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Carver School Building Committee

Monday, May 19, 2014

Minutes of Meeting

1. Members Present: Mike Milanoski, Sarah Stearns, Barry Struski, Heather Sepulveda, Liz Sorrell, Ruby Maestas, Patrick Meagher, Ruby Maestas, Dave Siedentopf, James O’Brien, Dan Ryan, John Cotter, Jon Delli Priscoli
2. Members Absent: none.
3. Others Present: Andrew Soliwoda and Steve Pratt.
4. Meeting called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman Barry Struski. Barry discussed protocol about comments from public. As chairman, he will keep meeting flowing by following agenda. He would like more structure. Questions and thoughts should be written down and discussed at the end of the meeting. He would like to keep these meetings more organized.
5. Discussion of minutes of meeting of 5/5/14. Dan Ryan noted his edits. Heather Sepulveda made a correction. John Cotter motion to approve the minutes with changes, seconded by Dan Ryan. All in favor; unanimous.
6. Barry reiterated the structure of the upcoming meetings and reminded all audience members to save questions and comments to the end.
7. Barry Struski reviewed the agenda for the evening.
8. Communications. Heather Sepulveda.

May 9th – CCAT came to CES to make video. Editing will be done on May 21.

Heather discussed the Facebook page. Carver Elementary School Building Project is the new name.

Fact Sheet has been updated and distributed to all members. Heather gave an overview of the fact sheet.

Heather would like feedback from committee on updated fact sheet.

Sarah suggested adding to the photos what building they were taken in.

Ruby would like to see more pictures of classrooms.

Sarah suggested adding why we are working with MSBA. Liz suggested adding their website. Dan Ryan suggested referencing the Collins Report. Liz noted that it can be put on the school website. Mike Milanoski suggested adding information about local votes that will be taking place on July 30. A discussion took place regarding the photos. Barry suggested getting photos to correlate with numbers on fact sheet. Sarah suggested moving comments to under the photo. Barry thinks we should keep the summary page but then add comments to under the pictures.

Heather will update fact sheet.

Dan Ryan questioned if the estimates should be updated. Mike Milanoski suggested not to waste money. Patrick Meagher discussed what soft numbers are. These figures were done for the five year capital plan. These added up to $21 million in 2011. Mike Milanoski made a motion to have Dave update numbers. Seconded by Dan Ryan and Heather Sepulveda. Unanimous.

James suggested adding figures to 4 and 5 (windows and doors).

Heather gave an overview of changes that will be made. This is going to be presented at Town Meeting on 6/17. Dave will have updated figures by 6/2 meeting.

Jon Delli Priscoli noted he liked the fact sheet with all of the information.

1. Meeting with DEP.

Dave Siedentopf, Mike Milanoski and Robert Tinkham met at the DEP office with the Director, Deputy Director and Enforcement Officer on May 13, 2014. Dave went over the notes from that meeting.

The purpose for the meeting was to get input from DEP on our considerations for a possible new school building on one of two existing sites. The outcome of the meeting was that neither the existing ES site nor the HS/MS is absolutely prohibited by DEP from another building on each respective site at this point. What this means is both sites could potentially have a new ES built on their tracts of land. We already know a re-model of the existing ES buildings has been approved by DEP on environmental impacts. Engineered plans and their environmental impacts need to be presented to DEP for review and approval. Which site scenario works best for us as a district needs to be decided.

On the drinking water matters, at either site we can possibly add additional wells to form a well cluster. A clustered well group has less of a footprint (Zone 1, 2 impacts) than separate individual wells do; you are piggybacking on the radius of the existing well.

On the well water matters we will need to relocate our SAS (Soil Absorption System). We want it to be outside of the IWPA, if it’s not it will require more treatment, this equals more upfront and operational costs. The SAS can now be buried underground, as before with our present discharge field it is above ground. The new SAS field could be below a sports field for example. We are presently permitted for 30,000 GPD, this would probably cover an additional building on that site, however there are other factors that need to be investigated as well, DPW and Transportation may need to be tied into the plant also.

