



Meeting Notes

Project: New Jordan Avenue School

Date: December 14, 2017

Attendees: Matt Pitzer and Lyndon Keck of PDT Architects. Attendees as noted on the attached sign in sheet

Purpose: Building Committee Meeting

These notes were taken by Lyndon Keck to the best of his ability. If you find any corrections please notify PDT Architects within three (3) working days of receipt of these minutes.

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	1. Meeting approved for November 16, 2017 by acclamation.	
	2. Review of schedule activities. Matt Pitzer explained the survey had been completed. Encroachment as noted on the survey will be discussed with abutting neighbors over the next several weeks.	
	3. Material testing agency has been on site testing for hazardous materials prior to the demolition if the school.	
	4. Matt showed the landscape rendering for the library courtyard, as well as the landscape rendering for the outdoor art courtyard.	
	5. It was noted the DEP permit submission had been forwarded to DEP. A question was asked as to how long it would take to receive a DEP permit. It was explained it would take between 3-6 months. It was explained the Planning Board submission had been filed on December 12, 2017. We will be going to the Planning Board in January for a first reading by the Planning Board.	
	6. There were no comments from the public regarding the project.	
	7. Matt explained that he and Suzanne Morin had conducted some additional teacher interviews. These interviews resulted in relatively few changes to the plan, however, there was a request by the teachers not to have urinals in the student bathrooms.	
	8. The Committee agree to only have urinals only in the public toilets by the gymnasium.	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>9. There was discussion about having small, lower toilets in the Pre-K classrooms only. All other student toilets will be regular sized toilets like residential toilet heights.</p>	
	<p>10. Matt noted the chair storage area off the cafeteria has been removed to increase kitchen storage.</p>	
	<p>11. Matt also noted that the second-floor teachers work room had been slid to the east on House A so the teachers work room was closer to the intercommunicating fire stair.</p>	
	<p>12. The exterior elevations were shown. Committee expressed concern about the windows on the north side and if there was going to be enough light into the classroom. There was also concern about the use of a second siding material at the windows.</p>	
	<p>13. Lyndon explained the amount of glass letting light into the classrooms was like Harriet Beecher Stowe on the north side. There was a ribbon of glass windows that runs almost the full length of the classroom wall.</p>	
	<p>14. There was a question about the pitch to roof drains on the sloped roofs. It was explained there will be internal roof drains located on all flat roof portions of the building, as well as on the second-floor corridors to catch the roof water from the two-story classroom bar.</p>	
	<p>15. The only areas where water will fall onto crushed stone will be at the single-story classroom roofs at Pre-K and the Kindergarten wings where there is no second floor.</p>	
	<p>16. Questions were asked about the color palette for the exterior of the building. It was explained that no colors had been selected yet, although we were heading in the area of neutral colors as per the wish of the School Board pre-referendum.</p>	
	<p>17. Lyndon presented a chart showing comparison of three different mechanical systems, their monthly utility costs and annual operating costs. The three systems were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heating only with gas boilers • Ground source geothermal heating and cooling • Air source heat exchangers and heat pumps providing heating and cooling <p>The initial monthly utility costs and annual operating costs show that the air to air heat exchangers are approximately \$7,000/year more expensive to operate than the geothermal.</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	<p>18. Lyndon explained that the test well had discovered that bedrock is very deep on this site. It is 133' below light brown and gray silty sands. This results in a premium cost for the geothermal wells because of the need to provide each well with 7" steel casing from the surface down to the bedrock. Assuming there will be between 60-70 wells, this results in a premium cost the geothermal system of an additional \$125,000-\$146,000.</p> <p>PDT has estimated the infrastructure delta difference between the air to air heat exchangers and the geothermal heat exchangers is about \$500,000.</p>	
	<p>19. The Committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of geothermal versus the air to air heat pumps. Lyndon explained that in both systems there would be a backup gas boiler to provide hot water for the domestic hot water system, hot water for the PK radiant floor slabs and the cafeteria floor slab, as well as any ice melt systems at the major entrances.</p>	
	<p>20. A question was asked if there were any environmental advantages to either system. PDT answered that both systems used electricity with a minimal amount of natural gas. Neither system used home heating oil.</p>	
	<p>21. Committee members noted that the savings by going with the air to air heat exchanger could, conceivably, allow the building to have more photovoltaics on the roof on opening day. There was discussion about PPA agreements which had similarly been used for the Friends School in Cumberland.</p>	
	<p>22. Lyndon had explained that the air to air heat exchangers work well done to a temperature of about 13-15F. They become much more inefficient at lower temperatures below 13-15F. Lyndon also explained the building would be better insulated than Harriet Beecher Stowe. We expect the heat loss from this building to be less than what is experienced at Harriet Beecher Stowe.</p>	
	<p>23. Lyndon asked if the Committee was prepared to move forward with the air to air heat exchanger. There was unanimous agreement to proceed with the air to air design.</p>	
	<p>24. The Committee briefly discussed subcommittee working groups. PDT noted that the Playground Subcommittee should be starting very soon because of the need for input regarding the Planning Board presentations and preparation of the documents.</p>	
	<p>25. It was noted the Public Art Committee could also be assembled to start to identify locations where public art could be included.</p>	
	<p>26. There was discussion about an Internal Design Subcommittee to work on colors on the inside. PDT explained that in general colors on the inside would not need to be selected for at least another year.</p>	



Meeting Notes

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	27. There was also discussion about PDT bringing brick and metal panels to the next Building Committee meeting, as well as windows because those materials would have to be approved by the Committee, at which time colors for exterior material could also be discussed.	
	28. The next Building Committee meeting will be January 11, 2018 at Town Hall at 6:00 p.m.	
	29. The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m. END OF MEETING NOTES	