**Carver Elementary School Building Committee Minutes**

**Tuesday, February 24, 2015**

**7:00 P.M.**

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

1. **Members Present:** Liz Sorrell, Andrew Soliwoda, Sarah Stearns, Mike Milanoski, Dan Ryan, Dave Siedentopf, Heather Sepulveda, John Cotter, Ruby Maestas, James O’Brien,
2. **Members Absent:** Peter Gray. John Delli Priscoli.
3. **OPM Present:** Walter Hartley, Chris Carroll.
4. **HMFM Present:** Matt LaRue, Laura Wernick.
5. **Others Present:** Kerry Agashe, Brie Wall, Caroline Todd, Sarah Hewins, Paula Foley, Kevin Tracey.
6. **Chair Dick Ward** called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm. He welcomed everyone. He notified the committee that HMFH is running about 30 minutes late tonight due to traffic. He presented an overview of tonight’s meeting.
7. **02-04-15 Meeting Minutes**.

These meetings need to be certified by this committee.

Amendment #1: Under PDP vote, Dan Ryan made motion to approve.

Mike Milanoski asked if there was discussion of number of classrooms under Space Summary Review. Liz replied that Laura did bring that up; we should go for 30 rather than the 27 that MSBA recommends.

Amendment #2: John Cotter, page 3, regarding model school not being an option because of the size. He asked it to be specific, what is the issue. Is it the education plan? What is the issue?

**Liz added that these minutes need to be certified.**

**Dan Ryan made a motion to approve with two amendments. Seconded by John Cotter. Unanimous vote, accepted minutes as amended.**

1. Chris Carroll showed slides to go with the meeting minutes from the MSBA’s Kick Off Meeting. Reviewed submissions and next steps for Town (feasibility phase requirements, schematic phase requirements, project schedule, overview of reimbursement and points, MSBA Pro Pay Update. Phone conferences to be held bi-weekly with MSBA to discuss progress and any issues.

Key upcoming dates: 3/2/15 SBC Meeting including selection of preferred schematic option; 3/25/15 preferred schematic option vote; 4/1/15 preliminary estimate to MSBA. 4/29 or 5/13: MSBA will invite us in to review project in front of Facilities Assessment Subcommittee; 6/3/15: MSBA Board approval to proceed into schematic design; 9/28/15: Schematic Design Submittal to MSBA; 11/18/15 MSBA will vote on project; 12/2/15: Town meeting vote on funding project.

Chris Carroll reviewed the reimbursement rate calculation process. 56.25% is our base reimbursement rate of eligible costs. Additional points are gained from: Model school, Regionalization (crossed out) Green program, best practices for routine and capital maintenance; overlay zoning (crossed out); Use of CM at Risk; Renovation/reuse of existing facilities; establish a maintenance trust.

Green Charrette will be held on March 6, 2015.

Chris Caroll asked if there were any questions.

Liz asked to confirm that our base rate will not change. Chris Carroll confirmed this. Plus additional incentive points.

Mike Milanoski asked if there is an opportunity to go back to reconsider points gained for routine and capital maintenance. What would we need to show to maximize the points? Chris replied that we will go back to review that with them. Liz added she feels that it was based on historical documents.

Mike Milanoski regarding maintenance trust, how would that comply with Town’s stabilization fund? Chris will review that and get back to us.

Richard Ward discussed model school program and what some of the problems were. If we chose model school, it may mean that the design company that originally designed that model school then could become our designers and not HMFM. Chris Carroll confirmed this. A transition to another architect would be needed. A two to three month delay would occur for MSBA to decide if it would fit on our site.

Mike Milanoski made an observation regarding model schools. It may not make much sense now; like it did three years ago.

PMA, HMFM, Richard Ward, Liz Sorrell and Mike Milanoski attended this kick off meeting along with two representatives from MSBA.

Dan Ryan asked if those 5 points for model school be redistributed to other areas? Mike responded that that question was asked. MSBA replied that everything was up for negotiation and discussion.

DR, move points to other categories to help us out?

Liz, weekly or biweekly conference calls to keep everyone in touch. More opportunities to ask questions and get answers.

Dan Ryan asked about base rate. Are we maximizing the points? Have we investigated further to get the base rate higher? Mike Milanoski replied that they are a pre-defined formula.

Laura confirmed that the base rate is predetermined; she doesn’t feel we will get any higher.

