**Carver Elementary School Building Committee**

**Minutes of Monday, March 23, 2015**

**CARVER TOWN HALL – SELECTMEN’S CHAMBERS**

(approved 4/9/15)

1. **OPM AND ARCHITECT Q&A SESSION (PRE-MEETING)** 6:00 P.M.
2. **Members Present:** Liz Sorrell, Richard Ward, Andrew Soliwoda, Sarah Stearns, Dan Ryan, Jon Delli Priscoli, Peter Gray, Dave Siedentopf, Heather Sepulveda, Mike Milanoski, John Cotter.
3. **Members Absent:** Ruby Maestas, James O’Brien.
4. **PMA Present:** Walter Hartley, Chris Carroll, Chad Crittenden.
5. **HMFH Present:** Devin Canton, Eric LaRue.
6. **Others Present:** Kerry Agashe, Jay John, Steve Pratt, Stephanie Gavin, Adam Holmes.
7. **Chair Dick Ward** called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

He then led the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. **03-10-15 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion made by Dan Ryan to approve minutes. Jon Delli Priscoli seconded motion.**

**Unanimously approved.**

1. **Overview of Meeting Agenda by Richard Ward.**
2. **General Updates (PMA)**

Chad Crittenden

PDP Feedback from MSBA. Generally the feedback was positive. Responses are due back by 3/30/15.

Well Investigations. JC Engineering has an executed agreement with the Town of Carver. Once the concept plan is complete, they will then meet. Mike Milanoski added information about his meeting with DEP last week. Abutting property owner Mike Paduch is willing to meet with us and possibly allow for an easement.

 Chad asked if there were any questions.

Richard Ward asked if the letter in packet was in reference to Carver’s PDP submittal to MSBA. Chad replied that yes, it is a response regarding the submitted PDP. Chad added that they are formulating responses and will submit to MSBA on 3/30/15. Chad reviewed the letter from MSBA with the committee. Liz has developed a very detailed response to educational plan questions. MSBA question topics included: Initial space summary – need more detail. Evaluation of existing conditions – geotechnical data at CMHS site that supports statement that soil there is unsuitable. Site development requirements – looking for site development and safety concerns addressed. Preliminary evaluation of alternates – the information is limited to; one renovation option, one new two-story option and one new three-story option. MSBA has also asked for a copy of the cost analysis of three options.

Dan Ryan asked about education program. Did this change drastically? Liz replied that she felt MSBA didn’t read it fully. Liz reviewed it thoroughly and has a good response to submit to them.

Chad feels a well-crafted letter to MSBA will resolve all the issues.

1. **Academic Plan Update (Liz Sorrell)**

Liz gave an overview of how students learn reading and mathematics currently at Carver Elementary School. All reading instruction is done in homeroom. In each grade, there are also two inclusion rooms. Small group instruction runs from 11 to 30 students in a regular classroom. They are at grade level or above grade level. 10 groups with 5-9 students for students who need a little more instruction. 5 intervention groups who meet for 30 minutes. That is the model that drives the spaces that we need.

Hallway- open plan building. There are no walls, just dividers that make hallway. Pod 4 has walls. Size of classroom can be modified by moving furniture. 6 classroom intervention groups (11 to 30 students). 16 small group interventions spaces with 5-9 students. Library has three small group areas for reading intervention. Simultaneously in grade 4, 75 minutes of math. Six math intervention groups meet in GJC cafeteria.

She feels MSBA didn’t understand this with the substandard building we have now. Her response includes pictures and charts and she feels this will answer their questions.

There are currently seven lunch blocks in each building. In a new building, we will go to three. This is described in detail in her response. Students travel to specials (art, music, physical education and IMC) daily. Preschool students also go to physical education and music.

This is the core our academic program. This program will be carried into a new building.

Sarah Stearns – is there ever an opportunity to have MSBA come and tour the school and see how intervention groups work. Liz replied that they could be invited. Richard Ward feels that if they don’t understand it, we should get them down here to see for themselves. Jon Delli Priscoli feels it is a great idea to invite them here.

1. **Conceptual Design Presentation by HMFH (Matt LaRue)**

There are five planning options to show the committee this evening.

Option A-Add/Reno – two floors

Option C1 – two story. New construction; on west side with new well.

Option C2-keep well where it is, build on east side of site. Challenges-not enough width. This would mean moving children to CMHS site temporarily. The existing septic system would need to be relocated. Same configuration as C1; two stories; early demo of one pod.

Discuss: 2 Stories vs. 3 Stories

Option E1 –new construction three stories on east side. Second floor would be for 2nd and 3rd graders. Third floor would be for 4th and 5th graders. Youngest children on first floor along with nurse, cafeteria. There is inefficiency built into stacking of floors. Over space requirements from MSBA.

Option E2 – new construction three stories on west side. Well would need to be moved. Pushes building up towards Main Street. He feels this offers the least desirability.

