leaks over the gym. David Twombly said there are significant leaks and watermarks in the gym corridor in front of the girls' locker room. He said along the right side by the soda machines there are signs of water. Troy Randall noted they are talking about two different areas; the low gym roof location is different from the perpendicular portion on that corridor.

John Reilly said in his package there is a report from Gale and asked if everyone received it. Paul Dunphy asked for clarification on the roof that has been approved and the roof that has been redone and turned over to the Town. He asked if there have been any leaks in those areas. Troy said that would be Phase 1, the library addition, auditorium administration, exhibit planning and a portion of the cafeteria. David said he doesn't think there are any leaks in that area but there are some spotty leaks on the science wing. Troy noted that is an area of concern for remediation. Paul Dunphy said at some point we will have to maintain the rubber roof on our own and we need to be ready to maintain it. He said don't think this is a 20-year no-maintenance rubber roof and we should be prepared to deal with these roof leaks as they occur. David Twombly agreed but said we have to resolve the rest of the roof as well or it will lead to other problems.

High School Punch List Work: David Twombly said on Monday or Tuesday he got an e-mail from CTA who said they would like to come back to do some punch list work like plumbing, hardware, electrical from 12/26 to 12/29 and asked if Tom Gould could be hired during that week to work 7:00am to 5:00pm because neither David or Jim Griffin will be around that week. ***Paul Dunphy made a motion to engage Tom Gould's services, as needed, who would report to Town Manager. Dr. Silva seconded the motion. All approved.***

Paul Dunphy said he noticed there are some items that seem to be more serious than others such as under plumbing, it has acid neutralization system. He asked if the school has been operating without the system. Troy responded, no, there is a functioning acid neutralization tank. That item had not been closed out because training was due but that training just occurred last week. Paul Dunphy asked if we can put items at the top of the list like the roof mechanical equipment that is either not running or is not secured. Troy Randall said they have sent correspondence to Vertex a few times putting a few items to the top of the list. However, the HVAC control contractor has been one of the more difficult to get on site to perform the work. Troy added they could make another request.

Charlie Ryder noted the last time he was up on the roof there was debris. David Twombly said Charlie Fiest went up there and cleaned the entire roof.

5. Fiscal Report:

- Warrant #458 was presented to the Committee containing seven invoices for the Jacobs School totaling \$704,115.67. PMA has reviewed and approved these invoices.
 - Two invoices from PMA totaling \$24,708.21 for project management services (\$19,263.34) and soils and concrete testing services performed by Briggs Engineering (\$5,444.87).
 - Two invoices from Ai3 totaling \$18,567.52 for professional services during November (\$18,473.94) and postage and delivery (\$93.58).
 - One invoice from David Reinks in the amount of \$60.00 for videotape/cablecast services at the 11/30 SBC meeting.
 - One invoice from Keyspan in the amount of \$43,000.00 for the installation of the new natural gas main and service line.
 - Payment Requisition #5 from TLT Construction in the amount of \$617,779.94 for construction costs through November 30.

Charlie Ryder noted that a lot of the Briggs invoices include overtime situations in many cases for testing and most of that should be done during a normal workday. Scott said Jeff has validated the times they are there in accordance with the invoice. Charlie Ryder noted on 10/5 the F# Testing has a rate of \$700/hr. Scott Libby said they have paid as much as \$6,000 per test in his last job and noted that is a typical fee. Pat Finn noted it is a unit price not, an hourly rate. Charlie Ryder said he would defer to Scott Libby and David Twombly regarding what to do about Keyspan. He said they are doing a terrific job and if they do not feel it is a major problem then that's fine.

Dr. Silva made a motion to approve Warrant #458 in the amount of \$704,115.67. Dr. Delaney seconded the motion. All approved Warrant #458 in the amount of \$704,115.67.

