

Livingston Board of Education

Oversight Committee



Representatives of the LBOE Oversight Committee

• Don Newell, PE

- Licensed mechanical engineer in NJ and Texas
- Certified energy manager
- LEED accredited professional
- NEBB certified testing, adjusting and balancing supervisor
- NEBB certified building systems commissioning administrator

• John Langdon, PE

- Licensed electrical engineer and licensed electrician
- Robert Emert, Jr., AIA
 - Licensed architect
- Edward Bier, PE
 - Licensed civil engineer in New York and New Jersey



Members of the LBOE Oversight Committee

Jack Ackerman Lisa Bayer Trudy Bier Mark Burack Scott Goldman Stanley Graboski Harvey Grossman Allan Hirschhorn

Marlene Laveman Bob Leopold Arthur Lowe Nick Pulitano Bernard Searle Yiren Wang Jason Wiseberg



Livingston H.S. Referendum Oversight Committee (OCOM) Rev. 1 Design Team response included in *blue and green italic text*

List of Comments from 60% Design Review

						Design Team Response			nses]		
Item	Priority	Cat.	Rev. 0 Item No.	Comment Description	OCOM Group	Date Posted	OK As-is No need to comment	Likely OK Need to Confirm	Requires Further Rev. Before Responding	Expected Date of Response	Urgency	y Impact
				i.e. lights, lighting controls. SEER values on DX systems, premium efficiency motors and upgraded insulation. The subsequent design alternatives are compared to the second design alternative for costing and efficiencies. These energy reductions are the basis for the Smart Start design incentives. The Smart Start Energy Simulation Report will be complete and available for review by mid-November. The LEED 2.2 template for EA Credit 1 (hard copy) would also be filled out for future submittal. Please note that the LEED documentation procedures have been dictated by the project team. Yee Engineering is maintaining a LEED 2.2 project file in our office. As MEPF activities are completed, the templates are updated (hardcopy) and saved there. All required documentation such as equipment cut sheets, invoices, etc. will be collected and saved in this file. The file will be turned over to DRG after our portion of the credits is completed.								
5	1	Music	5	For the Music Wing, did not see sound attenuation measures typically required in "quiet" environments. Due to the potential for mechanical (and other) noise in the new Music Wing, confirm that acoustical engineer has reviewed the current installation and ensured that concepts meet low sound pressure level requirements consistent with this application. Minimum concepts include ducted sound traps, low-speed ductwork, oversized fan wheels, properly selected outlets for low NC levels, suitable wall construction, vibration isolation, etc. Same issue in Auditorium (dwg. M2.9). The music room and auditorium will be analyzed for sound reduction. To perform Noise Criteria (NC) calculations the following are required for acoustical analysis: 60% Construction Documents; duct sizes.flow rates (cfm); unit sound power data in octave bands - inlet, discharge, radiated. After the analysis, proper sound attenuation measures will be included in the construction documents. Please note that the auditorium has an existing system of which the diffusers are being relocated to match the new ceiling layout.	HVAC	9-Oct					1	1
6	1	Misc.		Security Improvements are missing from plans. No visibility from main office to entry corridor. No doors to stop or slow visitors before being admitted by school personnel <i>Recommendation to Install vision glass on wall between main office and entry hall. Install doors at junction of "A" hall to contain visitors at the entry hall. Doors need to swing clear for morning and PM student traffic. LBOE will be handling the security via separate package for overall facility needs. Vision panels already scheduled as part of front entrance upgrades. DRG to provide additional design for second set of entry doors for Board's review and approval.</i>	EDU	9-Oct					1	1

Rev. 1

List of Comments from 60% Design Review

2

11

10

6-6-5

Comment Description Architectural Sample

A3.3- Arch window in greenhouse and matching blank panel look weak. This is an important elevation. Review and provide alternate design. *8. Arched window ties the new science wing in with the front entrance that is scheduled. Brick panel serves a function in that it provides additional wall space for upper cabs in prep room behind it. Design team will consult with science supervisor and consider. Complete design coordination prior to bid.*

347 System The relation property compared detections have startished writered supports with Automations of the

Comment Description HVAC Sample

Recommend providing CO2 based control of outside (ventilation) airflow in densely occupied spaces such as the new Gym. This new system would monitor CO2 levels (effected by occupants exhaling), and modulate the outside airflow based on the measured value. Believe this to be a no-brainer in many cases as outside airflow costs approx. \$4,000 per 1,000 CFM to condition each year. *CO2 sensors are planned for the auditorium, science wing and PE building. This is one of the design alternatives being analyzed in the Smart Start Energy Simulation Report..*

Comment Description

Educational Sample

Security improvements are missing from plans. No visibility from main office to entry corridor. No doors to stop or slow visitors before being admitted by school personnel. – *Recommendation to install vision glass on wall between main office and entry hall. Install doors at junction of "A" hall to contain visitors at the entry hall. Doors need to swing clear for morning and PM student traffic.. LBOE will be handling the security via separate package for overall facility needs. Vision panels already scheduled as part of front entrance upgrades. DRG to provide additional design for second set of entry doors for Board's review and approval..*

Date Printed: 11/7/2006 Time Printed: 11/7/2006

.

10

11

12

2

2