Carver Elementary School Building Committee

Monday, August 18, 2014

Minutes of Meting

1. Members Present: Liz Sorrell, John Cotter, Dave Siedentopf, James O’Brien, Richard Ward, Peter Grey, Heather Sepulveda, Sarah Stearns, Mike Milanoski, Dan Ryan.
2. Members Absent: Ruby Maestas, Jon Delli Priscoli and Barry Struski.
3. Others Present: Craig Weston, Bill Harriman, Tom Walsh, Scott Knief and Paula Foley.
4. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Sarah Stearns, vice chairperson. She thanked everyone for being here to kick off the feasibility phase of the project. She gave an overview of the agenda for tonight. She discussed the agenda for this evening’s meeting. She gave an overview of the panel discussion as well. Index cards are available for those members in the audience to jot down questions.
5. 7/21/14 minutes of meeting discussion. Motion made by Dan Ryan to approve minutes. Seconded by John Cotter for discussion purposes.

Mike Milanoski questioned why the panel discussion was being held tonight and not on 9/22/14. He assumed that Bill Harriman was presenting the OPM process for this evening. Agenda should be amended to have Bill Harriman go over the OPM process before the panel discussion.

All in favor of amended minutes. Unanimous. Liz Sorrell and John Cotter abstained as they were not present.

Sarah continued to discuss the agenda for the evening.

1. Richard Ward would like to have discussion before the meeting adjourns regarding communication between MSBA and SBC.
2. Overview of Meeting Agenda: Sarah Stearns introduced Bill Harriman. She thanked him for coming this evening. He just went through the OPM selection process with the Fire Department. Panel Discussion Members: Chief Marc Duphily, Chief Craig Weston, EMS Director Tom Walsh, Principal Scott Knief, Associate Principal Paula Foley. Facilitator: Sarah Stearns
3. OPM discussion with Bill Harriman. He discussed his life experiences in the Town of Carver. He was on the OPM Selection Process for the Fire Station Building Committee. He gave a handout. Process took two months. OPM is now created by statute. Projects in the state now require an OPM if the cost is over $1.5 million. Hiring an OPM is what needs to be done first. The OPM is the expert that will help get things done. He spoke with someone who built a fire station without an OPM. This person stated he will never do a project again without an OPM.
   1. April 10 was their first meeting. The committee was fully in favor to move forward this process. An RFP was developed (actually an RFQ – Request for Qualifications). May 8th went out to bid. It took a month to finalize the process. The OPM can do so much more than the building committee can. Daedalus caught their eye immediately. Best team. (OPM and designer). OPM guidelines were handed out to committee. The RFQ was published on wicked local Carver and the Central register on May 21 (has to be in there for 14 days). The form needs to be submitted two weeks ahead of time. Mandatory pre bid site visit; this is very important (he feels this is a critical step). Draw those interested in to see them. The Fire Station Building Committee made the site visit mandatory. He suggested there should be two site visits. RFP was due on June 4th. They were opened and distributed to committee members for their review. There was a scoring system that was used. They checked to make sure all of the required copies were there…made sure they had them all. Insurances were checked. Mass certification for Public Offices was also needed. Check off list was created specifically for this building project. June 12th meeting (members needed to review by this time). There were 12 proposals that needed to be scored. He suggested asking the applicants for their availability for an interview. The committee scheduled interviews that way. After six applicants were decided upon, interviews were set up. References were checked. They looked for references that these companies did work for, but not necessarily listed on reference sheet. Vote was taken on two final firms. Conference calls were conducted with principals of those firms and they were asked for a sealed enveloped with a price. On June 25th, proposals were received. Daedalus turned out to be the top end candidate after the process. The town administrator was given the directive to try and negotiate Daedalus as OPM for this project. On July 10th, they were welcomed as the OPM.

Reasons for Daedalus: They were OPM for a great fire station that was recently built. They had great references. They were just an OPM firm; that’s all they do. They had repeat customers. They are a mid sized firm. They have 26 employees. Their office is in Boston; their OPM lives in Carver. Their on-site representative lives in Plymouth. They were a good fit. They do in house cost estimates. All committee members felt comfortable with this company.

He encourages this committee to move forward and choose Daedalus as the Fire Station Building Committee did.

Mike Milanoski thanked Bill for giving the overview. He gave a background of why Bill Harriman was invited here. Daedalus was selected by the previous School Building Committee as OPM. He discussed a letter that was sent to MSBA on July 31, 2014 to re-engage Daedalus. As of 4:41 this evening, MSBA has reviewed the request. Because Carver withdrew from the former pipeline, they need us to re-procure the services of an OPM. The OPM is critical in facilitating this committee with this project. In a conference call with MSBA, they have given us two options. One is a game plan to get to a panel approval from MSBA on Monday, Nov. 3. The other option is that we could go in front of them with a final selection on October 6.