- Warrant #459 was presented to the Committee containing four invoices for the high school totaling \$10,283.68.
 - Three invoices from Architecture Involution totaling in the amount of \$8,133.68 for additional services performed during November 2006 (\$7,690.00 *this invoice will be added to the back charge list*), postage & delivery (\$41.18), and asbestos monitoring done by UEC during the auditorium renovation (\$402.50).
 - One invoice from Infrared Analyzers Inc. in the amount of \$2,150.00 for the infrared moisture survey that was done on the high school roof. *This invoice will be added to the back charge list.*

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 20

Pat Finn questioned if the Infrared Analyzers invoice is part of Gale. He was told it is in addition. *Dr. Delaney made a motion to approve Warrant #459 in the amount of \$10,283.68. Jay Meschino seconded the motion. All approved payment of Warrant #459 in the amount of \$10,283.68.*

6. **Town Manager's Report:** None this evening.
7. **Superintendent's Report:** Dr. Delaney informed the Committee that the School Committee met last Monday and presented options for placement of students during phase 2. She reminded the Committee that they needed eight rooms and it is now down to four if we keep the fifth grade at the middle school. There is a possibility of making one class out of two smaller rooms in the new building. So they are trying to find the less disruptive option as well as the least expensive option. The issue came up of getting a credit for the trailers and some of this will require some retrofitting and it will be costly but not too much.

Modular Classrooms: David Twombly informed the Committee they received a proposal from TLT who would like to take over the modulars and use them as their office on site. This would allow them to eliminate all other trailers on the grounds. The Town would get a credit because this would eliminate the need for the walkway from the modular to the new addition, which is a savings of \$15,036. In addition they would lease the space in the form of a credit of \$12,897 for a total credit of \$28,000. David explained, in addition, they did get estimates for mold remediation of between \$20,000 and \$40,000 and if the \$28,000 credit and the remediation money were added, the Town would not have to spent between \$50,000 and \$78,000. They would like to turn the modulars over to TLT and get these credits. In addition, they would need to take the preschoolers to the exhibition room at the high school but there would be expenses associated with that. David Twombly asked the Committee if the credits mentioned could be used to cover the cost to move the preschoolers up the exhibition room. John Reilly asked if this means TLT would be allowed to lease the modulars. David Twombly responded yes and at the end of the project they would move them to wherever the Town determines they should go (within the Town). Scott Libby clarified that the \$28,000 is a hard credit and the remainder is avoided costs. John Reilly asked if they were asking the School Building Committee to renovate the exhibition room or asking for money from the Building Committee to the School Department. David Twombly responded for the School Building Committee to pay to create three classrooms for the 45 preschoolers. Jay Meschino asked if the trailers would remain in our ownership and if we are sure they are going to remediate. Scott Libby said they are going to mitigate, to make them usable for an office environment. Scott Libby said Ai3 and we asked that they document what the understanding would be. If this is something the Town would like to pursue we will finalize that request we made and put in writing what the agreement would be and include a waiver of liability, etc. Scott Libby said they are not obligated to do it. Scott reiterated the credit is time dependent, as every week goes by the credit will diminish but the walkway is a hard cost. Jay Meschino said whatever you do, make sure that it is put down whether they

will mitigate or not because that will affect the value of the modulars and we need to make sure it does not get worse. If they take care of it, the Town can reuse or sell them after. Jay Meschino said he understands the School Committee has explored moving students. The 5th grade is at Memorial School but three rooms are still needed. He asked if they have looked at moving the 8th grade up to the high school and 4th grade over to Memorial. Dr. Delaney said that would disrupt a greater number of students. David Twombly said there was the option to create four classrooms in the gym at a cost of \$114,000. They looked at many different locations in town for the preschool. They looked at the Cub Scout building but it was too small. If the 4th and 8th grade were moved that would affect 172 students. They looked at relocating Central Administration throughout the high school or to the modular classrooms, which would allow them to move the preschool to the Hull Youth Center (Hadassah Way), but the cost associated would be too great. They looked into moving the preschool to the Hebrew school but there were many things to consider such as it is a kosher building, Jewish holidays, etc. They also considered moving the preschool to the high school library. That did meet the square footage requirements but it is the flagship of the school. The best option is moving the preschool to the exhibition room and allowing TLT to lease the modulars.