Liz added that Carver’s base rate is very high. Chris added that Somerville, Chelsea Quincy have higher rates. Liz added that Rockland’s base rate was same as ours.

Sarah Hewins, please speak into microphone so viewers at home can hear.

Design Program Update:

1. PDP submitted and under review with MSBA.
2. Existing well restrictions (new information).
3. Authorization to enter into agreement with Bennett Environmental for Public Water System (PWS work, relative to Mass DEP.

Cost Spreadsheet: Chris Carroll discussed this document. Four options that have been looked at up to this point.

Estimated Costs

 Potential Town Share

Option 1- Add/Reno at existing site: $63,152,631 $31,468,305

Option 2- New Construction at ES site: $57,434,378 $29,726,045

Option 3- New Construction at HS Field Site $60,082,867 $32,581,065

Option 4-New Construction at HS woods $59,724,547 $32,401,513

Dan asked what the site acreage difference is? Both sites at high school are similar in size. Both are significantly smaller than elementary site (22 ½ acres). High school sites are approximately 16 acres.

John Cotter asked about the technology allowance. Isn’t that in the capital plan Liz, yes, but this is for

Infrastructure

Heather asked, vote onproject 12/15 but building doesn’t start until November 2016? Could this be started any sooner? It is necessary for this. Heather asked, when would doors open? 18-24 months.

MM, asked about an early package. Chris Carroll added that this option could have us start building in September.

Dan Ryan summarized that option 2 is most cost effective for Town of Carver. Mike Milanoski reviewed DEP’s requirements for septic.

Mike Milanoski, baseline is Option 2, then Option 4. Option 3 is probably not feasible. Option 1 is the most expensive and takes a year longer to do. All option support academic plan.

The next meeting 3/2/15, a vote will take place on site.

James O’Brien discussed the lack of support from Police/Fire for the one campus site.

Dan Ryan, what was key item that was brought up?

Richard Ward, Chief of Police was opposed to have all on same campus.

Mike Milanoski added that the Police Chief was fairly strong about having two separate sites.

Dan Ryan, looking at long term.

John Cotter, EMS piece. Could we get a formal report from them. Richard replied that Laura asked Police Chief for this document. He has not submitted this as of yet. Mike Milanoski will work with him to get this document.

Laura, concerns about high school site. One was ongoing cost of WWTP. The other was concern expressed of future expansion of high school. Third concern was traffic issues.

Matt LaRue of HMFH discussed the Design Objectives:

Fulfill educational program.

Minimize construction costs.

Achieve optimal solar and wind orientation.

Provide separation of public/academic areas.

Mitigate perceived building size.

Maximize athletic fields.

Final building shape should look intentional.

MM, designed a building within MSBA guidelines? Should that be listed as a separate bullet. Matt feels that is included in the fulfill educational program.

Program Diagram:

Academic uses – 6 groupings of 6 classrooms, and 3 PK classrooms

Mike, asked about classrooms. Matt discussed square footage requirements from MSBA. Matt LaRue added that space can be shifted around. They are working with the MSBA’s guidelines for square footage. Laura discussed this. Allowances are suggested for different categories. For any given school, you are allowed to deviate from their room to room guidelines as long as you stay in their net square footage. Deviations will just need to be justified to MSBA. She doesn’t foresee any significant challenge from them.

John Cotter, asked about three classrooms? Cost for those? Laura replied that the square footage is not being changed. They are expecting Carver to use every square foot that they have allowed. They will not deny us, she feels.

Laura added that we are not exceeding MSBA’s square footage requirement. The guidelines are modified to meet their educational program.

Mike Milanoski, we have 30 classrooms right now? Yes

Dan Ryan, asked about the 39 classrooms. Matt, 1-5 classrooms=30 classrooms. All these classrooms are paid for? Yes.

Liz added that Kindergarten classrooms are not included because they have to be bigger. MSBA will not quiver about spaces.

Space allocation template

Liz talked about our intervention program and how this will work.

Matt added about specials: 2 art rooms and 2 music rooms; one library area; core spaces includes gym, cafeteria, kitchen, administration, custodial.

Classroom grouping option:

Grades should all be together. They looked at two story groupings.

Three story option

Preliminary Building/Site

Matt LaRue went over the four different options and briefly discussed the preliminary designs of all four options.

Option A – Addition/Renovation Option.

