

Mountview School Building Committee
Meeting Minutes
June 5, 2012

6PM

HMLD Building

Present: Chairman Paul Challenger, David White, Tom Pandiscio, Gary Kaczmarek, Chris Lucchesi, Mike Sherman, Erik Githmark, Jacquie Kelly, Peter Brennan

Absent: Nancy Galkowski, Margaret Watson

Others Present: Bill Senecal, LPA, Elizabeth Helder, Recording Secretary

1. OPM/Architect Update

Gary Kaczmarek, OPM, reported on progress being made on the Feasibility Study. LPA and the OPM have met with subcontractors from HVAC, Fire Protection and Structural Engineering to tour the school in order to evaluate the operating systems and structure of the school. LPA and the OPM also met with teaching staff on June 5th to gather educational input.

Mr. Senecal has completed an existing room summary and will develop a plan of these rooms, what the MSBA guidelines allow, and what will ultimately be blended together. LPA continues to work with the Principal and staff to determine the final configuration. The current square footage of the school is 91,000. With an enrollment approved by the MSBA of 800, this will allow for a 128,000 sq. ft. school. Approximately 28 classrooms are allowed under the MSBA guidelines. Classroom size will be approximately 850-950 sq. ft. There are currently 24 rooms in the school. Mr. Senecal explained that square footage can be traded/exchanged in the building and used in other spaces as long as the decision is explained/defended to the MSBA. For Example: the MSBA allows for 7 science classrooms but only 6 are needed. The square footage from that 7th classroom can be used/added to another classroom in the building. This allows the Committee to build the kind of building the educational plan needs and wants. Mr. Senecal said the process is very linear and the feasibility modules build on one another. The MSBA does not like the process to go backwards, so decisions made now cannot be changed down the road in another module.

Mr. Senecal said he had received verbal results from the borings from Yankee Engineering. Six borings were taken from the property on the west side, the north side behind the soccer field, and 200 feet off the left hand side of the driveway to determine the composition of the property. Mr. Kaczmarek said he was on site when this work took place. The borings showed that the bearings for the building should be ok. He said he is waiting for a written report/evaluation. A traffic study will be conducted on 6/7.

Mr. Senecal reported that he met with the Dr. Pandiscio on 6/4. The Committee and LPA must demonstrate to the MSBA that they are keeping the public informed through Community Outreach efforts. LPA and the Committee must hold a public walk-through of the school prior to July 1, 2012. Any public outreach efforts from the Committee must be documented and submitted to the MSBA. They want to know how the Committee has involved the public in the process. All Committee meetings are posted and the public is welcome to attend.

A Project Directory will be emailed to all Committee members from LPA.

Alternate building sites were reviewed. Working with Growth Management Director Dennis Lipka, LPA and the OPM determined that almost 50% of the land in Town is developed and the State owns 30% of the land. After removing land surrounded by water/wetland buffers, and farmland, there is very little land left for development, and there is no flat land left. The State bought all the good land. Sites with land large enough that were considered were: 1. The ECC site in Jefferson, which has hazardous waste/environmental issues; 2. Jefferson Mills, which has a river running through it; 3. The Geff Farm, which has an agricultural designation and other agricultural land in Town must be designated/traded for use of this site; 4. The sand pit off Quinapoxet, which contains vernal pools and an aquifer on site; 5. Property owned by the Zottoli family near Dawson off Salisbury Street, which has utilities; 6. The Reed Rico and Rexam sites in the Industrial Park, which abuts MDC land and includes the Worcester and Providence Railroad on site; 7. The WTAG Radio Towers, which is under water and abuts MDC land; 8. Mayo School land off Bullard Street, which is wet; and 9. Land abutting a church on Bullard Street, which is for sale but has a difficult topography and water issues like Mayo. Mr. Senecal said that LPA is studying these sites to determine which one will work best as an alternate site. Mr. Senecal discussed the current Mountview site, the Mayo site, and the Zottoli site. Five owners would be affected by purchasing/using the Zottoli site. It would be necessary to purchase 25 acres to make the Zottoli site have the required 15 usable/buildable acres. The topography of this land must also be leveled. The Mayo site also presents its own problems. While the Town owns land abutting Mayo, it is very wet. Twenty-two acres must be purchased to make the Church site have the required 15 usable/buildable acres. Use of this land would affect three abutters/owners.

Dave White said that the purchase of the Zottoli would be cost prohibitive because of the money necessary for site acquisition and excavation. He said that the Mayo site would be challenging because it is very wet, but sees it as the only site that works.

