**Carver Elementary School Building Committee**

**Monday, December 1, 2014**

**7:00 P.M.**

**Minutes of Meeting**

1. **Members Present:**  Liz Sorrell, Sarah Stearns, Dan Ryan, Heather Sepulveda, Richard Ward, John Cotter, Mike Milanoski, Ruby Maestas, Andrew Soliwoda, Peter Gray, John Delli Priscoli.
2. **OPM Present:**  Chad Crittenden, Walter Hartley, Chris Carroll.
3. **Members Absent:**  Dave Siedentopf, James O’Brien.
4. Chairman Dick Ward called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm**.**
5. **11-12-14 Meeting Minutes**

Discussion of meeting minutes of November 12, 2014.

Motion made by Dan Ryan and seconded by John Delli Priscoli to approve minutes of 11/12/14. Unanimous. John Cotter abstained as he was absent from last meeting. 8 for 0 against, 1 abstention. (9 voting members present tonight).

1. **Overview of Meeting Agenda**

Dick Ward gave an overview of the meeting agenda for the evening.

Liz suggested adding a section for comments from the public.

1. **Facts Session**

* Overview of pre MSBA Designer Selection Panel Meeting with Chairman, Superintendent, Town Administrator, and OPM and agreement on most qualified firm.

Chris Carroll gave an overview of the pre meeting on Monday, 11/1714 to discuss the applicants and educate the three voting members (Liz, Richard and Mike). Went through 8 packages and had a discussion on pros and cons of each firm. In the end, there was a split of 4 firms being more responsive than the other 4. Discussion of the meeting on 11/18/14 and what would occur. This meeting was to make sure the voting members were up to speed. Mike added that there were 4 firms that had more cons than positives. HMFH was most responsive on all points, Flansberg was 2nd, Design Partnerships 3rd, Tappe was 4th.

* 11/18/14 MSBA Designer Selection Panel Meeting Update and votes.

Chris explained the meeting, 9 from the MSBA board and 3 other members (Richard, Liz and Mike). They went through packages that firms submitted. Experience with MSBA of the firms was discussed. Went through all 8 firms, pros and cons of each, after each one they opened floor for discussion for comments. Chad added that they focused on number of architects (registered in MA) in each firm. Richard asked Chris to go down list of members of DSP. Liz added that the firms were present in the room but could not speak. Mike added that the Chairman was pretty clear they there was a desire to do interviews. Four firms will be interviewed. 30 minutes for each presentation. Chris added that each member submitted a vote sheet, and then the votes were tallied. Ruby asked Mr. Carroll why we are interviewing 4 instead of 3. Chris replied that two firms were close enough in votes. John Deli Priscoli asked what changed, he though HFHM was top choice. Liz replied that personally, after reviewing the packages the night before, decided HFMH was top. John reiterated his concern for solidarity is extremely important. We need to move forward in a timely manner. We can’t fail. He wants this group to be as united as possible.

Richard corrected himself, interviews will be held 12/9/14 not 1/9/15.

Heather asked if the designer will be chosen on 12/9/14. Mike Milanoski replied that yes and negotiations could then begin.

Richard Ward feels that a consensus will not be reached. There will be differences on the committee but asks for respect from all. We really need to get designer on board. With PMA and designer on board, we can then get moving.

Mike Milanoski feels it would be helpful for PMA to go over pros and cons of the top 4 firms. Committee is in agreement.

Design Partnerships: package was complete and detailed to Carver. They have experience with Carver. They have a 75 page renovation option. Cons: would due diligence be there as not having to look into new build. John Delli Priscoli asked about them downsizing. He suggested looking into their financial records. He feels there are cost and overhead issues; we really need to look into this.

Heather asked if we received financial statements. Chad replied no. They are a very large firm. John Delli Priscoli asked if there work was bonded like a contractor. Chad replied no. Liz added that MSBA has confidence in them. They will look into this during the interview process. John Cotter asked about financials. How will you make a decision? Chad added that if they don’t answer concisely, you can go back and hammer until we get an answer. Mike Milanoski is concerned if this committee comes back with renovation as #1 choice, with the same firm that it would be seen as a negative. He reiterated that our objective is to make sure we get majority of voters in town to approve this project.

