

**Building Committee Joint Meeting  
with Cooperative School Board  
January 17, 2006  
GHS Library**

**Building Committee Present:** Ben Mayerson, Chair, Craig Burcalow, Robert Demers, John Carpenter, Reed Leberman, Kathleen Kelley (coop representative), Dennis Pednault, Mike Waddell (coop representative), Jean Tremblay (coop representative)

**Cooperative School Members Present:** Jo Anne Carpenter, Chair, Angela Brown, Karen Cloutier, Michele Cormier, Alice Evankow

**Staff Present:** Pauline Plourde, Keith Parent, Paul Bousquet, Dave Goyette, DeAnn Murphy

**Call to Order** by Ben Mayerson at 6:35 p.m.

**Minutes:** Jean Tremblay moved to accept the minutes as read. Bob Demers seconded the motion. Dennis Pednault pointed out that Dave Goyette attended twice! An adjustment was made. Motion carried to approve as amended.

**Finance:** Ben Mayerson reported of the \$15,000 appropriated for the Building Committee this current fiscal year, only \$125 has been used. That was for compiling the report material. Some of the remaining funds may be used for materials to distribute to the public, before the annual meeting in March.

**Review of the Building Committee Report:** Angela Brown, Alice Evankow, and Jo Carpenter said the Building Committee Report was appreciated and met the requirements of the charge. Ben Mayerson said he was motivated by the commitment of the Committee members to this process. He personally thanked the Committee members and Pauline Plourde, Keith Parent, Dave Goyette, and the faculty for their input into the process. Ben asked if there were questions about the report. He mentioned that he anticipated more information from faculty and staff, concerning the academic space requirements.

**2006 Charge for the Committee:** Ben Mayerson summarize that the Committee had now gone past the original charge by requesting response to an RFP for consulting services. The next step is to determine the right solution for providing grades 6-12 in Gorham. We need professional assistance to review the data we have collected and advise us which options make the most sense for the Cooperative: renovate on site, replace on site or replace off site, or some new combination of grades utilizing the Ed Fenn, or some other solution. To date, we know of three responses to our RFP. We are scheduling walk throughs of the GMHS for these people.

The new charge should have some language to give the Building Committee more options to consider Ed Fenn/ GMHS reconfiguration of grades. Jo Carpenter said that the charge must include Ed Fenn renovations as well because voters do not want more than one bond solution. Ben Mayerson was concerned that the report from the building committee only addressed 1/3 of the design fees foreseen as necessary for the GMHS on site renovation. It does not include the Ed Fenn School design costs that were reported to be \$144,000 in January 2005 by Kyle Barker.

Role of the Facilities Committee must also be thought out. The Building Committee assumes that the Facilities Committee will directly address the ongoing maintenance/repairs of the buildings. The Building Committee will seek input from the public on various solutions to the construction project. Which committee will work on policies relating to construction and draft warrants? John Carpenter said the charge from the Board would help the Building Committee make progress and remain a viable committee. He also mentioned his concern that the Ed Fenn school solution must be included in the budget process.

**Funding Request:** Bob Demers said with only \$50,000, we could not do enough work to be ready for a vote on the bond by March 2007 and therefore the building needs could not be addressed until well after 2009. Therefore, escalated maintenance costs would be included in the operating budgets of 2006-2009 to address the building failures. Alice Evankow wanted clarification of what the “2009” means. Ben responded with “completion of the GMHS renovation/replacement by 2009.”

Jean suggested that the \$240,000 design fees proposed by the Building Committee for the 2006-07 budget might be appropriate if we move several grades to the Ed Fenn. Ben Mayerson warned that we do not have enough resources, both time and money, to adequately look at both projects being completed by 2009. Pauline suggested that the \$240,000 would buy us some of the design work and we probably could have a warrant article ready for vote in March 2007. This money would provide us with detailed construction drawings of both sites from which contractors could bid for the construction contract. Knowing the total bid for construction, plus or minus 10% and the remaining design costs, we could then present a bond warrant article to the three towns in 2007.

There was much discussion about whether to present both a \$240,000 request and if accepted by voters pass over the \$50,000 request. There was some discussion about whether to place the \$50,000 in the operating budget and only present the \$240,000 in a separate warrant. The committee was unanimous on making progress one way or another.

**Publicity of Building Committee Activities:** Reed said the Building Committee was confused by who was doing what – communication with voters about the meaning of the various choices needs to be thorough. Michele Cornier wanted clarification about whether paper ballots were going to be used or whether a straw vote would be taken on these two or three issues: \$50,000, \$300,000 or some other option. Mike Waddell suggested that the Cooperative needs to sell the bigger budget item or we will be dead in the water with just \$50,000. Bob Demers suggested that we drop the \$50,000 option, because we do not want to hide from the problem. The GMHS is failing. Reed suggested that by giving voters options we are letting them say, “move at a slower pace” or “find a solution so we can maintain our education system.” Mike suggested voters must be told that it is not as simple as replacing the GMHS and renovating the Ed Fenn School.

