

Memorial Town Hall, 1 Library Street, Georgetown, MA 01833

Ph. (978) 352-5755 Fax (978) 352-5727

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING MINUTES

Memorial Town Hall

7/23/12

7:00 PM – General Meeting

3rd Floor Meeting Room

Selectmen Present: C. David Surface, Chairman; Philip Trapani; Gary Fowler, Clerk; Stephen Smith; Stuart M. Egenberg

Others Present: Michael Farrell, Town Administrator; Beverly Enos, Town Moderator

Absent:

Call to Order

Mr. Surface called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

Pledge of Allegiance

Warrant & Minutes

Warrant to be signed

Mr. Trapani moved to approve the *Minutes of July 9, 2012*. Mr. Egenberg seconded the motion and the motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

Board Business

Discussion to set date for Special Fall Town Meeting

Mr. Farrell stated that the Town Accountant is confident the DOR will have the Town's free cash certified in time for a meeting to be held at the end of October. He recommended the STM to be held on Monday October 29th.

Mr. Surface asked Ms. Enos if that date would work for her. Ms. Enos stated that it would. He asked if there are any issues with October 29th, it will be before the election and we should be able to have our free cash certified.

Mr. Trapani moved to set the fall special town meeting on Monday, October 29, 2012 at 7:00pm. Mr. Egenberg seconded the motion and the motion was approved by a unanimous vote and the motion was approved by 5-0 vote.

Mr. Surface asked if we have a close date For the STM Warrant yet. Mr. Farrell stated that the last day to post the STM warrant would be October 15th. He stated that the board can just open the warrant sometime in September and it will only need to be open for a couple of weeks.

Discussion on the condition of Elm St Mr. Durkee was present

Mr. Surface stated that hypothetically if we were to build the new school we had some concerns and there has been some discussion around what would have to be done, if anything, to Elm Street as a result of the school. There is some scope and funds in the existing budget for some improvements.

Mr. Durkee stated that DRA put aside \$300,000. I don't think it was for water, maybe for the road that goes up to Penn Brook, I don't know what on Elm St. it would be able to take care of because I know that new emergency exit, there won't be any water coming off of that, that's already in the plan and when they do a building like this, no water can come off the property. So, they're going to fix the road going up now and no water will come off the other end. He stated in the plan he is having done Elm Street was rated at a 65 from 0-100 so it's not the best road but it's not the worst. What they planned on or what they would recommend for that road is to rehabilitate it consisting of a mill and overlay and there is one crossover pipe that would have to be replaced before they did that. The other thing that I would recommend is the sidewalk is definitely in need of repair. People have talked about the light at the end of East Main and Elm St. There is conduit underground for a traffic signal out there and I got a real rough estimate today of what it will cost to put a traffic light there. It would be \$140,000 and that light would work just like Winter St. It would be 24/7 it would be a working light all the time just like Winter St.

Mr. Surface stated that taking a look at that, what about the piping and if we're going to repave the road, is there piping underneath it to be replaced? Mr. Durkee stated that there is one pipe that I noticed on the East Main Street end that definitely needs to be replaced. He stated that he can do that in-house.

Mr. Surface asked based on a rating of 65, when would you repair the road. Mr. Durkee stated that he has not gotten back the information from the study. They usually do a 5 year plan on what roads need to be paved or rehabbed, or crack sealing, etc. He stated that if they plan on building the school, it would definitely be a good idea to use some of that money toward sidewalk repair and some of it maybe toward a traffic light at the end of Elm Street. Mr. Surface stated that it would make sense to do the paving at the end of construction. He stated that the road may be a 65 today but after the construction; it may be ranked quite lower.

Mr. Durkee stated that he feels the road is okay for now. He stated that it definitely needs some repairs in the future. Mr. Surface asked would that be a part of your normal plan or would it be because of the new school. Mr. Durkee stated that there is definitely going to be more people walking to that area and I try to do safety items first. Mr. Surface stated that in his estimation, we could essentially repave that whole street with the Federal dollars we get as part of our normal Chapter 90 funds. Mr. Durkee stated that their estimate now is I think \$187,000 to repave that road, to mill and overlay.

Mr. Smith stated that I don't know anything about the traffic signals. Is there not a way you can program it because it's a lower end traffic signal. Mr. Durkee stated that it is a

code reason that it has to work 24/7. It can't be just on between say 7:30 – 9:00. It has to be working 24/7 just like Winter St. If somebody comes out of Winter Street it knows there is somebody there, the light changes to Green so that car can go on to East Main St. So East Main St. is red until a car approaches, so it will work the same as that except on Elm St.

