

**BCOC Meeting Minutes****Date: January 21st, 2021, 5:30pm****Location: Video Conference****Video of this meeting, and past BCOG sessions can be found at:**<https://www.bsdt.org/district/budget/bhs-renovations/>**Present****Committee Members:** Tom Peterson, Doug Nedde, Clare Wool, David Boehm, Kate Stein, Martine Gulick, Marty Spaulding, Nathan Lavery, Peter Bahrenburg, Tom Flanagan**Members of the Public:** Natty Jamison (PCI note-taker), Colin (RETN)

1.

**Project Updates**

1.

**PCB Updates**

1.

**Building “A” partial occupancy status**

1.

**Selective portions of building A have been approved for occupancy including: kitchen, cafeteria, gymnasium and locker rooms.**

2.

**Ongoing air monitoring is taking place, the plan for which was reviewed by state agencies without comment. First round of monitoring tests is scheduled for next week (1/25/21). Results expected mid February. Overall testing schedule is not established yet.(i.e Monthly? Quarterly?) If there are any spikes detected, more frequent testing may be required, or even vacating the building.**

2.

### **Material sampling status**

1.

**Sampling is complete in buildings A, B, and D. F will be complete tomorrow (1/22/21) at which point sampling will proceed to C and E buildings. Samples shipped to the lab daily.**

2.

**Doug Nedde (DN): Is this different sampling from what took place in the fall?  
Tom Peterson (TP): Yes, that was mostly limited to air sampling. This work is 'characterization' of all suspect materials. Profile of that material will dictate the remediation plan.**

3.

**Lab results are due at the end of January / early February. The results will then be built into a spreadsheet and full report showing the results and locations, diagrams, etc. That will be complete by the end of February.**

3.

### **Soil sampling status**

1.

**Several hundred samples have been collected around the exterior of the facility. This round of sampling is complete. These will allow the consultants to build a 3d map / profile of the soils to show where all the contaminated soils are. Report is due on 2/8/21.**

**2.**

**Other Status Updates:**

**1.**

**Design Development**

**1.**

**Design Development is complete - there are over 600 pages of drawings and two spec books totalling over 2000 pages.**

**2.**

**Estimating**

**1.**

**WT is reviewing the DD package and issuing/tracking RFIs.**

**2.**

**Estimate expected at the end of January. DN: has WT done recent work in our market? TP: Yes, they built the new wing in the medical center. Marty Spaulding (MS): And they utilize local subs for budget numbers as well. TP: The SD round was mostly in house, for the DD estimate they are leaning more on local subs. Should provide realistic numbers and it gives contractors a preview of the work.**

**3.**

**There are some indicators that we will be over budget again. February will be busy for the project team as a whole, analyzing that estimate. Similar to the value management process last spring.**

**3.**

**Permits**

**1.**

**Act 250 not required**

**2.**

**State and local permits are filed, 30-60 days for review for State permits. Zoning application from BRD was very thorough and well put together.**

**3.**

**3 required hearings: Design Advisory Board (DAB), Design Review Board (DRB) and the Conservation Board (CB).**

**1.**

**DAB and CB meetings have taken place - unanimous approval including parking waiver.**

**2.**

**DRB is scheduled for 2/2/21 - approval anticipated. May not gain approval at meeting allowing for up to 10 day deliberation period.**

**3.**

**DN: Stormwater permit generally takes the longest. MS: 45 days I think. TP: they have 30 days, but if they ask a question, the clock stops. Resumes upon answering. So that can stretch things out.**

**3.****Upcoming Milestones and Tasks**

1.

**WT to deliver DD estimate by the end of January**

1.

**Will not include remediation costs. ATC and F&O will provide estimates for PCB and ACM remediation.**

1.

**Reconciling the remediation activity with the construction activity will be a challenge to address. Some materials may have absorbed PCBs, ceiling tile for instance. If WT is carrying ceiling demolition, and the remediation scope also carries that, we need to identify those overlaps.**

2.

**Estimate review will be conducted by all parties (design team, consultants, CM, and Owner). The BCOC will also assist in that process.**

2.

**Environmental consultants to provide remediation estimate by end of January**

3.