 Option B – New construction at current site. Two stories play space on southern side,

Option C – New construction at current site. Well to be moved? Three wings with grade groupings. Separates public spaces and academic spaces.

Option D- new construction at current site. Two stories, well would remain where it is. Academic space would be securable from public areas. Septic fields would need to be relocated.

Other options that they have started to look at:

Any questions?

Dan Ryan, asked if there are any safety concerns with three story vs. two story?

MM, is there cost advantage for three story vs. two story? Yes, roof and foundation are most costly.

John cotter, is there a negative to a 3story building? Matt replied that getting students around is the biggest.

Liz added that we have an ever growing population of physically disable children and getting them up three floors will be a challenge. Little people, little legs. They get tired going up and down.

Liz feels unless we have to build three stories, we shouldn’t

Ruby agrees with things that Liz just mentioned.

Ruby feels the time constraint on the students is a concern. If we could avoid a three story building, we should.

James O’Brien, in your experience, with elementary schools, two level or three level.

Chris replied that East Somerville and that was two stories.

Matt added that they have done three story elementary buildings. Space limitations.

Mike Milanoski, cost savings for different stories? PMA and HMFM would have to work on that. Next meeting, information will be brought

John Cotter. Multimedia center, what is that? Do we have one now/ Liz replied yes it is the IMC now. Contains books and technology features with work stations and small group learning spaces. Learning commons, IMC, multimedia center. Heart of the school.

Andrew Soliwoda, relocating wells or septic? Town pays for that correct? Those are excluded from reimbursement.

Mike Milanoski, page 11, 30 classrooms for grades 1-5. What classrooms do we have now? We have 6 per grade level except for grades 2 and 5. We have above 40 classrooms and that is not enough space. One room has been closed. Art is now on a cart.

Liz, what we truly need today and forever, we need 6 classrooms at each grade level. What we have now is not enough.

Workplan Update: slide was shown to the committee. Matt LaRue briefly reviewed this document.

Green Charrette will meet at the EKW building on Friday, 3/6/15 at 10:30 am.

Laura added that a decision will need to be made about add/reno or new.

1st and 3rd Mondays of month.

Next meeting is Monday, 3/2/15.

Heather asked if we really need the meeting on 3/2/15. Laura replied yes. They are still working on site options. They welcome our feedback.

James would like the time to think about these options.

What is scope of next meeting? To narrow down options.

Chris asked if we could meeting Tuesday, 3/10/15 with the intent on voting on Option 1 2 3 or 4.

Richard Ward asked if anyone was opposed to this? James will be late. Richard asked where will meeting take place? Town Hall is where the meeting will be.

Ruby asked about items 4, 5, 8 9 on Option 2 on the spreadsheet. Hazardous materials cost . Could that cost be potentially lower if we went with Option 2. Matt LaRue replied that abatement costs are necessary.

John cotter asked about base rate. Could we get a copy of that? MSBA rate reimbursement certificate was issued to us. MM will get that to John.

New Business:

Community Forums.

Heather created a Facebook page. She posts agendas for our meetings. A business has asked if they could do a fundraiser. If outside funding is received, MSBA will reduce

Before April 16, a community forum should be held.

James feels we need to establish the purpose of the meeting. We are not going to have answers to everything now.

Heather, could we do a Facebook poll, asking about their option choice. Laura feels that a face to face input from community is what MSBA wants. WE need to bring them up to date on the process.

Heather, communication person will meet with PMC or HMFM to discuss

Liz asked a clarifying question regarding Green Charette. Is this group still open to others? Matt replied yes.

Citizen Participation:

Sarah Hewins would like a clarification on Green Charrette? Is public allowed to attend to observe? Matt LaRue doesn’t feel there is a problem having observers there.

Questions, regarding construction process: Mr, Giliniskey

1. Has building design been determined? No
2. With regarding to well, reports were generated? Should be an easy process? Yes
3. Technology aspect, why wouldn’t they use Wi-Fi? Liz replied there will be wi fi.
4. Is there a cost per work day associated with construction? Not at this point.
5. Input from an RFI, construction company, funcationality different way to do it.
6. Richard Ward suggested asking questions to PMA or HFMH after meeting.
7. He discussed other ways of movning children around. (ie., ramps

Any other questions? Nob

Motion made by Dan Ryan to adjourn meeting at 9:30 and seconded by John Cotter.

Unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Yenulevich

Building Committee Recording Secretary