Mr. Surface stated that he's running through some numbers so I can come up with a total here. If we did a traffic light, it's \$140,000 the paving is at about \$187,000. In your estimation Pete, sidewalks and the pipes, how much do you think we would need?

Mr. Durkee stated that it wouldn't cost anything for the pipes; it's the sidewalk that would be expensive. We have to raise some area of road up and even lower some areas. So it would be re-grading and some areas may need some curbing. Mr. Surface asked for a rough number. Mr. Durkee stated that it's a lot more expensive that people think. I think I figured at one time \$5,000 would go from Library St. to the Post Office just paving. I know Elm St. is much longer than that. I would say easily \$50 - \$75,000.00 to do the sidewalk on that road.

Mr. Durkee stated that it depends if we can use some curbing that we have left over from other projects or if we have to with new curbing. He stated that he can find out if we can get on the TIP but the funds would be years away. The school is at least 3 or 4 years away if it's approved now. Mr. Surface stated that maybe we could get to that 3 -5 year bucket. Just adding it up, we're looking at about \$345,000. Mr. Durkee stated that if we have that \$300,000 to put toward it, that would be great and we could use Ch. 90 funds. Mr. Surface stated that this is assuming we're going to put the light in. Is there a real need for that? I think that's another discussion, we're just talking about that one issue. We were under the impression we were talking in the millions to do what really needs to be done.

Mr. Durkee stated that he got a price from an Engineer to engineer Elm Street over that was around over \$300,000 and he figured about over \$750,000 to do the road over. That's from soup to nuts, sidewalks, drainage, everything. I don't know how the engineering company for DRA is going to get that water to go uphill. It should have had drainage when they first opened the school. A lot of water comes from that hill. So, they've got to put catch basins in and it's got to go some place. Whether they get an easement and it goes across over into the wetlands but it's going to need retention areas.

Mr. Surface stated that your quick estimate is about \$425,000 and you've got an Engineer who tells you it's over a million. Mr. Durkee stated that the larger amount is to reclaim the road, new drainage from end to end, and a traffic light, reconfigure the Central St. entrance. He stated that right now you can come off Central St. doing 50 on to Elm Street we would make it so you'd have to slow down and turn right.

Mr. Surface stated that there is a big difference there. I want to look at doing Elm St. the right way rather than just a band-aid so; I think we need to make a determination. Is the

million dollar number the way we want to go? Any questions for Mr. Durkee from the Board?

Mr. Trapani stated that there is no curbing on Elm Street at all. Mr. Durkee stated that near the East Main Street end there is a little; maybe about 100 ft. So, it's not like we need curbing on that whole road. There is a grass area in between some of the roads so you don't need curbing there. Mr. Trapani stated that we are going to have younger kids there. And we're going to have 40% more traffic, I'm estimating on the numbers based on additional people going in there. I walk that a lot and it's a very dangerous road for an adult to walk on when cars are flying on that. I would hope that we're planning on doing curbing on that entire road. He stated that the other thing is the entrance at Nelson Street and Central Street there's a lot of work there to reconfigure.

Mr. Durkee stated that there is because you don't want people to go from Elm Street over to East Street and I would make Nelson Street a T-Intersection. If we ever do Nelson Street over, we'll remove that and make that a T-Intersection so people have to slow down before they turn. He stated that Nunan's was down there today cleaning up the islands. We removed some things so you could see better, but it needs to come to a T-Intersection there.

Mr. Trapani asked if there is an expectation that we're going to have a traffic study done. Because I have this feeling if you add a light down at one end of Elm St. and it's really going to back traffic up. People are going to try to go out the other end. Are we going to need a light on the other end as well? Mr. Surface stated that we really have to go back to what the experts have to say and take a look at it.

Mr. Durkee stated that he remembers the study that DRA did on Elm St. He stated that they can't just do a study of Penn Brook School, they have to do a study of all the schools and the needs of the whole town and Elm St. is part of that.

Mr. Surface stated that he'd like to open up a discussion, make our Board aware, make everybody aware that it's not just a school it's the surrounding infrastructure as well and that is obviously why we've called you into help us out with this and try to get a handle on it. At least be aware, we're looking at a number between; if we did it without going to the experts about \$425,000 or we're looking at right over a million dollars, I think that's a decision we have to make. But, at least we are aware of it. The neighbors are going to be impacted obviously, if the new school happens, and we want to make sure that we take care of that street.

Mr. Trapani stated that he is not sure who he is asking this question to but the question I have to Mike and Peter and the Board is when and how are we going to actually get that expert opinion on Elm Street?

Mr. Surface stated that he thinks its part of the whole discussion. I know we've scheduled a meeting for Thursday with the school committee and we're going to hear from the architects again tonight. I think we have to make it all at once, make sure we understand

what really needs to be done so I would say sooner rather than later; again, all contingent upon the school passing and we go ahead with the project. Immediately thereafter, we should; I think at Town Meeting, we should put aside dollars for that study.