Chris added that there are questions in your packets.

Flansberg: very strong school designer. Scored low in references. His concerns are with renovation. They have new team. He feels Flansberg is a solid choice; even though he had some bumps with them on the Rochester project.

Liz added that she liked them as a firm. What bothered her is that they paid no attention to what we had in our plan. They made no plan to look at our site.

Good reputation and very qualified.

Mike Milanoski added concerns over subs they have used before. Subs have now changed.

HMFH: PMA has worked very closely with them on several projects. Their designs can be a little quirky. They will design to our needs and desires. Chad’s experience with them in Hanover is that they are very fair and have a good reputation. Chis added that they had three of the most cost effective designs. Mike added that they have good community support with their projects. He also noted they have great sub-contractors.

John Deli Priscoli, asked thoughts on references? References were good. Renovations and new? They have done both.

Perkins-Will; new to Boston market. Very new to MSBA program. Lead architect is very experienced in Massachusetts. They did not have any current MSBA projects. They have 33 registered architects in Massachusetts. They lack public school experience.

John Delli Priscoli asked about the architect that moved to Perkins-Will from another firm with the experience. Chad added that no one else on staff has MSBA experience.

Liz added that their sub-contractors are good.

HFMH is under contract with Boston for a $250,000,000 project

John Cotter asked if any of these firms are too busy. Chad, replied that MSBA would know if they were too busy.

Dan Ryan spoke about the scoring sheet. Two firms stand at top. HMFM and Design Partnerships. What pros and cons put them so high at the top. Lower ranked ones had a minimal number of architects. Chad, one major factor is what Liz, Richard and Mike spoke about. Those two firms were specifically noted. Liz added that MSBA will rejudge at the next meeting.

Mike Milanoski has concern over having same firm as last time. MSBA stated they were surprised we didn’t bring that up. Mike wanted to make sure we had a unified front. Mike would like input from committee.

Liz highly favors Design Partnerships. Has had previous experience. They really listed to your needs. They are very knowledgeable. They want you to have what you want. She feels that having worked with Design Partnerships, she voted for them because she feels they will save us time and money.

Heather asked Liz, what if it is a new school build? Liz replied that there are feasibility plans for a new school. They came to the top for Liz, because she has experience with them. She can’t say anything bad about them. Liz knows what we need for the educational piece.

Richard Ward reminded the committee that everyone should be contributing at our committee meetings.

Chris Carroll spoke about the questions for the 4 firms. Q & A session after. As far as a unified voice, he anticipates that top two firms, doesn’t see a big upset occurring. Ruby, will there be an opportunity for discussion after interviews.

Mike Milanoski agrees with Liz that all four firms would be great.

John Delli Priscoli feels we should start with someone fresh. Feels we shouldn’t start with any negatives. This project just needs to get done.

John Cotter asked what is the role of this committee now? The three reps will go to DSP interviews. Richard Ward replied that committee should give their input.

Ruby – feels questions are huge. Financials are a big question. Some of the answers will have some candidates will rise to top. Educational program, wants to ensure we have an architect that will listen and support us.

Heather feels that once interviews are conducted, things could change. It is hard for her to have a top pick until interviews are complete. Doesn’t feel she could fairly judge at this point.

Andrew would like a fresh start. Financials are the unknown; goes with HFMH.

Peter stated that ultimately MSBA is our biggest funder. We are fortunate to have four great firms to choose from. They want us to be successful.

Sarah is pleased that MSBA is moving forward with interview process. Feels that it will be helpful. Feels will end up being between the top two firms. Understands both sides of committee. She just wants best firm for the job.

John Cotter-Design Partnerships and HFMH. Negatives with HFMH – concerned with school being built in Quincy. With Design Partnerships, he is concerned about possible negative impact from last time. Concerned about employees leaving there. He would go with HFMH.

John Delli Priscoli is concerned for the educational program that students have. He wants to see the best possible environment for teachers. Nothing that could derail this. We need to make sure whomever is picked is financially sound.

