

Litchfield School Board
Building Subcommittee
July 1, 2004

Present:

Members present: Dot Beauregard, Pat Jewett, Cindy Couture, Catherine Hamblett, Teri Blouin, Stacy Maghakian, Susan Seabrook, Scott Innes, Mark Fontaine, Joyce Wilcox, Doug Orlando, Ralph Boehm

Others present: Dan Cecil (Harriman Associates), Bill Spencer (Budget Committee)

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm

The minutes from the June 16 meeting were approved.

Dot apprised the committee of her meetings with LMS & CHS principals in an effort to gather 10 year projected space needs details and room utilization information for each school. Handouts of room utilization information for each building were distributed to committee members. Bo Schlichter will be in attendance on July 21 to meet with the committee to answer questions regarding the LMS handout. Cathy Hamblett reminded the committee that the lease for the portables at LMS expires in July of 2005. The SAU space needs will be discussed by the committee on 7/8.

Dan Cecil distributed a six page handout to the committee. The handout included a summary of deficiencies as noted in the Team Design report including a summary of options for GMS. Dan went through each item with the committee and responded to any questions or concerns. Dan noted that in his opinion the Team Design report was very accurate and thorough. Bill raised the question as to whether a sprinkler system existed throughout LMS. Ralph asked whether Dan will be comparing the cost of a sprinkler installation at GMS vs. other alternative life safety improvements that could result in an equivalent level of life safety. In regard to the mechanical systems within GMS, Dan noted that should the district chose not to replace the inefficient vintage equipment presently at GMS, the district will continue to incur higher maintenance costs along with higher operating costs. Dan recommended that the GMS transformer be investigated after noting the two notations in the report regarding the high level of temperature of the existing transformer. Mark noted that on page #5 the report stated that there is a water line above electrical equipment. Dan requested copies of any septic plans for the existing system should they exist. Bill noted that in order to determine renovation costs, the district would first have to determine what grade levels would occupy the building. With regard to excessive moisture, Dan recommended that the committee retrieve data on the humidity solution (room dehumidifiers) presently in place. Cathy recalled an exterior drainage installation at GMS to help mitigate water.

The last section in the handout from Dan outlined recommendations for prioritizing the corrections/renovations and how they could be funded. Dan pointed out that there is a level of risk behind not investing into corrections to the items outlined in the Team Design report. Bill inquired as to the threshold of renovations that requires full code compliance. In response to Bill's question, Dan agreed that renovations are subject not only to the relationship between code and regulatory discretion they are also tied to state funding. Dan recommended that Litchfield put in place a plan now that we have identified the deficiencies. Scott asked whether we should review potential renovations with fire, code, and other officials before engaging in the work to be done. This prompted Bill to revisit the need to determine who will occupy GMS. Dan brought out the need to include educational impacts within this decision. Cathy clarified that it is the school board that will make the final decision on this issue. Scott stated his desire for the committee to move towards clarifying this. If it is the committee who makes a recommendation to the board that needs to be done forthwith. Dan reiterated that only two grades can occupy GMS. Dot pointed out that the committee should consider the existing preschool and kindergarten in their discussions. Dan encouraged a consensus in this recommendation/decision. Cathy inquired as to the status of the engineering reports. Dan estimated mid July as a possible time frame.

The next meeting is July 8th. It was agreed that at that meeting the committee would work towards addressing the grade configuration decision. Bill added that if there is no difference in cost relative to construction of a 1,2,3 or 3,4,5 school, he feels the decision should be a relatively easy one for the board. Pat cautioned the committee relative to the number of bonds put before the voters in March of 2005.

Cindy agreed to email projection information requested by Dan. In addition, Stacy will provide additional space allocation information to Dan at her earliest convenience.

Ralph motioned to adjourn. It was seconded by Pat. Meeting adjourned 10:22 p.m.

The joint subcommittee is to meet 7/12/2004.