Mr. Trapani stated that only thing he is worried about is the unintended consequence of not putting that together before the voting on the school. Mr. Surface stated that maybe Mr. Durkee can share with us the existing number that he has for us. The one for a million dollars, as we said, was prepared by ...

Mr. Durkee stated that he asked an architect for an estimate on how much it would be for him to do Elm Street from end to end. He said \$300,000 for engineering but then another \$750K to do the work.

Mr. Trapani stated that what he is saying here is, if we don't have the answers to some of these questions at the Town Meeting we're going to get hit by; are we going to have to spend a million and a ½ extra, or not. I want to have those answers. Mr. Durkee stated that he knows DRA has a traffic study and I believe I got them some numbers for traffic counts and I'm almost positive there was a traffic count done in the Spring if not, last fall.

Mr. Surface stated that we will ask them again. Again, the purpose of this was to get this out in the open and address how to make this part of the whole project. We certainly don't want to neglect this infrastructure. That's why I asked Peter come in because there have been some questions revolving around Elm St. Alright, we have a meeting with the school committee, like I said, on Thursday.

Mr. Fowler asked Mr. Durkee that on the rough estimate that he got, would any of that also include the water pipes and/or drainage? Mr. Durkee stated drainage, yes, water, no. He stated that there is either an 8 or 10 inch main on Elm Street and going up to the school. Mr. Durkee stated that they did a flow test this past week but he did not know the results.

Mr. Surface asked if there were any other questions for Mr. Durkee.

Mr. Egenberg stated that he is trying not to take this too far over the horizon but, if we were going to re-do that entire street, would we want to consider sewer lines. Mr. Durkee stated that his feelings about sewage are we would have to have our plant in town to have a sewage plant. He stated that most of the houses in town have septic systems and they all pass. The problem we have is the downtown area; does everybody in town want to have their tax money going toward sewage for the businesses in the center of town. Mr. Egenberg stated that he is just trying to look over the horizon and think if we were going to spend a lot of money to re-do that road do we want to build some infrastructure for it and that's a huge question.

Mr. Fowler stated that there are a lot of historical homes in this area and would want to keep it looking historical they may want to talk with the Historical Commission. Mr. Durkee stated that they will try to keep the road as is with new paving and sidewalks.

Mr. Fowler stated that he does not want to run the cost of things up but you really don't want to not think of things.

Mr. Surface stated that this is a valid point. He stated that we have to start with the school committee meeting first, I think then we go from there. See if they have appropriated it at all; see what that \$300,000 entails.

Discussion on the tree removal near the Civil War Monument

Mr. Surface asked if Mr. Durkee was here to represent the committee on the civil war monument and tree.

Mr. Durkee stated that they do not plan on doing anything with that until we meet with the veterans and show them a plan they agree on. Then we'll bring it to the historic and the Park and Recreation; and they agree on it. Then we come to the Selectmen and they agree on it and then we'll go ahead and do some work. Mr. Surface stated that we still haven't come to a decision? Mr. Durkee stated that they have a rough plan and we're working on where we're going to get money. We're thinking that at the fall town meeting to see if there is leftover money from Harry Murch Park and put it towards this so we can finish. But, it would be a plan that everybody agrees on and then we can go in there and do the work. We would like to do the work before Veterans Day. So, if we're going to take the tree down where else are we going to put a tree? There are a couple of areas I have looked at. One is at the end of Elm St. and East Main St. back behind the sidewalk. We can put a Christmas tree there. The other place is between Johnny's and Napa. They have a dwarf variety so it doesn't grow too high and we would be able to put lights on it and not bring a bucket truck in to put lights on it.

Mr. Trapani stated that this will satisfy the folks, if we cut the tree down, we'd put another tree of the same sustainability. Mr. Durkee stated that the park and rec has given us permission to take the tree down. But, it's still got to go through the Selectmen so I haven't pushed anything.

Discussion and vote for placing a debt exclusion question on the State Ballot for November 6, 2012.