Mr. Senecal said that the current site of the school is more encouraging now that the borings have come in positively. Mr. Challenger asked if it was conceivable to purchase one or two houses at the front of the school to make the land space more usable/buildable.

Mike Sherman asked about the agricultural land designation problems on the current site. Mr. Senecal said he has had a phone conversation from Barbara Hobson with the Massachusetts Agricultural Department. Soil classifications for the property were done in the 1950's. After the school was built, the farmland was buried under the fill. Ms. Hobson said that she would be fine with planting a garden/teaching horticulture at the school in trade for building on the designated agricultural farmland (currently the soccer fields.) Mr. Senecal is waiting for written confirmation from her regarding the conversation. Mr. Senecal and the Committee discussed that the MSBA will only reimburse 8% for site work (including land acquisition, demolition, excavation etc.). Because of the hazmat issues at Mountview, it will cost approximately \$1-2M to demo it. However, the site is attractive because it already has infrastructure (electricity, sewer, water, etc.). LPA and the Committee must do due diligence to eliminate unbuildable sites and choose the best site for economic and educational purposes.

Mr. Challenger said that he was opposed to building in the Industrial Park because it is not a good environment and there is so little industrial land in Holden to begin with.

Motion by Dave White, seconded by Tom Pandiscio, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ONLY PURSUE THE CURRENT MOUNTVIEW SITE, THE CHAPEL/BULLARD STREET SITE, AND THE ZOTTOLI SITE.**

Mr. Senecal offered the Committee the opportunity to walk through the Shrewsbury, MA Sherwood Middle School. This school has a stratified grade/pod design similar to a design plan being considered for Mountview. It does not have science labs. Mr. Senecal will follow up with the General Contractor and report back with a time/date to Mr. Kaczmarek. Staff at Mountview would be encouraged to attend the tour. Mr. Githmark reported that Mountview staff is very favorable on the pod design concept.

Mr. White offered to conduct a tour of the Middle School in Southborough. While not designed by LPA, it is a very effective/efficient building.

Mr. Senecal said that one of the State requirements is that the school become energy and environmentally efficient. LPA needs to conduct a "Green Engineer" charettes, which will help earn the project points towards an ultimate goal of achieving 50-points to satisfy MSBA requirements. LPA will conduct two charettes that will be held after school ends. The public will be invited to attend to learn how to design a "green" school to also help satisfy Community Outreach directives. Certain Town employees and officials will be required to attend.

Mr. Senecal handed out a new "color-coded" Module 3 Feasibility Study – Summary of Deliverables chart. The goal is that the whole schedule will be "pink" by July 1st. Mr. Brennan will forward the Teaching Philosophy Statement to LPA.

The Committee reviewed the Proposed Space Summary – Middle Schools chart.

Dr. Pandiscio determined the School Committee designated that the middle school is categorized as an elementary school.

The Committee will meet On Tuesday, June 12th at 6PM at the HMLD.

2. New Business

Mr. Kaczmarek handed in several invoices for Committee approval and signature. Mr. Lucchesi commented that the Public Safety Committee used a signature page for requisition approval and invoices were approved with a stamp and forwarded to the Town Accountant. Jacquie Kelly will determine the best method to pay invoices. The Committee signed the invoices submitted by Mr. Kaczmarek.

Mr. Challenger reported that he, Mr. Lucchesi, Mr. Sherman met with the Shrewsbury Middle School Public Outreach Committee last week. The Committee was headed by one, outstanding and motivated resident who began the public outreach approximately 90-days before the vote at Town Meeting to secure funding. Mr. Challenger said it was important to determine who would best represent the project to the Town. The group will meet with an Outreach Committee from Ashburnham next week. It will need to be determined whether a website, separate from the Committee, should be established to raise awareness of the project.

Mr. White inquired if the SIMCO would have a volunteer who would be willing to take on this job. Mr. Githmark will reach out to the elementary and middle school SIMCO representatives and invite them to an informational meeting with Committee representatives. Mr. Sherman recommended contacting local Principals to seek a list of potential candidates. He said it was important to identify these candidates before the summer starts.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion by Chris Lucchesi, seconded by Dave White, it was **VOTED 8-0-1 WITH 1 ABSTAINED TO APPROVE THE APRIL 24, 2012 MEETING MINUTES. (ABSTAINED: GITHMARK.)**

Motion by Peter Brennan, seconded by Dave White, it was **VOTED 7-0-2 WITH 2 ABSTAINED TO APPROVE THE MAY 22, 2012 MEETING MINUTES. (ABSTAINED: KELLY, PANDISCIO.)**

4. Adjournment

Motion by Dave White, seconded by Chris Lucchesi, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 5, 2012 MEETING AT 7:50PM.**