John Reilly asked where administration would be in September 2007. David Twombly said where they are now but added the rental agreement is up in July of this year. Kevin Richardson said the construction bid included alternate #1, which was to convert the gym to four classrooms but it was taken out at Town Meeting. Dave Walsh said we might have to do that if we have to create space somewhere. Dr. Delaney was asked if they looked into the Charter School. Dr. Delaney said they looked at everything and those are in worse condition than the Jacobs School. They looked into the church, A Street, etc. – they have done a lot of research. It was noted they are not suggesting that retrofitting the gym is the best option just that they looked at several options. Dr. Silva asked if the \$15,036 (walkway credit) and \$12,897 (TLT lease) is what came to the \$28,000. Dr. Silva asked if there is a ballpark figure to convert the exhibition room. Kevin Richardson said there are currently two full-day preschool classes and two half-day classes. Kevin Richardson said this includes special education students and there are specific requirements. The other important thing about the exhibition room location is the bathrooms are right there but no matter what we do we are going to have to get a waiver from the DOE. Dr. Silva said this option seems the most reasonable cost-wise if we can get TLT to put on paper that they will clean up the mold. Dr. Silva said he thinks where the School Department puts the kids is their concern but it is reasonable to use the high school exhibition room since there is some cost savings and it is construction related. Scott Libby said the alternate cost was \$114,000 and the Town would be getting some credits but there are other advantages to the site such as removing the trailers opens up more playground room and allows the project to move efficiently, these are extra bonuses. Scott Libby said this helps manage the work on a cost side, which is a \$114,000 benefit. He said even if the town has to spend \$28,000 to convert the exhibition room -- even if it is a wash -- it is still a benefit. Scott Libby said from his perspective it is no impact on the project. David Twombly said when he talked to TLT, they mentioned they would hydro

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 22

seed the area to increase the recess area and this may also help speed up the project. Scott Libby added if the project is done early, it allows a longer time frame for FF&E installation. In the end it may be built a little bit faster and move smoother into the next phase.

Jay Meschino asked if there would be a cost implication to move the 172 students (4th & 8th grades). Dr. Delaney said that would disrupt a lot of students and it is not gaining anything. Jay Meschino asked if the three preschool classes are mandatory. Dr. Delaney said it is required for the kids on education plans as well as peers. She said it would cost ten times as much to service them off site. Kevin Richardson added it is mandatory to provide services for those students (on ed plans) or we have to have a program just for them out of district. Dr. Delaney noted we do charge for the peers, there is a cost for them to attend preschool. Jay Meschino asked about the 172 students saying it would allow us to use more of the credit. Kevin Richardson said they would need either four or five classrooms and space wise they would have to find other space to offer services vs. four or five regular classrooms. Dr. Delaney said there are no spare classrooms at the high school or Memorial. Paul Dunphy asked if they are prepared to make a motion tonight. Dr. Delaney said their charge was to put it on the table and get feedback from the Committee. Charlie Ryder commended the School Department for finding that spot. He said he has been sitting in on the constructions meetings and when they talked about converting that gym to classrooms the construction people said it was going to be problem to make rooms on top of the gym floor and we would end up with a repaired gym afterwards. Charlie Ryder added TLT said they would clean up the modulares before returning them to us too.

John Reilly said he looks favorable on the plans as presented with a few stipulations. He would like the connector between the modulares and the existing building right now removed or at least not attached to the school. He would like a committment from the School Department, that once the exhibition room is not needed, it is returned to the original condition they got it in. John Reilly said he expects things like the carpet and woodwork cleaned and returned to the present condition. John Reilly said it is quite clear that parents don't want their 8th graders at the high school – there are strong feelings about that. David Twombly said whatever proposal TLT puts in writing he would like Jim Lampke to review it. David Twombly said the School Committee was looking for a decision tonight from the School Building Committee because very day delayed the credit goes down ***Dr. Silva made a motion to approve the plan put before us, providing we have a written agreement, that the modulares are cleaned up (meaning the mold is removed) and the passage way to the existing building is removed. Also with the stipulation that the School Committee absorb the expense of returning the Exhibition Room at the high school to its present state. Charlie Ryder seconded the motion.*** John Reilly said he does not want the School Department to two years from now say they don't have the money to restore it. Paul Dunphy asked if the exhibition room is part of the roof that needs to be worked on. He was told no, that roof is fine. Pat Finn noted that in the contract the general contractor is responsible for moving the modulares after the contract anywhere within Hull. Scott Libby noted David Twombly is getting estimates to outfit the exhibition area and he will work with David to

determine the net change to the project budget. David Twombly said he has contacted a company that installs paritians and he will get back to him with an estimate to lease and to purchase. *All approved.*