Mr. Surface stated lets talk about the ballot question, for the special town meeting warrant. He stated he would turn this over to Mr. Farrell. Mr. Farrell stated that this is the required language by statute. The only thing the town can put in is the general purpose. The state statute dictates the language of this warrant article with the exception of the purpose and this was reviewed by town legal counsel, the MSBA counsel, and bond counsel. So, the purpose as stated here requires the Town to pay for the bond issue in order to finance the design, construction and original equipment of a new elementary school building including the cost of incidental or related thereto. For instance, the Elm Street work that Peter was talking to, that could be included into, it's not to be reimbursed but it makes sense to put everything in need in this bond article, for the amount although as you heard Peter say, we're somewhere between \$400,000 and a million dollars so, it would be nice to have a little more certainty. The ballot question, as you noticed, doesn't have a dollar figure. It's not required to or it's not allowed to have a dollar figure. The

dollar figure is voted on at the Town meeting or the Special Town meeting. That's why I included samples of an article and a motion. These 2 have been reviewed by legal counsel and they are probably as close to final as it's going to get, you just fill in the dollar amount. But, you don't have to make that decision until sometime in September. It's a simple, as you see, a yes/no question and what the vote would be tonight is to place this ballot question on the state general election in November and we would need to certify the vote and send it to the Secretary of State's office who is in charge of putting it together. This must be done by August 1st, so we're right on schedule.

Mr. Surface stated that there are going to be additional ballot questions on this ballot.

Mr. Farrell stated yes, you're voting for President, but there are also going to be state questions.

Mr. Surface stated that there are three ballot questions would ours be last, first, this is something you may not be able to answer tonight. Mr. Farrell stated he did not know.

Mr. Farrell stated that to adopt this, it needs a 2/3 majority vote by the Board of Selectmen; and in this case it would need 4 yes's to be put on the ballot, 5 is perfect.

Mr. Fowler stated that we can send this to the State without filling in the dollar amounts. Is that what you're saying? Mr. Farrell stated that you cannot put in a dollar amount.

Mr. Farrell stated that this is just what goes to the State. He stated that the dollar amount does not go to the State it goes before Town meeting.

Mr. Surface stated yes. If the yes is successful, then we move to the next step. If it's a no, we don't consider anymore.

Mr. Farrell stated that you can still do it, but it won't be on this ballot. You'd have to call another special town meeting. Have another election which would mean you'd have to wait until spring.

Mr. Egenberg stated the ballot question is for the November election and this motion is for the article for the town meeting. If it doesn't pass town meeting, it's not going to hit the ballot. Mr. Farrell stated that it will be on the ballot, because the ballot is being printed August 1st. Mr. Egenberg stated that if it does not pass at Town Meeting then it's null and void. Mr. Farrell stated not necessarily if it passes on one and doesn't pass on the other you can hold another election or meeting within 9 months of the first vote. Mr. Surface stated that the question has to pass both.

Mr. Surface stated that he would entertain a motion to approve the language as presented for the fall 2012 election and place it on the state ballot as follows:

QUESTION 1

Shall the Town of Georgetown be allowed to exempt from the provisions of proposition two and one-half, so-called, the amounts required to pay the for the bond issued in order to finance the design, construction and original equipping of a new elementary school building, including costs incidental or related thereto?

_____ Yes _____ No

Mr. Smith moved to place the debt exclusion question “*Shall the Town of Georgetown be allowed to exempt from the provisions of proposition two and one-half, so-called, the amounts required to pay the for the bond issued in order to finance the design, construction and original equipping of a new elementary school building, including costs incidental or related thereto?*” on the state ballot for the November 6, 2012 election. Mr. Trapani seconded the motion and the motion was approved by a 4 -1 vote.

Presentation from DRA regarding the Pennbrook School Feasibility Study
Carl Franceschi, DRA and Pat Saitta, MBC were present.

Mr. Surface asked DRA to come up and give a brief presentation on the school. He stated that the board has some specific questions about Elm Street.

Mr. Franceschi stated we’re moving along in the process. We’re approaching one of the milestones in the school construction process with the State, which is known as the schematic design. It’s a time when we establish the so-called scope and budget of the project. First, to your agreement and then to the state the school building authorities’ agreement at their upcoming October 3rd Board Meeting. In order to get on that agenda for October 3rd, the district needs to make a submission to the MSBA by August 8th. We’re here tonight for an informational presentation first to show you the status of things. The school building committee is going to be meeting tomorrow night and reviewing not only the design but the budget as well. Then Thursday there will be a joint meeting of your committee and school committee looking for your support at that time officially. The design has developed and evolved pretty consistently with what we showed you earlier of this preferred alternative. When we went through a series of options, should we renovate the school, should we add on, should we build new, if we build new, where it should be, should it be on the field, should it be in the woods. The current teacher parking lot will be recycled, if you will, as part of the new parking lot. This is the footprint (a t-shaped building) we’ve tried to site the building in such a way that significant areas of existing trees will remain there. Particularly as you approach from this direction, you will see a clump of trees here and a clump of trees there, you’ll get a glimpse of the school. The approach is to come around here to get to the school so it will still feel much like a school in the woods; which sort of inspired the whole theme of the school. Hopefully, the aspect of nature and the environment gets in with the curriculum as well. It’s going to be a green school, all schools these days that get funded by the MSBA are required to be green to a certain extent. We’re going to take it beyond that to hopefully get you two additional reimbursement points from the MSBA which will help your economic situation of being able to afford the whole project. As we say, the idea was to minimize the clearing and the grading that will be needed for the school,