Dan Ryan asked for clarification; didn’t we vote at our last meeting that we were not going to go through the procurement process; we were going to go with Daedalus because we already had a contract with them. “Are you saying that we can’t do that?” Mr. Milanoski replied that the vote was subject to seeking guidance from MSBA and if they would allow us to do that.

Mr. Milanoski stated that this is a new project; we have to go out to procurement.

Dan Ryan asked if we would need to put out to proposal, collect all the applicants.

Mr. Ward added that if the meeting is going to take place on October 6th, the advertisement needs to be in the Central Register by tomorrow.

Mr. Milanoski clarified this. There are 6 items that need to be done:

1. Place advertisement in Central Register by tomorrow, 4 pm,

(needs to be in for 14 days).

2. MSBA has a standardized request for services (this is basically an RFP). We would need to review this and submit modifications. We would need to have a finalized RFS by 8/26.

3. Registry is published on 8/27.

4. Ad appears. The ad would need to stay published for two weeks. Closing date would be 9/10. This would be the date that we would receive proposals back.

5. 9 days given by MSBA for this committee to give them final recommendations ranking all of the applicants (Friday, 9/19/14).

6. The committee would then submit the selection to MSBA. The OPM panel meeting would take place on 10/6/14. On 10/6/14, they would hopefully concur with the final candidate. Price proposal would then be discussed in coordination with MSBA.

Mr. Milanoski stated that the above is the accelerated one. The non-accelerated one would mean we would do a similar process with different dates. It would end up on 11/3/14. When he spoke with MSBA today, he asked what could be done to expedite this process.

Dan Ryan asked if the committee needed a motion as to which set of dates we would follow.

Mr. Milanoski stated that before there is a motion, he is just presenting this information from MSBA.

He asked if anyone had any questions.

Liz asked if it was 9 business days or 9 calendar days. Mr. Milanoski replied calendar days.

Richard Ward stated that he feels we should go with the first set of dates.

Mr. Milanoski stated that this is a standardized process.

Dan Ryan made a motion to advertise for an OPM in Central Register tomorrow.

Seconded by Richard Ward.

Heather Sepulveda asked who puts the information together for the advertisement.

Mike Milanoski replied that there is a proposal for that as well.

After the phone call with MSBA, he came up with a way to move forward involving these three items:

1. The committee needs to be in agreement with RSP.
2. Preliminary screening to narrow it down to a short list.
3. Final interview of three candidates for the committee to make a selection from.

Mr. Milanoski summarized that he would, with the concurrence and the coordination of the Superintendent, work with Dave Siedentopf and Peter Gray to finalize ad for tomorrow and to finalize the RSP with MSBA. These are standard documents. This procedure will then be out of the way. We should then create a preliminary screening committee to work on 9/10, 9/11 and 9/12 to come up with three candidates. The full committee could then interview the final candidates. Then they could be ranked. Select final candidate and rank the other two.

He is proposing, for discussion purposes only, that selection committee will be himself, acting as facilitator, James O’Brien, Sarah Stearns, John Cotter and Dan Ryan.

Liz asked if we come into the process and can’t make the dates, could we go for the second date. Mike Milanoski replied absolutely.

Mr. Milanoski suggested that full committee could meet on 9/16 to interview the final three to five candidates.

Documents could then be submitted to MSBA on Friday, 9/19/14.

Dan Ryan made a motion to advertise in Central Register and firm up request for services (RFS). So moved.

Seconded by Richard Ward. Unanimously voted.

No further discussion.

Dan Ryan explained to the public what has been happening with OPM.

Mr. Harriman, given that the fire station is different than a school project, and you established criteria for the fire station, how would you rate the firm that you selected as far as school building projects based on the scoring criteria from your evaluation process. Do you see anything important in your process that would fit for both projects?

Mr. Harriman replied that they didn’t look at schools but that needs to be the focal point for this committee. Liz added that Daedalus has a large school clientele and they have built at least 6 schools on the south shore. Mr. O’Brien likes that Daedalus is just an OPM (not a design firm). Dan Ryan stated that we should incorporate some of the key scoring criteria that the FSBC used into the school project.

Dan Ryan thanked Bill Harriman for his presentation this evening.

Bill Harriman added that 2% of the total project for the OPM for fire station ($175,000).

