

Litchfield School Board  
Building Subcommittee  
July 21, 2004

Present:

Members present: Dot Beauregard, Cindy Couture, Pat Jewett, Doug Orlando, Linda Scott, Ralph Boehm, Roland Bergeron, Dave Ross, Teri Blouin, Scott Innes, Brian McCue

Others present: Dan Cecil (Harriman Associates), Bo Schlichter (LMS Principal)

The meeting began at 7:12 p.m.

Scott & Cindy motioned to approve the July 8, 2004 minutes as amended.

Dot opened the meeting with a brief overview of the middle school space needs handout. The handout included an existing space summary. Bo reviewed the LMS floor plan for the committee. Dan Cecil addressed questions surrounding state standards relative to required square footage for regular and special education classrooms. Dan advised the group that these standards are under consideration at the state level and new standards are expected in the fall of 2004. Scott requested confirmation from the Chair that if 5<sup>th</sup> grade is removed from LMS, the building would not have sufficient space within 10 years. Dot confirmed this to be true. Bo outlined the impact on programming when a teacher is on wheels. Cindy discussed the utilization figures which confirm the extensive efforts to utilize existing space. Doug commended the administration for their positive and supportive attitude but noted that it will be the public who will ultimately decide if "making do" is sufficient. Bo informed the committee that the hallway traffic at these enrollment figures is a challenge for both students and staff. Bo pointed out that a high number of his discipline issues are directly related to incidents that occur in the LMS hallways. Dot stated that one of the intents behind constructing the new building would be to move the 5<sup>th</sup> grade out of LMS. Bo thanked the committee for their hard work towards finding a district solution.

Dot apprised the committee of the 7/21/2004 meeting with Fire, Police, and the Code Enforcement Officer. The meeting was at the request of Dan Cecil, Harriman Associates, in order to review the Team Design report findings with these officials. It is the understanding of the Building Committee Chair, Dot Beauregard, that the State Fire Marshall's office would be at the GMS site on or about 7/27 to perform a walk-thru with local Fire Dept. personnel. A report will be forthcoming. The new Police Chief is planning to join this walk-thru. It is also possible that the Code Enforcement Officer will join the walk thru as well.

Dan discussed the most recent geotechnical study by Jaworski. The report noted that the soils at GMS were the same as at the new school site proposed in March of 2004 located near LMS. The difference between the LMS new building location and the GMS site is the water table. The water table is much higher on the GMS location. Dan stated that the porous soils together with the water table are not a good combination. The GMS property would require substantial de-watering in order to build upon this site. Dan noted from the report at hand that while the contractor was digging the test holes they filled with water immediately upon penetration of the soils. Dan reiterated that what the committee has authorized for engineering studies to date is considered "limited geotechnical" studies. Dan advised the committee that when the exact location is determined for a building, additional test pits would be required. Again, Dan pointed out that "water is not your friend". The high water table would drive the level of drainage required to build at the GMS site. The site costs (de-watering) are what contribute to the higher final cost to build on the GMS site. Roland stressed the need for proper engineering to successfully de-water the GMS site. Teri asked Dan when we would know if the LMS site would be able to withstand a 1000 student school. Dan replied that the last engineering study by Vollmer (flags mapped) is the final piece of information to determine this. Dan expects to have this study completed in two weeks. Following the Vollmer study results, Dan's firm will be able to answer the ? of whether the LMS site can hold a school for 1000 students. The committee as a whole expressed confidence in the engineering study process being used to gather information. They also felt that this process will draw the committee to the best solution including the best cost estimate available at this time.

Dan led the committee through a process of prioritizing their concerns based on his 6 page bulleted list of the Team Design analysis of GMS. Dan stated for the group that there are three options: (1) do nothing (2) do minimal renovations (3) implement a complete renovation of GMS. Roland asked for clarification as to whether there is a present "health issue" related to the moisture at GMS as he has heard from local residents. Linda stated that this is not easy to clearly identify/answer. She also stated that custodial staff has been diligent in their methods to mitigate moisture problems when they have been associated with health concerns in the past (ex. removal of rugs, wall washing, etc.). Roland reiterated that while we can't clearly identify a health issue, what presently exists at GMS is a combination of moisture, inadequate ventilation, and aging systems. Dave stated that air quality testing has been done in the

past showing slightly elevated levels. The committee noted that a mechanical solution to the moisture problem (ex. installation of a corrective measure system) almost guarantees an interaction with all the other safety, code, & building issues which could potentially lead to a domino effect or major renovation. A discussion pursued of whether renovations can be done bit by bit. Roland noted that in some cases a particular renovation can not be done piece meal but would require a complete process. Dan encouraged the committee to continue to try and identify what they would classify as “minimal renovations”. Cindy brought up the topic of building aid and Ed Murdough’s statement of 25% = substantial renovations.

The committee continued to go thru the list prepared by Dan. The committee was in consensus that the lack of a sprinkler system is a serious concern. ADA is something the School Board would need to address with a plan. Everyone agreed that the boilers are a serious concern due to age. Dave agreed to look into options for testing the water at GMS. Dot stated that Cathy is looking into grants for security systems. Dave recommended the district test the transformers during the winter. Dave will follow-up on this testing during the upcoming school year. Dan will contact Vollmer to obtain a quote for review of the condition of the GMS septic system due to the fact that the field is beyond its expected life. Educational needs (page 5 of list) will be addressed through a proposed floor plan for two grades with or without the SAU offices at GMS. Dan advised the committee that when the minimal renovations are determined, a cost will be determined using a formula.

Ralph requested that Cathy contact Ed Murdough, New Hampshire Department of Education (State Aid), to get a better definition of the substantial renovation % for the 30% state aid reimbursement eligibility.

The committee reviewed draft #3 of three space allocation workbooks for the following options: 400, 600, and 1,000 projected 10-year and build-out student enrollments. Dan will estimate costs of each option for comparison purposes by using the draft workbooks.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm

Upcoming meeting dates: 7/27 @ 7 pm, 8/2 @ 7:30 pm