preserve large areas of the existing trees. The existing school will be removed/demolished and replaced with a green field, overlapping soccer fields, and existing green fields. The scope of the project right now, basically the start of it at Elm St. driveway but there is very little work here or on the existing fields. The work really starts to the wooded portion of this site beyond or starting with the parking lot and over into the wooded area. These fields will remain as is through this project that's the approach, and the development of the new school will include not only the driveway to get there, but two parking lots. One on the North side and one on the South side of the school and some visitor parking right by the front door. You can see how it nicely separates the traffic which is a major issue at this school today. We've carried that through here to develop it further. There will be play areas adjacent to the school, both hard surface areas and these colored areas will be rubberized play areas where you can have climbing surfaces and so forth and nowadays instead of wood mulch, we recommend having a cushioned rubber surface so that's what is indicated here. There are other play areas here where you can see in the vicinity of the school itself, there are no grass play fields, those are over here. So, we're trying to minimize the clearing to what's needed for the school and the related parking and get the play areas for recess time over there. The larger play fields will be on the footprint of the existing school. One of the other things that will happen as part of this project is a new septic system will be put in partly because the proposed school is much larger than the existing. The regulations have changed since the time the existing school was built and also the existing field is right here which is kind of limited and in an area that will be affected by the construction, so a new septic field will be put in behind what's now the existing school play area. It's not an existing field, soccer field or baseball field, it's just a green grass area right there. And then we would pump the septic from the proposed building into the new school area. Another part of the project is taking part of the water line which currently serves to not only extending to this school but looping it around the school and continuing it back out onto Elm St. down this portion of land that the town owns so that there is good flow in the water and it's a preferred arrangement as opposed to having the long end of the water line coming into the site. Now we have many more options off of this road and traffic will not be as congested there; but this right of way here is actually town property. It's sort of a logging road although the grading is a little bit up and down and it's fairly narrow with stonewalls and such – it's not really a road but it can be a path and it can be an emergency exit. Not only would it be an emergency access it could be a pedestrian access too for the people who live in this vicinity. They don't even think about walking here but if there were a more direct route to the school and there might be a few more students who could walk to school safely. We're thinking long term and we'd like to be able to encourage as many students to walk to school and reduce the numbers that have to be driven to school. So that's the basic site plan layout.

Mr. Smith asked if it is in the budget the removal and leveling of the existing framework for the field.

Mr. Franceschi stated that this is a turn-key project in the sense that the budget includes not only building of the new school, demolishing the old school, creating these fields,

fully furnishing the new school with desks and chairs and computers and things as well, so in that sense, it's a turn-key project.

Mr. Egenberg asked if it also include the septic and the water line.

Mr. Franceschi stated that it includes all the utilities on site. We haven't really discussed beyond the driveway anything on Elm St. for the school, there is no utility work needed from Elm Street. He stated that they can pick up the utilities that are on site. We will be making a connection to the water line there. So the utility work is basically extending the existing gas, water, electrical. And the driveway is already as wide as it can be and it already has a sidewalk. We will be continuing the sidewalk into the school but basically all the work for the project is onsite here as part of the project and as Mr. Farrell mentioned, some things, even out here on the street, to put in a cross walk and a handicap curb on the other side of the street, the MSBA looks at that really tightly and says that's beyond the property of the school and they start to exclude some things like that from being eligible. Certainly if we went up or down the street which you would put in your own budget, the MSBA would exclude those from being eligible for reimbursement.

Mr. Surface stated before Mr. Franceschi arrived we had a discussion with Mr. Durkee because we wanted to get the discussion going on the impact to Elm St. and what we would need to do as far as improvements to Elm St. As far as within the school budget, in the entire scope and budget it was about \$300,000.

Mr. Franceschi stated that we carried what's called an allowance. We had identified specific work but for your own use, I don't know if we're still planning on that.

Mr. Saitta stated that we are planning on carrying that allowance of \$300,000, not knowing what it's for but a place holder. MSBA won't participate but it's in the overall budget.

Mr. Surface stated that we were looking to put up a separate budget for what we felt would be needed for Elm St. So far we've got a number between \$425,000 and a little over a million.

Mr. Franceschi asked if this included signaling.

Mr. Surface stated that it includes lights, repaving, and sidewalks. The full number is a complete re-do. But that \$300,000 could be used for other items or is it just for Elm St.