Richard Ward asked about site visit. Did you just bring applicants to site? Bill Harriman replied that the OPMs were brought to the new site where Fire Station would be built so they can see what we are working with. Some chose to go to current fire station.

Heather Sepulveda thanked Bill Harriman on the behalf of the committee.

Dan Ryan asked how long have you been working with Daedalus. Bill looks forward to seeing what they have to offer during the next three days with the designer interviews.

Dan Ryan stated that if Bill Harriman any further concerns down the road to please let this committee know.

Bill Harriman told the committee that he will share everything he can with this committee. He wished the committee good luck.

Dave Siedentopf feels that the 10/6 deadline would be great. But feels this is super aggressive. He feels we shouldn’t rush into this. He will not be around 9/17, 18 & 19.

John Cotter had questions about time frame. Regarding the site selection; will we have the site for the OPM?

Dave Siedentopf replied that borings have been tested in the winter before.

Mike Milanoski stated that OPM should be person facilitating this information. Having the OPM on board soon is critical.

Liz Sorrell noted that some things have been done already at both sites. This data could be used.

1. Sarah Stearns suggested moving on to the questions for the panel. She introduced Police Chief Mark Duphily, Fire Chief Craig Weston, Safety Director Tom Walsh, Assistant Principal Paula Foley, and CMHS Principal Scott Knief.

Sarah gave an overview of the Q & A sheets. She spoke of the four proposed sites. She noted that these are working documents.

She asked for questions from the public and the committee members. She added that once we have an OPM in place, we will be able to narrow down the site. She went over some of the questions.

Compilation of questions of the four potential sites for the new Carver Elementary School (sites 1, 2, 3, 4).

Site 1: complete demo and rebuild at current campus

Site 2: new construction on this campus

Sites 3 and 4: new construction at CMHS site

Sites 1 and 2: not too many questions.

Craig Weston discussed height restrictions from a public safety aspect due to the lack of a ladder trucks. Without a ladder truck, the height of a new building cannot be more than 30 feet and 2 ½ stories, some areas are 40 feet and 3 stories. Their tallest ladder reaches 32 feet. His concern is that there is a reason and a method for height restrictions.

Index cards were handed out to public for their questions.

James O’Brien noted that we should focus on sites 3 & 4 first. These questions could be answered by those here tonight. Sarah agrees.

The first question asked was about having one resource officer to protect three schools on one campus. Chief Duphily replied that one would be better than what we have now. Just having someone in schools, even at random times would be great. Safety plan involves his entire staff not just safety officer. It would be nice to have two (one for younger and one for older students). He discussed a new gun control act that requires a school resource officer. This has been a goal he has been working on. Liz asked if there was a timeline on this. Chief Duphily discussed the timeline. Liz will pass the legislation onto the committee. James O’Brien reiterated that this committee is looking at four different sites. Is there a benefit to one campus as opposed to two separate schools? Chief Duphily doesn’t believe having two separate campus would affect police. Both campuses are relatively short distances from the station; he’s comfortable with either way.

Sarah Stearns discussed a concern from younger parents with younger children. All towns children on one campus…will there be interactions with younger and older children? Paula Foley replied that students are never without an adult, they are always supervised inside and outside of the building. There is no outdoor recess at CMHS. They wouldn’t be riding same buses. There is supervised outdoor recess at elementary level. Scott Knief discussed intern program…11 to 19 year olds enter the elementary building every day. It hasn’t been an issue. He believes it is actually a positive peer role model. He discussed the negative of language and attitude of older students. He doesn’t feel these are major issues. Mr. Knief asked would there be a negative impact, if an emergency occurred at CMHS campus, of having both schools at the same site? Mr. Walsh replied that the only incident that he would think of would be a hazardous waste emergency. Chief Weston feels the school building committee should have the new school where they think it is best. Emergency services will develop plans to meet the needs of the building. Safety requirements will need to be met.

James O’Brien asked if there is a benefit with having all on one campus? He feels there are a lot of benefits to being on one campus.

Mike Milanoski asked if Chief Weston and his department would provide input to the school building committee during this process. Chief Weston discussed how previous projects in town have worked involving all town departments.

Liz Sorrell noted that MSBA requires certification from town officials before the construction phases begins.

Questions from audience: (read from index cards)

When is this expected to go to town for voters again? Liz replied that in June, 2014, we went to Town Meeting to get funded for feasibility know that we might need to go back to ask for more money. The last phase is when we have agreed upon design and where to put it, project scope with MSBA, then the town goes back and votes for the project. Goes to Board of Selectmen first then goes to Town Meeting. Sarah Stearns asked Liz for an approximate time of when this vote would be. Liz replied that it takes 17 months for schematic design. Detailed design would need to be done. Liz estimated that the earliest for a vote would be April, 2016. She added that a brand new building would take 22 – 26 months to build.