**Project team to analyze and report on revised cost estimates**

## 1.

**DN: When do we expect remediation and construction to begin?**  
**TP: There is the remediation and then the renovation. We all want to be sure that if we make this investment, that the facility will be fully functional (PCBs in air under 15 ng/cm). The pilot projects are our best way of ensuring that. If targets are hit, that will provide some assurance that we can do the same process throughout the facility. If not, we will have to do the next level of removal. So, first the pilot project will start in April or May at the earliest. I'd hope the district considers removing C building sooner rather than later. In the original scope, it was slated for demolition. That would simplify remediation efforts. E building could fall into the same category. It had been originally slated for swing space prior to demolition at an unspecified time in the future. It was never part of the main project. But if it were to be used as swing space it would require extensive remediation. DN: when will you understand the cost of demolition vs. remediation? TP: the pilot projects will hopefully provide us with that answer. June or July or even later. That is the big question. MS: even if we demo, the remediation will still need to happen to some extent. Martine Gulick (MG): how do we go about prioritizing the demolition of C? MS: put out an early bid package for that demolition and remediation. TP: yes, some time after the characterization is complete. DN: the cost of removing C would be good to have soon. TP: agreed. Generally costs don't go down, adding to the urgency.**

## 2.

**Other work that could be done ahead is potentially moving the gas line. DN: if C is coming down, it could be paired with the pilot projects, might have some savings there on general conditions etc. Tom Flanagan (TF): We still need to address BTC. Might seem weird to say we need space, and then demolish a building. MS: In either case, F is outside of the current design scope. TP: To TF & MS's point, F was largely taken out of the project. It had been limited to ADA upgrades but now will require more work.**

4.

Findings to be presented to BCOC for discussion at 2/18/21 BCOC meeting

2.

### BCOC Member Q&A

1.

**DN: what is the total SF of the renovation / construction? TP: The total campus is approximately 240,000sf currently, the end product will be approximately 270,000sf**

2.

**MG: It does feel as though we are in a holding pattern while we await test results. TP: Agreed. Once the PCB issue came to light, we started meeting weekly with the state agencies. We then added a technical meeting as well. We are now awaiting those results, and cancelled the next couple weeks of meetings. MG: and the state won't raise that 15 nanogram per cubic meter level? TP: No, they won't budge. TF: right. The agencies clearly indicated that is the number and it isn't moving. They do averaging in some cases. TP: The final number will determine the ongoing O&M requirements. DN: Is the 15ng/cm<sup>3</sup> threshold different for different uses? MS: That number is based on a teacher being in the building for 200 days a year, 9 hours a day, for 30 years. TF: bottom line is, we can't have levels above 15ng/cm<sup>3</sup> when this project is complete. DN: if that isn't achievable... could the facility be repurposed at all? TP: good thought. TF: big decisions to be made this summer. TP: I asked if the preliminary test results might give us a good indication, but no, there are too many variables. We won't know if it's possible to get the spaces below the threshold, until we do the pilot projects. TP: MS, I think we asked WT to include the demolition of E as an alternate correct? MS: yes. TP: And that would be a post abatement cost. So we'd have to add the cost of remediation prior to demolition. KS: Do we have the funding to do that now? NL: We do have a good deal of money from the bond. We took out about \$20m. TP: Technically the money is there for C, but E was not included in the project scope. NL: Right. Any new elements in the project will come at a cost somewhere else. I don't think there'd be an issue making E's demolition part of the scope.**



3.

TP: I've heard several people say they've had difficulty finding information about the project. Our webpage is full of information, but I wanted to ask the committee if you've experienced that or have ideas about how to make it more accessible. David Boehm (DB): Are all the meeting minutes posted? TP: Yes. MG: I think publishing the test results will be important, and maybe an explanatory memo. TP: Agreed, and previous test reports have been posted. DB: The DD estimate will be very important. TP: Yes, and how should we share that? It will be a large, data rich document. Do we just publish it, or make it more digestible? MG: Perhaps publish a high-level summary. MS: We'll have that estimate prior to the next BCOC? TP: Yes, and we should have time to review it ahead of time. DB: the public won't be interested in the detail, but what it means for how we move forward.

3.

#### Public comments and questions

1.

There were no members of the public in attendance.