Mr. Saitta stated that the \$300,000.00 in the budget as a placeholder; it can be used any place, but it's not going to be reimbursed because we're over the 8% cap.

Mr. Surface asked if the funds are designated just for site work. Mr. Saitta stated yes.

Mr. Franceschi stated that this is sort of off the MSBA's balance sheet, if you appropriate it; it's up to your discretion.

Mr. Surface stated that the board knows we're on our own if we want to do anything.

Mr. Trapani stated that we certainly know that it's not our money matched in any way. There is about \$300,000.00 we're putting aside as part of this. The question that I've been asking is who is giving the expert opinion what needs to happen on Elm St. based on the additional volume that's going to be on that street from a vehicle standpoint and a pedestrian standpoint. And who's giving the expert opinion on whether or not we do traffic signals on one end on two ends or on zero ends.

Mr. Franceschi stated that they have not included this in their scope.

Mr. Trapani stated that when we get to town meeting and we're looking at number x and we don't have the answers if there is an additional \$300,000 or \$1 million that we need on top of this. I just want to have some way to answer that.

Mr. Surface stated that the issue right now is there is no money appropriated for the feasibility study, if you want to call it that, or engineering study for Elm St. When we do the debt exclusion that day are we open ended on the bond where we can add to it based on where we figure out what's next with Elm St. So, it's like where the MSBA wanted us to look at the high school, the Schools gave them a number, but there is no money appropriated for it. We're in the same boat where Elm Street is concerned. We can only go by Mr. Durkee's opinion at this point.

Mr. Fowler stated that at some point we talked about a traffic study. Wasn't there a traffic study done previously and are we allowed to carry that study over. Was that why we didn't do one this time?

Ms. Sinkewicz stated that we weren't required to do one at this time because of the location of the building but we still have the results from the previous traffic study.

Mr. Fowler stated that the traffic study wasn't a K-6 study.

Ms. Sinkewicz stated that a traffic study is just to study the patterns of the road, but you're right, the approach to the school would have been different if there were more classes.

Mr. Fowler stated that we have that traffic study at least we do have something.

Mr. Egenberg asked how old is that study was. Mr. Saitta stated that the moratorium was 2004 – 2006; when they opened in 2006.

Mr. Smith stated that they can only study on what's existing so they could only do 2-5 regardless and it's only an indicator. We'd have to extrapolate because you can only study what's there; but it hasn't significantly changed since then in a good way anyway.

Mr. Trapani stated that he does not know if that's possible, if we have 35% more traffic on that road and if we put street lights at the end which we're talking about on one end, how is that going to impact the other end and we're not professionals on this.

Mr. Smith stated that with a traffic study you can only look at what exists.

Mr. Trapani stated that you can, but you can at motion study to see the capacity and if you can add to that road. He stated that he made a commitment to the folks on Elm St. that we are doing everything we can to make sure there are no ill-intended consequences and I just don't have that confidence that I can say that to them. I don't know Mike, if there is a way to work with Peter to put a couple of bucks together quickly out of whatever account we have to get a traffic study done by a professional engineering firm; I think it might save a lot of headaches down the road if we do a thorough study. That's my recommendation.

Mr. Surface stated that he thinks this goes well beyond that though. I think you need a full expert opinion on everything. Looking at tradition volume and I don't think it's a couple of dollars from an account here or there, I think it's some significant dollars. From a timing perspective, we may have to go ahead with this and then appropriate some money to Elm Street and then at the next town meeting come up with the vote to do the improvements to Elm Streets because we don't need to do those improvements to Elm St. for probably 3 years down the road anyway. So, we may have to do it separately. I like the idea of putting it all together but it doesn't appear that we would have an expert opinion to tell us what we really need and have the money to really do it right.

Mr. Trapani stated that we don't have a lot of time and he does not feel comfortable there is just a lot of risk for the residents.

Mr. Surface stated that there are also a lot of ways to do that too, free cash, grants, etc.

Mr. Trapani stated that he is just disappointed, we've been talking about this for a long time and I thought this was part of the process.

Mr. Franceschi stated that they do have some traffic opinion when we started looking at the driveway and the adequacy of the road serving the school. It didn't get into at all the signalization out at E. Main Street or what improvements they would recommend, but I think we have confidence that the road and the driveway can service the school. That was part of our study, but as to the level of service that's really what a traffic study can tell you. And what the recommended improvements might be. There is some value there. It's not a total unknown what the impact of the school is going to be on the street. We do have some information in that regard as part of our traffic opinion that was done for the site itself. We can certainly share that.

Mr. Surface stated that this is a good start.