If project is approved and built on this site, where would students go during construction? Liz replied that there are two proposals: renovate and demolish or new construction.

Liz replied that ideally they would stay here. Renovation at this site would mean phasing (children would be in both new and old portions). It is expensive to rent/buy trailers. The cost is entirely on the town, ideally, stay in place or phase.

Once ground is broken, 22 to 26 months.

James O’Brien asked about the phasing process and would 5th graders move to Middle school. Liz replied yes. They wouldn’t be integrated into MHS. They would have their own wing.

Sarah Stearns asked if any principals been through renovation project at schools? Scott was a teacher at CMHS during additions being added and he stated that went very smoothly. From a teacher perspective, the impacts were minimum.

What are plans for current elementary school, if location is moved to the high school? No answers for this yet.

How would students be evacuated in a timely, safe and effective manner? James O’Brien added that schools have evacuation plans. If the evacuation has to do with the Pilgrim Plant, Mr. Walsh’s department would be in charge of those plans. Tom Walsh replied that students from both schools would be evacuated in the event of a nuclear power plant disaster.

John Cotter asked bus schedules? Would students be on buses for unreasonable amount of time? He asked if there was a maximum of time students could be on a bus. Liz replied that special needs students shouldn’t be on buses for more than 45 minutes; although some are on for an hour due to traffic. She doesn’t feel being here or at CMHS would make a difference in bus schedules. She doesn’t think elementary and middle high school routes would ever be combined due to their different start times.

Sarah Stearns asked about parking lot safety, new high school drivers, will there by oversight programs put in place? Scott Knief feels that there will be separate entrances and separate parking lots. Presently, high school students exit out on Pond Street not main entrance.

Heather Sepulveda, how will CMHS stay in place impact elementary students if on same location? Chief Duphily replied same thing would happen as it is now; lock down where is needed. Paula Foley discussed the two building elementary school presently; if an event happens in one of the buildings, police tell us what to do. Depends on the nature of the event as well.

Has a mailer been considered to residents to gain more support? Indoor school photos should be linked to the U-tube video or have a virtual school tour. Liz replied that it is on website. Heather discussed how information has been distributed: fact sheets, Facebook, school website. There will be more newspaper articles. Liz replied that once a ballot is issued, school or town resources cannot be used for mailing of information to residents. Two groups govern this: Ethics Commission and Office of Campaign and Political Finance. Building committee meetings are videotaped and shown on Cable. She urged the residents if they think of any other way to get the information out, to please let us know.

Sarah Stearns thanked the audience for their questions.

Craig Weston mentioned that if we have any further questions to ask him. They can be more specific with their answers.

Sarah and the committee thanked the panel members for their time

1. Communications Report – Heather Sepulveda. Fact Sheet #2 includes mission statement (to partner with the MSBA to build a cost effective building in a timely manner, meet the educational needs for current and future students while being fully transparent to the community), what has happened over the summer, exploring four sites, upcoming meetings, helpful links. Heather suggested adding some of the questions and answers from tonight’s forum.

A discussion took place about upcoming meeting. The next meeting will be scheduled for 9/15/14.

Heather asked if there was anything else that anyone would like updated, added or changed on the fact sheet. One meeting at a time will be added to the fact sheet.

Mike Milanoski suggested adding about expediting the OPM process.

James O’Brien asked, are you going to pick questions and give some answers. Heather feels a highlight would be on the fact sheet. This would be a general message.

MSBA Board Meeting: Peter Gray, Michael Milanoski, Liz Sorrell and Sarah Stearns went to this board meeting on July 30th. Liz gave an overview of the meeting. Steve Grossman, State Treasurer chairs the meeting. The team from Carver was introduced and told them we had been here before, but we feel the town supports this now. We will be assigned a new project liaison. This person will help us through the feasibility stage.

Mike Milanoski stated that we are building an academic building. That’s what we are here to do; educate the kids and put them in the right building.

Signed feasibility docs have been distributed to committee members.

Richard Ward had a concern. He wants best message to come from here to MSBA. He went to model school in Newburyport. His concern is to make sure to communicate with MSBA with one voice. He is very concerned about this. James O’Brien feels there is a benefit with two collaborating. Heather added that she thought the committee already decided that the Superintendent would be the person to communicate with MSBA and that at times there would be a need for the Town Administrator to contact MSBA.