Ben Mayerson suggested that the Facilities Committee could report to the Board a schedule of deferred maintenance/repairs that must be completed in the next six years to keep the building safe for students and staff. That number then could be presented to voters along side the construction estimate so that they could see what the true cost of construction would be after state aid versus maintenance costs which does not provide state aid.

*(The following list was not presented or specifically discussed at the meeting)*

*This deferred maintenance budget would include such items as:*

*Main Building Roof 1999 estimate \$175,000  
Gymnasium Roof 1999 estimate \$180,000  
Science Roof 1999 estimate \$10,000  
Locker room Roof 1999 estimate \$45,000  
Classroom Addition Roof 1999 estimate \$170,000  
Ann Lary Building roof 1999 estimate \$180,000  
Canopy #1 Roof 1999 estimate \$10,000  
Kitchen/Activity/Platform Roof 1999 estimate \$85,000  
Fire Safety system 2005 estimate \$125,000  
Ventilation system 2002 estimate \$435,000  
Heat Recovery System 2002 estimate \$468,000  
Physical Safety systems 2002 estimate \$250,000  
Repair falling rear gym wall no estimate available  
Chimney pointing no estimate available,  
Technology rooms air conditioning and wiring no estimate available*

Jean Tremblay concurred that a report must specify the minimum maintenance work that must be done versus the construction costs proposed. Mike said we should look at the report presented a few years ago on this subject. Bob warned that we need to let people know that if we repair the roofs and then find we must install air conditioners we will be ruining a perfectly good roof. We need to plan these repairs as a major renovation.

The consultant(s) that is hired as a result of the RFP that is now out will not have a report prepared until after the Annual Meeting.

Angela Brown suggested that we create a photo board of the systems failures in the GMHS and ED Fenn School for the Annual Meeting. We could offer tours of the building before the School Annual Meeting. Cooperative School Board members were urged to schedule a tour ASAP so that they could speak from experience as they are asked questions. Ben warned that we do not want to create fear in the voters by threatening them into quick action. We need to reassure them that we are going to control costs by studying and planning for an academically appropriate and safe building for our K-12 students.

Jo asked what the voters would get for \$240,000. The \$240,000 represents 1/3 of the 8% design fees for a new building on the existing GMHS site, based on a total cost of \$10,000,000. Dennis said if voters approve this amount they could expect a tighter budget ( a tolerance of +/- 10% versus +/-30%) for a GMHS building new onsite, if this is the direction the building committee decides is the best direction after working with the consultant we are now in the process of hiring. The design fees would be higher if we built off site and/ or if we include the Ed Fenn School.

Reed Leberman suggested that we could bring the voters a plan with just the \$50,000 budget if we choose a design build approach to construction, but then we get a budget for construction that is +/- 30% and we may have no control over the actual items included in the project.

Bob suggested that the renovation on site option has not been flushed out. If we repair items listed above in our normal budgeting process, we may not get complete state building aid. Pauline said building aid would be available if we do a major renovation or repair such as replacing all the roofs, and it including stripping and replacement of the

sheathing materials. Alice asked the difference between replace on site or repair the building. Are the students present during the entire time? Ben said the scale of the work is so large that at the GMHS that it could not be accomplished solely during the summer break. Ben said students would be in all likelihood being present during a major renovation or build new onsite, as there is no where for them to attend school. Ben said a comprehensive plan would have to be drawn up to make sure there is no major negative impact to students, while the work occurs. Building off-site presented its own host of logistical issues, such as sewer, water service, athletic field development, and more as stated in the Committee's report. Reed Leberman suggested that either option would need to include a plan for educating our students during construction.

Mike Waddell suggested that we keep a careful eye on the interest expense we pay by going to a bond for this size of project. The state building aid applies to the principle expense and does not include interest.

Angela suggested that the Building Committee members might want to be present at each town budget meetings that are scheduled for February to answer questions that voters will no doubt have about this capital expense.

**Next meeting** will be February 7, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. The Facilities Committee will be invited to join us at the meeting. The agenda will include:

Compilation of repairs that need to be made to the GMHS in the next four years.

Discuss the process with the Facilities Committee

Accept the Coop budget decision / charge for 2006-07

Review RFP responses

Approve Minutes

Discuss the New England School and Facilities Maintenance Conference.

**Craig Burcalow moved to adjourn the meeting, Jean Tremblay seconded the motion. All Agreed.**

Sincerely presented,

Kathleen Kelley

bwm