Mr. Fowler stated that what you're saying is you've done the increased traffic here because you're adding new grades and you're saying that traffic will not be backing up onto Elm St. for the pickup and drop off area and that's what you're confident of. That's the study you've done and you've got those numbers. We would add them to the old survey to get the increase but it's still not a professional Elm Street study.

Mr. Smith asked if he knows off the top of his head the approximate number of cars that go through to the current Pennbrook School today and how many you're estimating in the future.

Mr. Franceschi stated that he does not have those numbers tonight, but we did compare the current lengths of queuing distance versus the proposed queuing distance and so forth and the separation of busses and how much space they will need and the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Farrell asked if this project has to go before the Planning Board for any approvals.

Mr. Franceschi stated he was not sure whether it has to or not. I think we've already planned that we would go before the Planning Board as a courtesy we think it's a significant project that we've already made that commitment on.

Mr. Farrell stated that if it's a private development, it would have to go.

Mr. Franceschi stated that he did not recall what the thresholds are. We're not looking for any variances. We're not looking for any relief in that regard. But, again because it's such a significant project, we've made that commitment.

Mr. Farrell stated that the point I'm wondering is wouldn't the Planning Board require a traffic study.

Mr. Franceschi stated again, that he does not recall the zoning code; it may be related to increase versus current flow. He gave an overview of the new school to the board.

Mr. Surface stated tomorrow night, we come up with a number, everything goes well and that gets submitted to the State. He stated then 6 weeks later we decide if we're going to put in an additional million dollars for Elm St.

Mr. Saitta stated that since the town is not going to be reimbursed at all for work on Elm Street we could do that as a separate project and not contact MSBA at all.

Mr. Surface stated that my question is to Mr. Farrell, would it still be included under the debt exclusion. Does that put a kink in any types of submissions to the state or would we have to go back and notify them and will it still be covered? When do we have to have the final number that will be under the warrant article?

Mr. Farrell stated that the final number is with the Motion.

Mr. Surface stated that if we find out sometime in September before town meeting that we need to add a million dollars to this project for the Elm Street improvements, could we add it.

Mr. Saitta stated if you're going to try to come up with a number and try to do something 6 weeks down the road, we're submitting August 8th so that would be outside the privy of this particular project. If you knew of an allowance and it wasn't a conflict with the language in the warrant then we could very easily within the confines of our site pricing have the site estimators tally whatever the budget would be. We could carry that million dollar allowance in the site budget for work on Elm Street if it didn't conflict with the warrant language and that's obviously not going to be reimbursed by the MSBA but it would cover it under the umbrella of the warrant article that's going to the MSBA that's going to town meeting. So, if you're talking about having a number in 6 weeks, I see it as its own standalone. If it's part of this particular project I would say we could pick a number we could have in there, we'll carry an allowance for work on Elm Street that will be within the confines of the number which is going to MSBA so that your budget would be complete. It won't be reimbursed but it will be complete.

Mr. Franceschi stated that one issue they may care about it is if the work is to be done by the same contractor doing the school. When the bids come in they need to be able to sort through what's yours and what's theirs. From the sound of it; it is unlikely that the improvements to Elm Street would be done by the same contractor building the school. Different schedules, different site work. Just have a site contractor to do it. I don't think the MSBA will care about it.

Mr. Saitta stated that it would be his recommendation to do separately. He stated that you don't want to do a road job under the construction statute 149. You can include it in this bundle but show it as a separate project. He stated he would recommend carrying it in your budget if you have the number, but do it as a separate project.

Mr. Surface stated that he does not want to trip up the Bond piece. If we said Thursday night there is only \$300,000.00 in there for site work for Elm Street then boosts it to a million. He stated that if the 3 Boards are in agreement with that that's fine. We just have to be comfortable with that. But, if we're going to town meeting, we've got to come up with a number for Elm Street. Mike, can we still slip it into that bond, and that's the question.

Mr. Farrell stated that the language for more incidentals is "including costs incidental or related thereto". And the MSBA has already looked at this as has bond counsel. We made it broad enough to include the unexpected costs too.

Mr. Surface stated that he would suggest to this Board that we think about that when we have the discussions on Thursday night. We're not experts, Mr. Durkee told us \$345K, and his expert tells him a million. We could boost that contingency up to a million dollars if we spend it, if it's required to be spent, that's fine; but just like anything else we do it

won't exceed that. We won't spend it just because it's there. We have to factor something in for Elm Street more than \$300,000.

Mr. Egenberg asked what is Chapter 149.

Mr. Saitta stated that Chapter 149 is the building construction statute in Massachusetts.

Mr. Smith asked if we put a million in there and submit it August 8th we can always back that down at town meeting. We can amend the value at town meeting, that doesn't affect the MSBA. Is it easier to back it down and we are talking a lot of different scopes here.