8. Old Business:

Pat Finn asked for an update on CBL. Jim Lampke said he told the committee he would look into it. He is gathering documents and also said then it would be at least month unless the committee feels there is some urgency. Jay Meschino asked if that company has been contacting anyone at all and are they requesting anything. Pat Finn said they submitted a warrant and it has been on hold. Dr. Silva noted only February is outstanding and there was a question about how many days were actually worked in February. Charlie Ryder said if you remember, there were doubts that he was there at all during February. There were some alleged breaks in the trailer in which the door was left open and as far as he is concerned, we have no obligation whatsoever to pay beyond January. Pat Finn said he brought it up because Mr. Lampke said we should pay the bonding company in full so we would not be in breach of that contract. It reminded him of other contracts we may be in breach of. If we owe it by the contract we should pay it and use it in the negotiations with the bonding company. Charlie Ryder said we have no obligation whatsoever. Jay Meschino said he thinks we voted not to pay it and the board's opinion was he defaulted. Pat Finn said to protect everyone we need a legal opinion and not keep it on hold forever. Paul Dunphy said this back charge list is what he has been referring to as the "going out in the back yard and getting money off the money tree". Paul said we will never recover everything that is being back charged and he will not vote to spend real tax payers money for that month, and when he seconded the motion he did not mean put it on hold for further review, he meant hold and not pay it. Dr. Silva said he didn't think the actual vote was to not pay it, it was to take it under advisement.

New Business: John Reilly said he would like to set a new policy relative to New/Old Business going forward. He asked if, in the future, members could let Debbe Bennett know about any agenda items so it can appear on the agenda and everyone has a chance to review it. Otherwise someone who should be here is not because they didn't know it would be discussed. Dr. Silva said a good policy, whether old or new business, is we bring it up at a meeting but it is not necessarily discussed that evening but rather is what they want talked about at the next meeting.

Jim Tobin said he would like to hear Jim Lampke's comments. Jim Lampke said he would pass on correcting some of the statements made in the interest of moving forward. With regard to how the committee is going to handle old and new business, it would really help the support staff to know in advance what will come up so they have the necessary information. He said he has a file developed on this subject and would have brought it tonight if he had known it would come up. He said, in general, it would be helpful if the support staff knows

Town of Hull
Building Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 14, 2006
Page 24

in advance and has an opportunity to respond and is prepared with more information. Jim Tobin asked if the committee would like to reaffirm the vote of ten month ago and not use the word put on hold. John Reilly said he has no problem doing that but would rather wait until the next meeting. John Reilly said as stated, from now the policy will be if you want a new item discussed you can bring it up and ask that it be put on the agenda for the next meeting. Old items that have been discussed before, please notify Debbe who will include it on the agenda. This way any members of the community who have an interest can attend the meeting and so everyone knows what is going on. John Reilly said as a caveat, if there is a new item that is time sensitive then we will use our own discretion. Jim Tobin asked if he heard anyone say this would be discussed at the next meeting John Reilly said it would be either in two weeks or in a month. Jim Tobin said a lot of people were under impression that when they put it on hold it meant not paying it. He would like to put this to bed at the next meeting.

Jim Lampke wanted it noted that at tonights meeting the Committee approved the November 2 minutes and within those minutes there was a reference made that the questions sent to him for Mr. Garrity were not forwarded. Jim Lampke said he wants it noted for the record that that is completely inaccurate. He said only two SBC members, Charlie Ryder and Jay Meschino, sent him questions and he immediately forwarded those to Bob Garrity. So he does not know why people are suggesting the questions were not forwarded. Pat Finn said those are executive session minutes Mr. Lampke is talking about in open session.

John Reilly informed the Committee that the next meeting is posted for December 28, however, the Committee would likely not need to meet again until after New Years unless there are any objections or there are new developments with the high school roof.

9. New Business/Submission of Agenda Items

Dr. Silva made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Jay Meschino seconded the motion. All approved. The meeting adjourned at 10:08pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbe Bennett
Recording Secretary