John Cotter noted that there is an educational component and a financial component.

Mike Milanoski added that Liz is the only person on this committee qualified to make educational decisions. The taxpayers are paying to build a structure around an academic building which the Board of Selectmen is in charge of that process. There are two different components of the project. He feels that he and the superintendent can professionally work out the lines of communication so that she takes the lead on the academic portion and he takes the lead on the financial portion. Through that whole process, the two of them are in sync so that when we go to MSBA with something from the committee, it is one message. There may be different opinions from them that may need to be shared with the committee but certainly information going out needs to be from one voice.

Heather Sepulveda asked if this is what happens in other towns. Who is the typical voice for a building project? What does MSBA say? Richard Ward replied that it varies between superintendents, town managers, town administrators, mayors. In Newburyport, the mayor is the voice. Liz feels it is a variety as well. It has been her experience, with the projects that she has been involved in, that superintendent has been liaison with MSBA. Except for finances and signing of contracts, the rest of the project is an educational decision. Liz doesn’t want to be left out of decisions that would affect the school.

Sarah Stearns feels that working as a team is a great idea.

Liz would like to be copied on all emails to and from MSBA.

Mike Milanoski reviewed the regulations of this committee. Purpose of this committee is to generally monitor the application process and to advise the Board of Selectmen during the construction of an approved project.

James O’Brien suggested a communication plan between Superintendent and Town Administrator that establishes clear guidelines of how this will move forward. We need to be collective and show that to MSBA. Both perspectives are essential.

Grant submission to Wastewater State Revolving Fund.

Dave Siedentopf. This needs to be addressed and upgraded due to the possibility of the elementary school being relocated to the high school. The waste water treatment plant at the high school is 27 years old and needs to be addressed and upgraded. Through a federal grant, there are now low interest loans for such projects. They have now engaged Chasey Engineering. They submitted grant on our befhalf to move forward with this project. Liz added that these grants are not offered every year. This was an economic opportunity that couldn’t be overlooked to save the Town some money.

1. Mike Milanoski suggested that once we receive applications for OPM on 9/10/14, we would create sub committee to narrow down to 3 to 5 finalists. Full committee could then interview finalists.

Other option would be for entire committee to meet to narrow down to 3 to 5 finalsits.

Heather would like to be on that screening committee. James would like to make sure this selection process go smoothly.

Motion by Richard Ward to form a subcommittee to work on 9/10, 9/11 & 9/12 to narrow down to a group that they feel could be submitted to the entire building committee.

Sarah asked who Mike suggested to be on the committee. He replied, James O’Brien, Sarah Stearns, John Cotter, Dan Ryan and Heather Sepulveda will be on screening committee. Mike Milanoski will be the facilitator as a non-voting member.

Seconded by Dan Ryan.

All in favor, unanimous.

1. Upcoming dates and meetings.

On 9/15/14, this committee will meet to conduct interviews. He suggested the committee should have another date available that week.

Mr. Ward asked Mr. Harriman when site visits should be done. Mr. Harriman suggested a week or so before the proposals are due.

Mike Milanoski suggested that the Building Committee meet on 9/15 & 9/16 at 7 pm to interview the finalists and to make a final decision. If a decision can’t be made, we could have one more meeting on 9/18. The decision will have to be in Boston on 9/19/14.

Kelly will post meetings.

9/10 & 9/11 subcommittee will meet at 6:30 pm.

Next meeting 9/15/14.

John Rogers will be present with a half-hour presentation.

Sarah Stearns asked if there were any other questions.

Steve Pratt, 16 Weston Street. He talked about the school that Mr. Ward visited (model school). Construction for this model took from April, 2013 to June, 2014 and the school will open in September, 2014. Conversely, option B3 would take 31 months for construction. Model schools are built faster. He really encourages the committee to look at the Model School Program.

He feels mistakes cannot be made. Correct information needs to go to MSBA. Everything needs to be right on mark.

Richard Ward agrees with Mr. Pratt that we need to visit a model school; just not right now.

Steve Pratt suggested visiting other schools nearby as well. Rockland and Easton are examples.

Liz Sorrell added that Carver is approved for 750 students (without the preschool students). Minimum school will be built for is 800 students. She also agrees we should look at a model school.

Sarah Stearns thanked everyone for their support while she was filling in for Barry Struski this evening.

Motion made by Liz Sorrell to adjourn meeting at 9:41 pm.

Seconded by John Cotter.

Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Yenulevich

Carver School Building Committee Recording Secretary