Matt asked if there were any questions about the five schemes.

Liz pointed out that the two story building supports the educational program most effectively.

John Cotter-in your experience, is there more savings by adding a floor? Chad replied that there is a savings (about 250,000). Matt added that in a two story, vertical egresses (stairs) are built more simply than in three story.

Mike Milanoski spoke about three story option. He is concerned with this option (E1/E2). Were all costs included in this scenario? Matt replied yes. E1 – music and art room on top of admin space? Do they need to be on first floor? Liz replied that music room needs to be adjacent to multi-purpose room. Materials for art, they would have to go up. Liz feels three stories for an elementary school is a bad idea. We have blind students and physically handicapped students. Jon Delli Priscoli spoke about three story building – we want it to look like it belongs here in the community. Feels any option that affects the day to day operation of the school is not a good idea. Dave Siedentopf added that operating and maintenance costs are cheaper for two stories vs. three.

1. **Schedule and Cost Review (PMA)**

Chad Crittenden showed a slide of five options and total project costs.

Option A $59.8 million

Option C1 $57.3 million

Option C2 $58.1 million

Option E1 $57.3 million

Option E2 $57.0 million

Sarah Stearns asked about option C2 which impacts the existing school structure of the Washburn building. Is there room in layout to continue to play around with space? Matt replied that this could be looked at if this is a desire. Liz replied that the pod that would need to be demolished is the smallest pod. It could be done by relocating preschool students and having art on a cart. Chad asked Liz about parking considerations. Liz added that the playground area could be shut down temporarily and use that for parking spaces. Mike Milanoski asked about C2. This is about $1million more than others. No flexibility without impacting this structure. He feels this option shouldn’t be on the table now. Dan Ryan, asked about PDP, looking at three distinct options.

C1, E2, Option A. JDP made a motion to just look at Renovation Option, C1 and C2. Dan Ryan seconded motion.

JDP amended motion, C1 as presented, E2 adjusted on site, Option A. Seconded by Dan Ryan.

Steve Pratt feels this is out of order according to agenda.

Richard Ward asked if the public had any comments.

Steve Pratt, 16 Weston Street. Concerned that where we are now is the same as we were six years ago. He doesn’t want us in the same situation we were in last time. Concerned about inflation costs. He feels this is $15-18 million more than it should be. Too much time has been spent on this, and he feels it needs to be done right this time. Let’s build a building with a price that is right for Carver. Heather Sepulveda hears his concerns. She asked what his suggestion is? He wants to know why it increased so much? Newburyport built a school for $35 million. Why can’t we do that? Is our educational program worth $20 million?

Jay John, South Meadow Road. Hears what Mr. Pratt is saying. We need to find an answer to give to the Town. We have to able to tell people why this increase is there. Answers should be given.

Chad Crittenden – costs of escalation since 2010. $45 million was construction only, did not include soft costs. Cost wise, we haven’t seen a cost increase since 2010. Estimator used a very low escalation cost of 1.5%. They are carrying 6% escalation costs.

Adam Holmes, 12 Leonard Street. Top priority for Town is the academic plan. Very impressed with the professionals and how they have handled the current building situation. He feels we are getting it right. He feels C1 is best option. We have right people working on this. Students and quality of education is what is top priority.

Jon Delli Priscoli added that the reality is that public construction is most expensive. Property values will increase, people will move here. This is the most important decision Carver is facing.

Mike Milanoski. We directed our consultants to include all costs. Credit to them for giving us full costs. These aren’t real costs; we still have value engineering to do. He is very proud of what this committee has accomplished. He added that all votes have been unanimous.

Dan Ryan discussed the increase in homeowner’s taxes. We have an obligation to manage costs for townspeople. He feels the committee should start to figure this out. Feels we need to focus on that.

Richard Ward feels this committee is very diverse and feels we are on right track. We can’t give an exact cost yet; but we will as soon as we can.

Jon Delli Priscoli added that home values will decrease if school is not built.

Amended motion. Unanimous vote by committee.

Sarah, any merit in discussion of E1 and E2. No.

**Chad Crittenden went over MSBA key dates slide.**

Thursday, April 9 – meeting to review the preferred Schematic Report.

Will be submitted to MSBA on Monday, 4/13/15 by PMA.

Meeting with MSBA on 4/29/15. Intent of meeting is to review package with full group before it goes to board.

JC Engineering meeting upcoming for PMA.

We are on track for June 3 Board meeting with MSBA.

Chad asked if there were any questions. They have a lot of information. He clarified Newburyport is a model school with an enrollment of 660.

John Cotter asked for a new comparison sheet so they can compare apples to apples.

Motion made by Dan Ryan to adjourn meeting at 8:45 pm. Seconded by Liz Sorrell.

Unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Yenulevich

Recording Secretary