

Meeting Minutes: Monomoy Regional Middle School Building Committee

Date & Time: June 15, 2026, 5:00 PM

Location: Hybrid: Monomoy Regional Middle School & Remote (via Google Meet)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 PM on June 15, 2026, by Co-Chair Ed McManus.

2. Attendance

- Members Present: Ed McManus (Co-Chair), Peter Troy (Co-Chair), Lisa Norcross, Emily Milan, Robert Stello, Eric Whiteley, Matt Barnes, David Whitcomb, Stephen Davol
- Members Absent: Richie Roy, Craig Gabri, Mark Kelleher, John Marsh
- Others Present: Matthew Kolva (Facilities Director, Monomoy Regional School District), Michael MacMillan (Business Manager, Monomoy Regional School District), Scott Carpenter (Superintendent, Monomoy Regional School District), Steve Watchorn (Designer, Raymond Design Associates), Molly Parris (Designer, Raymond Design Associates), Inga Knox (Owner's Project Manager, ECC), Seth Adams (GC Owner, Pearl), Tom Shevory (GC Project Manager, Pearl), Bill Baker (Clerk of the Works, ECC)
- Others Present Virtually: Robin Millen (Assistant Superintendent, Monomoy Regional School District)

3. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

4. Review and Approval of Prior Minutes

No prior minutes were discussed or approved during this session.

5. Agenda Item 1: Update on Siding and Window Project

- Project Status and Window Testing:
 - Following introductions, Ms. Inga Knox provided an update on the siding and window project's progress since the last committee meeting.
 - Two model windows have been fully prepared in line with the design and installation specifications, passing both vapor and water testing. One window was kept as a rough installation without trim, and one had a finished trim detail.
 - The project team has obtained a letter of acceptance from the window manufacturer confirming that the installation method is satisfactory for the windows that had been observed during their site visit. The manufacturer will continue to perform periodic site visits to review progress on newly installed windows. Minor punch list items remain and are addressed towards completion of the installation; these are typically cosmetic in nature. All major deficiencies, gaps, sealants or leveling items have to be addressed and corrected prior to the

window being accepted by the manufacturer and the OPM/Design team. To date, the manufacturer has not identified any fundamental issues that are integral to the installation.

- Mr. Steve Watchorn noted that while certain windows have been fully addressed and approved, other windows around the building have not yet passed inspection, and field reports with ongoing recommendations continue to be issued. He noted that the general contractor has been responsive to deficiencies identified by the Architect and OPM teams.
- Site Walk and Field Inspection:
 - Co-Chair Ed McManus directed the committee to transition to a localized physical walk-around to review two specific project areas rather than scanning the entire facility.
 - During the window inspection, Mr. Matt Barnes asked for confirmation that the inspected unit was installed to specification, which Mr. Watchorn confirmed.
 - Ms. Lisa Norcross inquired whether the flashing details originated from the manufacturer. Mr. Watchorn clarified that they were designed by Raymond Design Associates (RDA) in conjunction with the manufacturer, who warrants the installation based on that specific detail. Ms. Molly Parris highlighted the implementation of primary and secondary seals.
 - Mr. Robert Stello requested information regarding a black material visible on the assembly. Mr. Seth Adams explained that it is a liquid-reinforcing flashing utilized where numerous folds occur. Mr. Watchorn added that it is an expensive material specialized for corners and overlapping joints.
 - In response to queries from Ms. Norcross regarding field workflow, Mr. Adams described a sequenced process where selective demolition occurs before successive subcontractors perform their work.
 - Mr. Stello asked why certain windows required rework and pointed out a window that appeared half an inch out of alignment. Mr. Adams responded that early work commenced while design details were still being finalized. Mr. Watchorn confirmed the alignment issue would be addressed.
 - Mr. Bill Baker described the setting process for the windows. When Mr. Stello re-emphasized windows being out of alignment, Mr. Baker noted that installers are contending with structural discrepancies in the existing building. Mr. Watchorn affirmed that the installers are exerting substantial effort to correct existing building errors and ensure windows sit on the correct plane.
 - Regarding the testing of windows, Ms. Norcross asked what percentage would be tested. Ms. Parris said that although a specific percentage had not yet been determined, at least one of each type. Mr. Adams noted there are over 200 windows, and Ms. Parris clarified that while there are approximately 40 distinct technical window types, many contain similar features, and the differences are aesthetic; the team is identifying windows that have very different functional types to start with, as well as location within the building. While not every window will be tested to start, further testing may be warranted should any of the initially tested windows fail the test. The initial test is paid for by the Owner, any

subsequent tests that are due to failure are the responsibility of the general contractor and their subcontractor.