DEP will most likely be issuing us an ACO (Administrative Consent Order) in the near future. This translates into DEP will be looking for locking us into a date to have a plan of action in place that will meet the Groundwater Discharge Permit that they issue to us.

Engineers will have to go to DEP next to bring them what we are proposing.

Mike Milanoski noted that tying in DPW and Transportation, that wouldn’t be reimbursed by MSBA.

Sarah asked about the idea to cluster wells? Is this for both sites? Yes.

The next step would be to choose an engineer.

Mike Milanoski noted that the public needs to know we are being financially responsible. We should start to put together a scope of work. We should go out to bid.

Liz mentioned that this (prior work) would be reimbursed by MSBA as long as we are invited into the Capital Pipeline. We have a lot of information already. We need to know how much money to ask for.

Liz asked, what would be the harm with starting the RFP. This would be a small cost. We shouldn’t be sitting still.

Mike Milanoski thinks we need some clarification from MSBA. First order of business is procurement. Should we start a procurement/selection committee? This needs to be an open, transparent process.

Liz Sorrell noted that small studies don’t need to be procured. She thinks this is something we should be working on. Every day we are spending money on these 3 buildings and every day construction costs are rising. We have been studying the WWTP (Waste Water Treatment Plant) for about a year now and we have a lot of information.

Step 1 – Set up procurement committee.

Mike Milanoski stated that clarification is needed from MSBA. Right now, there is no project. Between now and when we are invited into Capital Pipeline, will they reimburse? Liz had a conversation with MSBA and yes we will be reimbursed. What about OPM? We should be thinking about OPM.

MSBA prefers us to not get OPM until July 30.

James asked if we could get the MSBA’s answer in writing. Liz confirmed that they would put their answer in writing.

Mr. Ward asked if we should be starting RFP and working out Procurement Process. Liz replied that we have a Procurement Process that we already follow.

Liz would like to be gathering information at this point. We need to come up with a figure to ask the Town for. An engineered study will help us get this information.

Mike Milanoski will propose to Selectmen that the $581,000 in Building Stabilization Fund should be split between school project and fire station project. This money would help us to jump start projects. We may not need all of the money. $290,000 for school and $290,000 for fire station. He again states that we should procure everything.

Feasibility and Schematic $850,000. Town meeting needs to approve the total amount. $101,000 is left in Schematic from first appropriation. Mike Milanoski doesn’t feel we need $850,000. Liz does not agree. She feels the $850,000 is the amount.

Community vote needed.

Liz noted that in order to get to MSBA’s July 30 meeting, we have to have full amount voted on. Liz was told monies spent would be reimbursed. Mike Milanoski stated that clarification from MSBA is needed.

Dan noted that there are unknowns. Liz will call MSBA and ask for clarification.

Mike Milanoski would like the responses in writing. Two questions: Will they pay for new work that’s done before July 30 before we are invited into Capital Pipeline? Where we are in process, with the funds we have, is $290,000 enough to get us through Feasibility and Schematics?

Feasibility is exploring your options.

Schematic is when you are only working on one option. This is very detailed.

In the meantime, we need to focus on the OPM. He feels this should be the focus for now. Module 2 goes over the OPM.

Mike Milanoski would like the committee to vote on procurement. Everything should be procured.

Mike Milanoski made a motion for a Procurement Committee. All activity from this committee will need to be procured. Competitive pricing for all elements of this project. Chairman will keep track of finances. Seconded by Richard Ward. Unanimous.

Sarah Stearns asked what the down side would be. Patrick Meagher replied that under $10,000 we do not need to go through procurement process. Under $25,000 could be done by email and phone calls. Over $25,000 would require three bids.

Barry Struski asked if we might suffer if we go with lowest bidder. Mike Milanoski replied that is does happen.

Patrick Meagher – Schematic Design. We have spent $500,000 on SD. This is a big issue.

