



PLANNING & BUILDING COMMITTEE
Merrimack School District
<http://www.merrimack.k12.nh.us/PBC/>

Minutes
August 9, 2010

Present: R. Hendricks, G. Perry, S. Heinrich, L. Rothhaus, F. Rothhaus and School Board liaison
R. Swonger

Excused: D. Powell

Also Present: Business Administrator M. Shevenell and Architect Tybor Farcus

R. Hendricks called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM.

JMUES Feasibility Study

T. Farcus presented a revised floor plan for renovations to JMUES in order to move the SpEd offices there. He said most of the concerns expressed in the prior meeting still exist and he stated that should the SpEd offices be located within a new SAU building, the footprint of the SpEd space would be 20% smaller due to inefficiencies inherent in converting existing classroom spaces into offices. In addition, he said renovations would still cost approximately \$494,000 – but that this cost did not include treatments to darken or soundproof the windows on the playground side of the building. He said including SpEd in a new building would cost \$481,000 that is marginally less expensive than renovating space in JMUES.

After discussion, S. Heinrich made a MOTION to remove renovations at JMUES from consideration due to concerns expressed at a prior meeting and the cost comparison between renovating space and building new. Second: L. Rothhaus. MOTION PASSED unanimously.

M. Shevenell told the Committee that he would like R. Hendricks to report on this action to the School Board at the August 23rd meeting.

New SAU Building

T. Farcus told the Committee that he had received a copy of the survey of the area and had drawn a schematic of a 10,000 square foot building, which is placed on the survey for comparison of the two sites the Committee had suggested to him. He said he had originally thought that “Option 1” (using the current SpEd building site) was the best option. However, he noted the site has several limitations: no room for growth, difficulty in placing the building over the existing basement space, closeness of building to the streets, need to add a 2nd staircase for access and egress from the basement, etc. He said that “Option 2” (the one acre site adjacent to the parking lot and the football practice field) offered more possibilities; so it was his recommendation that the Committee strongly consider Option 2. He indicated that a pump station would be needed for water and sewer access and that both lines could be in the same right of way as long as they were separated.

Members discussed the pros and cons of each option:

	PRO	CON
Option 1	Existing utilities Basement for storage Close to High School Visibility	Building close to road Need to redesign high school parking lot Close to High School Need to relocate SpEd during build Loss of parking during build
Option 2	More options for parking Quieter location Central location Minimum disruption to area during build	Expense to bring in water & sewer Higher site prep costs

Members noted that it would take 5 – 6 months to build the new building.

M. Shevenell shared a quote for 2 portable buildings that could be leased to house SpEd if needed should Option 1 be selected. The lease has a guaranteed 12 month term. Cost would be \$58,000 plus \$6,000 for the stairs and each portable would need a place to be parked. The cost includes all utility connections and hook-ups.

Members had questions about the costs of new construction and what the price quoted included. Members wanted to ensure that site costs, paving costs, costs to demolish the old buildings and costs for any additional furniture were included in the “turn-key cost” that is proposed. Member discussed that the building was quoted was a wooden frame structure, and then discussed flat vs. pitched roofs and preferred pitched roofing even though it was slightly more expensive to install. M. Shevenell said that paving and/or repaving areas impacted by the construction could cost as much as \$1,000 per space. G. Perry said he thought that demolition costs could run \$150,000. R. Swonger stated that he agreed the current Superintendent’s office should be demolished, but that the School Board might have some use for the current SpEd building. Members thought that a decision about the future of the SpEd building must be made prior to any building plan being presented.

Members also wanted to know if an office building needed to have sprinklers. T. Farcus said he didn’t know what local code required, so some investigation is needed.

T. Farcus asked M. Shevenell to review the proposed floor plan with staff for further input regarding space needs proposed and any needs that have not been included.

Next Meeting

The Committee will not meet on August 23rd because this is the School Board meeting at which R. Hendricks has been asked to give an interim report. August 30th was not convenient for T. Farcus, and a quorum was unattainable for September 13th; so a meeting on September 20th was tentatively set.

L Rothhaus made a MOTION to adjourn. Second: S. Heinrich. MOTION PASSED unanimously.

R. Hendricks adjourned the meeting at 9:20 PM.