- Mr. David Whitcomb asked how the installation process is actively verified. Mr. Adams explained that internal checks occur continuously, supplemented by manufacturer spot checks every couple of weeks, continuous oversight by RDA and ECC, and a final punch listing. Mr. Baker noted that he has personally inspected roughly 50 windows installed thus far and has not yet needed to order corrective actions from Pearl. Mr. Watchorn added that designers remain on-site to provide immediate feedback.
- Exterior Siding and Details:
 - At the model window at the front of the building, Mr. Watchorn outlined a design modification implemented to give the exterior trim a clean, crisp finish. Co-Chair Peter Troy noted that the sealant is positioned behind the trim layout.
 - Ms. Norcross asked about the progression of the siding installation. Mr. Adams stated that siding is moving in waves to avoid pacing ahead of the window approvals.
 - Regarding scratches and blemishes on the siding and the painting of trim, Mr. Adams confirmed that ‘touch-up work,’ but will now proceed using Hardie color-matched caulking and nail head painting. Mr. Adams said that in large commercial projects, PVC trim is rarely painted, but suggested that the District could request a quote before deciding whether or not to paint all trim. Ms. Parris noted this approach reduces mildew risks.
 - Mr. Adams mentioned that a local Hardie representative has visited the site twice to review the quality of the installation.
 - Ms. Norcross also asked if all HVAC equipment was slated for replacement, and Mr. Adams clarified that the scope is limited to the louvers.
- Committee Review and Debate:
 - Upon returning from the site walk, Co-Chair McManus requested final comments regarding whether the reviewed model window was acceptable to move forward.
 - Co-Chair Troy expressed confidence that if all finished windows match the model, the project will meet standards. Mr. Eric Whiteley sought confirmation that six specific windows would be reset, which Mr. Adams verified.
 - Mr. Stello expressed lingering reservations regarding the overall timeline. Co-Chair Troy and Ms. Knox reassured the committee that any unacceptable windows or details will be fully corrected, recalling that the project had previously paused work to redirect the general contractor toward corrective action.
 - Ms. Norcross commented that because she had not previously seen the formal design details from RDA or the manufacturer, the uncompleted sections initially looked deficient. Ms. Parris and Mr. Watchorn confirmed that all subsequent windows will be verified by RDA and the ECC Clerk of the Works to match the design details and the approved mock-up standard. Ms. Knox added that full final approvals must be secured from RDA, ECC, the commissioning agent, and the manufacturer.
 - Mr. Whiteley questioned the necessity of a committee vote, suggesting that technical acceptance falls under the purview of the Owner's Project Manager and

the Architect. Co-Chair McManus noted that because the committee had previously raised explicit concerns, it was appropriate to act on the professional advice received to move the project forward. Ms. Knox clarified that a vote would not constitute final acceptance of the completed project, but rather authorizes the continuation of the work based on the established model standards. Mr. Whiteley requested that the motion be amended to reflect reliance on the advice of RDA and ECC.

Siding and Window Project Standard Authorization

Motion: Moved by Peter Troy to accept the in-progress and finished models as acceptable, amended by Eric Whiteley to state: Based upon the advice of Raymond Design Associates (RDA) and ECC, the Committee authorizes the General Contractor (Pearl) to continue with the siding and window project on the basis of the standard established by the two model windows viewed by the Committee. **Vote:** Approved. 8 in favor, 1 opposed (McManus-Yes; Troy-Yes; Norcross-Yes; Milan-Yes; Whiteley-Yes; Barnes-Yes; Whitcomb-Yes; Davol-Yes; Stello-No). *Opposing Discussion:* Mr. **Robert Stello** voted no, stating that the extensive time required to finalize an acceptable window standard indicated deficiencies or delays in the project management decision-making process.

6. New Business

None.

Adjournment

Motion: Moved by David Whitcomb, seconded by Matt Barnes, to adjourn the meeting. Vote: Approved Unanimously (9-0; All in favor).

Time of Adjournment: 6:16 PM

Minutes Prepared By: Michael MacMillan Minutes Approved On: