

MEETING NOTES

Building communities  
since 1870

---

To  
Tom Morrill, Jude Cyr, Building Committee Members, JPL, MDL, JBJ, FLC, DPD, SCH, RDM,  
ROM, PRM, PRA, DER, FILE

---

From  
Jeff Larimer

---

Date  
May 1, 2009  
**Revised May 6, 2009**

---

Project  
Edward Little High School Study - Additions/Renovations  
Auburn, ME  
Project No. 08512

---

Subject  
BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING #5 – APRIL 30, 2009

---

Present

Tom Morrill	Superintendent, Auburn School Department
Jude Cyr	Business Manager, Auburn School Department
David Das	School Committee Chair
Laurie Smith	Assistant City Manager
Larry Pelletier	School Committee
Bonnie Hayes	School Committee
Valerie Ackley	ELHS Staff Member
Pat Gautier	ELHS Librarian
Annie Helmkamp	ELHS Student
Tara Paradie	Community Member/Parent
Dick Gleason	Community Member
Jeff Larimer	Harriman

---

Not Present

Jim Miller	Principal, Edward Little High School
Billy Hunter	Auburn School Department
Chris Camire	ELHS Student
Ray Berube	Auburn City Council
Chip Morrison	Community Member
Debora Philbrook	Community Member/Parent
Louise Nunn	Community Member/Parent
Ron Lebel	Community Member
William Luce	Adult Ed Director
Larry LaBrie	Community Member

---

1. Distributed copies of the final draft of the new construction vs. renovation analysis that included the following revisions made since the second draft.
  - a. Additional information on code deficiencies, handicap accessibility and roof upgrades in the architectural section of the facility analysis.
  - b. Revised structural analysis for C and D wings based on additional information provided by the school department.

## H A R R I M A N

- c. Noted that there have been upgrades to the gym roof but documentation was not available prior to completion of the report.
2. Reviewed the cost analysis and project budgets for each option that compares the total costs between renovating and adding on to the existing building (Option 1) vs. constructing a new building on a new site (Option 2). The advantages and disadvantages of each option were included with the cost analysis narrative and these were reviewed with the committee.
3. The project budgets are made up of three parts using the standard state format. Part A includes the cost for building and site construction, Part B includes administrative costs for such items as land, furniture, equipment and contingencies, and Part C includes fees and services for such items as the architect/engineer feed, environmental permitting, construction testing, owner's rep and clerk of the works.
4. The project budget for Option 1 assumes that all identified deficiencies are corrected, all recommended upgrades are implemented and all additional spaces are added. The estimated costs for Option 1 are as follows:
  - a. Estimated Construction Cost: \$37,626,286
  - b. Estimated Project Cost: \$48,780,456
5. The project budget for Option 2 assumes constructing a new building, of equivalent size to that analyzed for Option 1, on a new site. The estimated costs for Option 2 are as follows:
  - a. Estimated Construction Cost: \$47,760,320
  - b. Estimated Project Cost: \$61,153,214
6. The committee was reminded that the budgets are based strictly on all the research and data collected over the past several months. They are not based on any particular design but only on the information and recommendations included in the analysis.
7. Based on several factors, including costs, it would appear that renovating and adding on to the existing building would be the better option. But it will be the decision of the building committee to determine which option to move forward with. This decision is expected to be made at the next meeting.
8. Once the option has been selected, it will also be up to the building committee to decide what to include and what not to include as these decisions will impact the final estimated cost for the project.
9. Tom Morrill distributed copies of the latest letter from NEASC dated April 16, 2009 which also included copies of all preceding correspondence from NEASC dating back to April 15, 2005. The latest letter indicates that NEASC has voted unanimously to place the high school on probation due to curriculum and building deficiencies. The decision is subject to appeal by the school department by May 15, 2009.
10. Most of the deficiencies outlined in the NEASC letter were also cited in the New Construction vs. Renovation Analysis.
11. The timeframe for probation will need to be determined. It was unknown how long a school could be on probation before officially losing its accreditation.
12. Having the high school on probation is considered very serious and could very well impact those students who wish to apply to college. It will be important to get this information out to the community so it is understood what the impact is.
13. Jim Miller was not available to attend tonight's meeting so there was no update on the status of the educational specifications.

H A R R I M A N

14. There will be an open house for Edward Little on Saturday, May 16<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 am to Noon. This will be an opportunity for community members to tour the high school, ask questions and provide feedback on the project. Flyers announcing the open house will be going home with students.
15. It is important to get the word out about the project through a variety of different means including radio, TV, newspapers, flyers, posters, etc. It was suggested that various organizations be contacted, such as Rotary and Kiwanis, to schedule meetings with those groups and to spread the word to as many people as possible.
16. Jeff Larimer will attend the next school board meeting on Wednesday, May 6<sup>th</sup> to update the board on the work that has been completed to date.
17. The next meeting of the building committee is scheduled for Thursday, May 21<sup>st</sup> at 6:30 pm in the council chambers at Auburn Hall.

*If written notice is not received within two weeks of receipt, the above meeting notes represent an accurate summary of the meeting and its conclusions.*

jplar