Dan Ryan feels confident with Design Partnerships and HFMH. Has the educational program changed since last time? Liz added the only thing that has changed is that we have added math intervention groups. Space environment hasn’t changed. Dan asked about Liz’ previous experience with Design Partnerships. She replied that it was excellent.

Dan is leaning to HFMH.

Ruby asked if these questions are given to the four firms prior to the meeting? Yes.

Mr. Ward asked for citizen input at this time.

Jay John, “this is my community”. He suggested going to those groups of people who don’t support this project and having discussions with them; rather than waiting for a vote to take place. This is not the same town as it was 8 years ago. New people, new groups. Different world now. There are people willing to fight for this.

Mrs. Caroline Todd is for this project 100%. Has a lot of friends that haven’t even set foot in this school. Has heard that everyone is worried about their taxes going very high. This project just needs to get done, as economically as possible.

Adam Holmes, educated here and is raising his children here. Comprehensive understanding of where we have been and where we are going is needed for the public. There is confusion and misinformation out there. Unified front=this needs to be happen on this committee. Asked about Perkins & Will? They have school experience elsewhere in the country; just not in Massachusetts. He feels they would be a great candidate.

Mike Milanoski, asking PMA, how are any of these architects going to take educational plan and work into their design? Chris replied that these are all MSBA guidelines (space summary). Their guidelines develop how much space will be reimbursed on.

Liz talked about cafeteria space. Last time, MSBA let us add a multipurpose room (and it would have been reimbursed).

Mike Milanoski. Still focused on educational plan. Designers need to go by MSBA rules. He feels any one of the designers could give us the best project. Wants least number of negatives on this project.

Liz Sorrell. Preschool and kindergarten classrooms require larger spaces than other grade levels. Different architect have different takes on how to utilize space (clusters of rooms). Clever ways to use stairways for small group gatherings. Feels anyone of the firms could do this as long as they listen to us. We need to listen to town.

Richard Ward. Whichever site, they both have possibility of new school. Plans we have are for a renovation. We paid 600,000 for these designs. Would any of these firms be able to use the designs that we already have. Chris feels that those plans could be utilized. Mike added that we paid for the plans, they are ours. He voted for HMFH #1and Design Partnerships #2. Still depends on how they present on the interviews.

* Vote to approve spokesperson for District on Designer Selection Panel. There will need to be side discussion during interviews, if it is allowed. If 2/3 vote for one firm, then all 3 will vote the same. This will prove our unified front.

Heather feels we need to ask them about the previous failed attempt. What would each of these firms do differently.

John Delli Priscoli asked about HMFH. They are involved in community. Will they make that point known in interview? Chad feels they will.

Sarah Stearns, people want to be involved. Feels we need a firm that will help with this.

2/3 vote, then all will vote the same on the 12/9 meeting.

* Updated Feasibility Timeline – PMA.

3/25/14

Entire feasibility package would need to be submitted by 2/12/15 to be able to make it to 3/24/15.

More reasonable would be to go to June 2015 meeting (submit package by 4/16/15).

Liz added that it is confusing to public when you choose your preferred option, but we don’t have a cost.

MSBA now reimburses up to $287/square foot.

Adam Holmes, when does this go to Town for vote? October, 2015 more than likely.

By March, we should know where the school will be built.

Heather asked if MSBA reevaluates the enrollment of the school. 750 + preschool space.

Liz feels we should stay with this number. Mike Milanoski agrees. We don’t need any more delays.

Richard Ward asked PMA to look at this for our next meeting. Chris cautioned that it could add time.

Discussion about preschool. Liz noted that we have to serve students 2.9 years old until the age of 22.

Next Meeting: 12/15/14 at 7 pm, IMC of the EKW Building.

Heather asked if an email could be sent out after the 12/9/14 meeting.

Motion made by Dan Ryan to adjourn meeting at 9:15 pm.

Seconded by John Cotter.

Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Yenulevich

Building Committee Recording Secretary

**Approved: 1/12/15**