The Town owns that $500,000 study. This will need to be changed no matter what. Any design/engineering firm would be able to use that. Patrick Meagher noted that the design is only good if we go with Option B3 here at Carver Elementary School site.

Liz believes the town’s people will not forget the $757,000 we have already spent.

James, are we doing Procurement Subcommittee? Heather nominated Dave Siedentopf, Sarah seconded. Unanimous. Liz nominated Assistant Superintendent. Seconded by Dan Ryan. Unanimous. Richard Ward nominated James O’Brien. Seconded by John Cotter. Unanimous. Richard Ward nominated Dan Ryan. Mike Milanoski seconded. Unanimous.

1st order of work – set up procedures, etc.

2nd OPM – scope of work

Mike Milanoski asked if we can we get someone from MSBA here? Liz said that we can ask. Mike Milanoski believes we should have questions in writing to submit to them.

Liz is still concerned about the amount of money we need to ask the Town for. Mike Milanoski replied that he will work on that administratively.

Questions need to go to MSBA this week.

Raise and appropriate? Or borrow?

Next deadline for MSBA is Thursday, August 7 or Wednesday, September 24

1. Brainstorm Questions to be answered regarding Site Selection. Sarah Stearns.

Get everything in one place…all questions.

? Where and how will we build school

? How we will figure out where to build

Mike Milanoski: 1) Water and Sewer question. 2) What is future of Middle High School? 3) When you start to look at connection of a 100 acre campus, can it be designed for both elementary and Middle High school at the same site? Older kids with younger kids.

Sarah Stearns stated that the big issue is a long term economically feasible plan.

Jon Delli Priscoli stated that whatever project we do, we need to get GMB (guaranteed maximum price). What is the true, real long term cost of running these buildings?

Emergency Management had a concern that this school is in zone…Middle High School is not in zone. The elementary school site is now a decontamination site for Emergency Management workers.

Parents, how will you keep kids separate? Traffic really worries parents.

Barry mentioned a past incident.

James mentioned a Resource Officer. One site would be beneficial.

Barry Struski asked what would happen if this position is eliminated in a few years?

Sarah noted the good points being made. There are arguments on both ideas.

MM, maybe these points should be weighted. This will help us focus on solutions for these issues.

“In the beginning phases.” Should be answer for questions asked to committee members.

Richard Ward suggested have a multi column document with this information included.

Richard Ward discussed the footings and foundation and that he spoke with someone regarding reusing these.

$60,000 to clear land at MHS.

Loss of education when you relocate kids.

Need to get a series of questions, and rate them. All questions should be emailed prior to next meeting to Sarah Stearns. Mr. Pratt has submitted a list of questions.

Consensus voting would work great.

B3 here (reno) New here New at Middle High School

DEP ruled out using the town water (well near library).

1. Who is Carver’s Contact for MSBA? Barry Struski replied that Liz is. Heather agreed that one person is the best way. Dan Ryan asked who the previous contact was? Liz was. John Deli Priscoli asked what the Town Administrator’s role is. Liz replied that most Superintendents are the contact.

Upcoming Dates and Reminders:

June 2 June 23 July 7

July 21 August 4 August 18

We will keep meetings as listed and we will reevaluate at a later date.

Barry Struski mentioned that John Cotter did some work to get a retired superintendent to come to one of these meetings. He was very open to come in to meet with us.

Any last minute thoughts…..John Cotter asked for Statement of Interest. It is on the School website.

Citizen input. Barry noted a five minute limit.

Steve Pratt.

1). Collins Center is on website of the Selectmen.

2) Water..why can’t we bring water from North Carver? He spoke to Jack Hunter. We should look into that now.

3). Encourages every member to become intimate with the MSBA website.

4). We have to be certain that when we go to the voters, we should have all the right information. We must have the right plan. A lot of time has been spent over the years. We can’t take the risk this time to do it wrong.

Richard Ward made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 pm.

Ruby Maestas seconded the motion. Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Yenulevich

Recording Secretary

Carver School Building Committee