

Hollis School Board
Energy Study Work Group
Minutes
Thursday, June 23, 2016, 7:00 p.m.
Hollis Upper Elementary School

In attendance: Hollis School Board – Tammy Fareed, Rob Mann, Michelle St. John
Hollis Energy Committee – Venu Rao, Mike Leavitt
Consultants – Charlie Niebling, Dick Henry

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

Discussion addressed finalizing recommendations for the Scope of Work and Gantt Chart, which are Attachments A and B of the consultants' draft contract for the school energy project. Mr. Rao expressed concern about absence of a type of document he referred to as a Requirements Document. In his experience such a document describes the known parameters of a project and is created prior to the start of work. The current Scope of Work and Gantt chart make no mention of such documents. He explained that a requirements document should present the technical metrics of the project in its current, or status quo, state, as well as estimating performance with various modifications of the project, so that estimates and quotes can be compared as apples-to-apples. He said he had expected to see a requirements document for heating source vendors and for energy efficiency product vendors. He felt that to keep the project schedule moving in a timely way, the consultants could work to develop these documents concurrently with developing lists of potential vendors. He added that he had recommended Mr. Niebling and Mr. Henry as consultants to the school board because they are the best in their industry, but his years of experience as a project manager make him feel strongly about adding requirement documents into the scope of work agreement. It was agreed to discuss this concern with Mr. Niebling and Mr. Henry upon their arrival later in the meeting.

Mr. Niebling and Mr. Henry arrived at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Niebling submitted a Progress Report of work accomplished to date. He asked the committee to comment on the format of the report as well as any items in it. The report utilized the organizational format of the Scope of Work tables and was well-received. Mr. Mann asked that items of high priority for preparing the Public Forum in October should also be included in future progress reports.

Discussion moved on to Mr. Rao's concerns. Mr. Rao described his views on requirements documents. Mr. Leavitt asked how vendors would be given a consistent set of requirements as a basis for their estimates.

Mr. Henry and Mr. Niebling spoke of their experience developing energy projects. They asked if the requirements documents Mr. Rao recommends were intended to be highly technical, which they explained is not in their area of qualification. Mr. Rao stated his belief that most of the technical information needed could be found in the 2012 ASHRAE energy audit of the buildings. Mr. Niebling agreed that a great deal of valuable information is available in the energy audit, but there is an additional need for input from technical experts such as an engineer to create complete and updated

metrics of the project. Ms. Fareed noted these experts have been referenced since earliest conversations with Mr. Henry and Mr. Niebling, and they have been listed and budgeted in the Scope of Work plan from its first draft. Mr. Henry had stated they expect to utilize these experts less than had initially been envisioned when the project was first suggested to them. Ms. St. John stated her confidence in the overall planning to date.

Upon further discussion it was agreed that the consultants would prepare a Performance Document describing the status quo condition of the two school buildings as a baseline against which to compare different products that vendors might recommend. This document should list various measures that affect the buildings' performance, and vendors would be asked to submit estimates on how their products would perform in the current environment as well as what performance might be expected under certain modified conditions.

Mr. Henry stated that he would not be available until approximately July 4, after which he would draft the Performance Document as soon as possible. It was agreed that members of the group would meet with the consultants by phone for some of the follow-up work on technical matters. Mr. Niebling and Mr. Henry departed from the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Rao raised a concern that the Performance Document as described in the previous discussion only included building efficiency components. He felt strongly that there should be a similar document exclusively concerned with heat source systems.

Members voiced consideration for Mr. Rao's concerns, but also felt that the Performance Document would allow the consultants to meet the objectives Mr. Rao raised. Ms. Fareed offered to contact Mr. Niebling the following day to ensure Mr. Rao's views had been clearly understood.

The meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

Submitted by Tammy Fareed

June 27, 2016