**Carver School Building Committee Agenda**

**Monday, August 31, 2015**

**7:00 pm**

**CARVER TOWN HALL – SELECTMEN’S CHAMBERS – Approved 9/10/15**

Members Present: Liz Sorrell, Heather Sepulveda, Richard Ward, Sarah Stearns, Michael Milanoski, Ruby Maestas, Peter Gray, Dan Ryan, John Cotter, Dave Siedentopf, James O’Brien, Andrew Soliwoda,

Members Absent: Jon Delli Priscoli.

HMFH Present: Devin Canton, Laura Wernick.

PMA Present: Chad Crittenden, Chris Carroll, Walter Hartley.

Others Present: Stephanie Gavin, Adam Holmes, Scott Knief, Paula Foley, Kerry Agashe.

1. Chairman Richard Ward called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Mr. Ward then led the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Discussion of minutes from meeting of 8/17/15. Dan Ryan made a motion to approve. John Cotter second. Unanimous vote. Heather Sepulveda abstained as she was absent at this meeting. Dan Ryan asked if all motions made be underlined and bolded in future minutes.
2. Mr. Ward gave a brief overview of the agenda for this evening.
3. Chad spoke about a recent security meeting that was held last week. Schematic design was issued to estimators on 8/24/15. A draft VE (value engineering) option list was provided to estimators. PMA Design review is 50% complete at this time. MSBA funding scenarios have been developed. JC Engineering is working on WS-13 application to DEP. Still waiting for a response from Mass Historical. Estimate reconciliation meeting is scheduled for 9/10/15.
4. HMFH Design Update. Devin discussed the security meeting that was held last week. Plans were shown to the committee. Location of video cameras was shown to the committee. Placement of cameras is around perimeter of building; to ensure that all of entrances are covered. The interior of building; security cameras are in main hallways. The level of access for doors: the main entry doors will have a buzzer system to allow you into the building to the security desk. All of the main entry doors have intercom system along with key pad and key card entries. In the building, during an emergency event, all classrooms will have lockdown hardware. Teachers will be able to secure each room. Each wing has doors that can close automatically in the event of an emergency. Small rooms in corridors also have emergency lockdown hardware. The meeting was quite positive. Dan Ryan asked if doors locked both ways. Devin replied that you can get out just can’t get in. Laura added that the 6 kindergarten classrooms have direct access to the outdoors. John Cotter asked about camera system. How long is data stored for? Devin replied that there is discussion about storing it on the cloud. The current design calls for it to be stored for 45 days; but looking at storing it for longer. Liz added that we will be storing this off site. John Cotter asked about motion detectors for site lighting. Devin replied that exterior lights are not connected to motion sensors. Police will provide any additional light they need once they are on site, this was discussed at the security meeting.
5. Construction Procurement Options. Chad talked about CM at Risk (Construction manager at risk). This is a qualification based selection. This person comes on board in the end of the design phase. You have ability to negotiate the total “GMP” contract value with them; you don’t necessarily need to take the lowest bid. Advantage: open book accounting system. Chris added that they are more collaborative, there is a cost to this. DBB (Design, Bid, Build). When packet is complete, bids can be put out there. First, filed sub contractors are pre-screened; sealed bids; bids are then published; once you have bids, then you put out solicitation for General Contractor. Site work, concrete, steel, general trades; these are not filed bids. GC is responsible for soliciting those. GC is going for competitive prices; this is the major difference between GC and CM at Risk. 6-10% lower cost with GC. With a GC the oversight component is more critical. Sealed, low bid environment; not as many budget moves at the district’s level. Chad gave an overview of Chapter 149; lowest responsive bidder must be accepted. With CM at risk, early packages can be done more easily. With CM, contractor is based on qualification; don’t need to pick lowest bidder. With CM at risk, MSBA will audit contracts at a more detailed level since they are open book, possibly resulting in additional ineligible costs and a higher district share. Chad added that this is becoming more common. Chris Carroll noted that CM at risk could assist with phasing; not needed here. CM at risk is good for schedule critical projects. Chris noted that one of the key items of this project is cost; CM at risk could be up to 10% for this project. Richard Ward asked if we were in a pretty concise schedule. Chad noted that we have a definitive window; not many variables; early packages might add time. Dan Ryan asked if there were any projects that should have gone the other way. Chad added that his last three projects had CM at risk. He spoke about a school that had a fire and needed to get emergency procurement. They could have saved a few million dollars by going with a GC. He would have recommended GC for that project. Hanover High School was his last project with GC; $9 million savings. Chad feels his Clerk would be able to handle this project as a c. 149 without difficulty. Chad recommends to this committee to go with a GC. Richard asked HMFH for their recommendation. Laura added they agree with PMA. Mike Milanoski added that the Fire Station Building Committee has a GC and the project has come under budget. Mike feels a GC would be fine. Dave Siedentopf has concerns; there are quite a few logistics. Two schools will still need to operate while building. MSBA does give an additional point for reimbursement if you go with CM at risk. Change orders would be a cost to the Town. If we had CM at Risk, they rectify the situation. Chris added that owner directed changes, designer errors and unforeseen conditions would be added cost. John Cotter, what happens when CM at risk has to pay out of pocket? Where does money come from? PMA replied that it comes from their company’s fee. John also asked if there are any savings, does that go back to Town? Chad, replied that it would get returned to the owner. John Cotter asked if CM at risk focuses more on union contracts. Chad replied that both GC and CM would be required to pay prevailing wages, but CMs are often signatory to union carpenters and laborers. Laura added that anyone who wants to bid on the project has to submit their qualifications; they check references. Sarah asked if that included the GC? Yes. James added that CM at risk is adding an extra level of protection. Do you come under budget with CM at Risk, he asked. PMA has seen both. Mike added that our OPM’s clerk of works is on site every day. Chad feels with a GC, the project will cost less for the Town. John Cotter asked about CM, open book financials. Could we with that with GC? Chad replied that there will be a schedule of values. Don’t see the little details with GC. Change orders come to Building Committee to sign off? Mike replied that they will have to go to Selectmen for any change orders. Dan Ryan made a motion to accept GC, second by James O’Brien. 9 yes, 1 no.
6. VE Process. Chad showed a slide to the committee with a list of items that could be reduced in cost. This list needs to have decisions made by this committee. At our next meeting, we will go through the list line by line to get a target savings value. Liz asked, when we have costs, we need an option to prioritize. Anything that affects the program we need to look at. We really need to protect the Educational Program. Ruby asked how was the list generated? Laura replied that this is something they do regularly with projects. They look for things that can be simplified or altered so they don’t impact quality of building. Mike asked if this list would expand. Chad replied that this list is complete. Mike spoke about running ten percent over budget with fire station. They tested items. Liz added that we don’t know total cost yet; she feels we need to discuss the total budget before we discuss the list. We should get community input once we have the total budget. Chris feels VE will need to be done regardless of the outcome of the estimates. Richard Ward, will we know how much taxes will increase? Mike replied that we won’t know that until December 18. At the next meeting on September 8, we will have the first estimate for this project. Heather asked about estimates that we will get next week. Could we come up with estimate for homeowner’s taxes increase? Liz asked if we could get the list with the numbers to send out to committee. Mike replied that the approved budget will go to BOS then MSBA; John asked if once the bids come in, we will be going over this list again? Laura said, after design development and another cost estimate and another reconciliation; construction document phase then begins. Cost estimating and value engineering. Next summer we should have 100% construction. Dan asked if construction costs are climbing. What is the trend? Chad feels escalation is at 4 – 6 %.
7. MSBA Form 3011 Budget. A document was shown to the committee. This gets submitted to MSBA. Chad explained how this form is used. Estimated costs column, ineligible column. We are aiming for 59% reimbursement rate. Mike added that this chart is focused on eligible costs. There is a column for ineligible costs. Furniture and technology $2400 per student x 750 students= $1.8 million (this is the maximum).
8. Next Steps:

9/10/15 SBC Meeting at 7:30 pm (review estimates and approve VM options).

9/17/15 Schematic Estimates/Budget Due to MSBA.

10/1/15 Schematic Design submittal to MSBA.

10/14 or 28, feasibility assessment subcommittee

11/18/15 MSBA Board of Approval of Schematic Design.

\*12/1/15 Special Town Meeting, 6 pm.

\*12/19/15 Ballot Vote for New Elementary School Debt Exclusion.

\*these two dates need to be confirmed by BOS.

A discussion was held about the 12/19 date. Liz feels 12/12 would be best. This committee will continue to discuss this.

Community Outreach meeting was held last week. Heather met on 8/24/15 with subcommittee. The subcommittee is putting together a slide show that could be presented to different dynamics of people. Notes from this meeting will be sent to the committee. This presentation still needs to be finalized.

Public Comments.

Adam Holmes had questions. VE, how are these line items incorporated into budget and why do they need to be voted on before. Chris replied that this committee will go through list and make adjustments. What’s the harm in including these in budget? Chad replied, the number that is submitted is the number that is voted on in the ballot in December.

Chad replied to Adam that they will continue to try to drive numbers down.

Adam wanted to know how that process worked.

Dan Ryan added that taxes will go up. We need to be sensitive to affordability.

Adam added that as a parent he has spent a lot of time here. He wants to be able to get the correct information out to community. That is very important. He feels we need to be transparent and let the community know that these numbers may change. He added that numbers are being shared in papers. Mike clarified that the only numbers that were in papers were numbers from PMA in early spring. Order of magnitude of numbers. The second round of numbers will be coming next week. Don’t share numbers until finalized.

Dan Ryan noted that this could be discussed at public forms.

Richard Ward spoke about a letter from Chance Court resident. They are concerned that their concerns have been overlooked. They want action within ten days. They are asking for a stockade fence. Richard feels this is an inexpensive remedy. Michael feels we should add it to value engineering list.

A motion was made by Dan Ryan to adjourn meeting at 9:40 pm. Second by James O’Brien

Unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Yenulevich

Recording Secretary

Carver School Building Committee