Mr. Farrell stated that it just gives you bonding authority up to that level. You don't have to bond that much. We're going to get an estimate from them when we go out to bid it could be more it could be less.

Mr. Surface stated that a lot of communities run into that issue.

Mr. Smith stated that the key issue is putting an extra ½ million dollars in which is fine but when you go to vote on it we want to know. Procedurally we're just trying to give ourselves enough head room. Having an extra ½ million to use is a little tougher for the voters versus having it there now and firming it up by the time we have town meeting. Where we can say this is our realistic estimate.

Mr. Surface stated that we have to find a way to get the right number for Elm Street between now and town meeting.

Mr. Egenberg asked when they would have the estimate from DRA. When do we get what the real price will be? Is that in the bidding process?

Mr. Franceschi stated that we are doing one now at this level of design. When the design moves forward there will actually be 3 more estimates at the end of the face of design development. Then when we start doing actual construction there is a 60% and sort of 90% before you go out to bid so you can fine tune things if you have to at the last minute. You still have to have contingencies for change orders you still have to have allowances for furniture and equipment but for hard costs, you'll get that all at one time when bids go out.

Mr. Egenberg asked that those bids would happen after town meeting when money is appropriated and all that. What's the probability of risk with what the budget is and the reality coming from a contractor bid?

Mr. Saitta stated that the preferred amount of about 5% we're now roughly at 20-25% percent design and we're doing the budget. It would be nice if the MSBA allowed us to lock in at design development when the design is locked in at 40% but that isn't the regulation. The regulation is they're going to lock in the scope and the budget right now at 20 -25% but bear in mind, there is 80% of the design to go. That's good and bad, there

is a long way to go but there is also opportunity as we progress through the process there will be another estimate at 40% and another at 60%, another one done at 90%. We carry contingencies.

Mr. Surface stated what's your batting average?

Mr. Saitta stated that we were just awarded a school in Marblehead. The general contractor's price was right on target, the subcontractors were over by about \$100,000 on \$21 million. There was enough contingency for the ability to move around. Even when the numbers come in you can still take a look at it. My guess is we're going to be in good shape, we'll be in range to get this thing done. Hopefully without playing with any contingencies.

Mr. Trapani stated that they have seen I think the public has seen a very strong showing of support from the Board. Please whatever we can do to make sure all our t's are crossed and our i's are dotted. This is crunch time, if you need any support; please let us know what we can do.

Discussion on items to be done at the Middle/High School and Perley School.

Mr. Farrell stated that the ballot question for town meeting and here will not be for any funding to do work at the high school. We may have to come back again in a few years. Also, Thursday night, we're going to hear a rough idea of the cost. At what meeting will we have to discuss how we're going to pay for it?

Mr. Surface stated that we have some spreadsheets from Mr. Farrell and when we go over the warrant articles we will discuss funding.

Mr. Farrell stated that he has schedules from \$18 million all the way up to \$28 million.

Mr. Fowler stated will we as a Board be sitting down with finance committee to go over this before we put it before the town.

Mr. Surface stated that if you feel that's the way to go. I don't have any issue with it. You want to bring finance in on the discussion, that's fine. It's up to the voters to decide whether we're going to borrow money for this project or not. The numbers will be disclosed on Thursday. He stated that the number he has heard for the M/H School study is \$85K. Discussion on MSBA and the other schools in town. Mr. Saitta stated that MSBA has said they would consider reimbursement for work done at the M/H School and he stated that this unusual for MSBA.

Mr. Smith stated to Mr. Fowler on his point that this is a town wide project and this is important for residents to know the scope.

Mr. Egenberg asked about ice dams, collapsing roofs, etc and what is being done to prevent these issues at the new school. Mr. Francesco stated that with new codes we are engineering for these issues and MSBA will also be reviewing the details on the project.

Correspondence

Mr. Surface stated that there is an Eagle Scout Ceremony for Jacob Barosin of Troop 51 on Saturday, August 11th and Mr. Egenberg will be attending.

Selectmen's report

Selectman Smith updated the Board on the Common Victualler License Guidelines Policy.

Mr. Surface asked if the changes to the Approval of Contracts Policy have been made. Mr. Fowler stated that there was a question on the CPO for the Town and School. Mr. Farrell stated that he has not heard from legal counsel.

ESCO Update

Mr. Farrell stated that the notice to proceed has been issued. He stated that equipment is being ordered and construction should begin in early August. He stated that 80% should be done by November. Mr. Farrell stated that they have the OPM until September 15 and he would like to see if they have funds to extend the contract to November.

Mr. Trapani moved to adjourn. Mr. Smith seconded the motion and the motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50PM.

Minutes transcribed by S. Roy, M. Farrell, and J. Pantano.