

**Mountview School Building Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**June 26, 2012**

6PM

HMLD Building

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

Absent: Nancy Galkowski, Tom Pandiscio

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

**1. OPM/Architect Update**

LPA confirmed that the interior and exterior hazardous materials survey had been completed. Hazardous materials have been identified in the school. The hygienist has recommended a fairly sizable budget for removal whether remodeling or building new. The estimate is upwards of 1M if demolished and slightly less if renovated. PCB's were found in the window glazing/caulk. Mr. White said that usually, PCB remediation must be completed within a certain amount of time. Mr. Brennan said that he thought that the EPA would work with the project seeing that a renovation/rebuild is planned. Mr. Pagano said the Committee would receive a copy of the report. The hygienist is required by law to report the PCB levels to the EPA upon detection. PCB guidelines are still evolving and LPA as responsible designers will due their do diligence with the information and come up with a plan. Ms. Watson reported that PCB's found in another district school required that the students in the rooms be relocated to another school and the cafeteria could not serve hot food until the situation was remediated. Mr. Brennan commented that the District took those measures on their own, and were not required to do it. He said that once the District receives the report, they will contact the Town Manager about formulating a plan. Mr. White asked if the Committee could get an update from the hygienist regarding what the school should do. Hazardous materials removal has limitations to the amount of money the MSBA will reimburse for clean up. Some remediation they pay for, some they don't.

Mr. Senecal said the proposed room summary has been completed. He said that the District has asked for 30 rooms, 2 more than the MSBA has determined that a school of this size is allowed. Mr. Githmark is in the process of working on a description of variations to the MSBA room summary guidelines in support of these two additional classrooms. The square footage of the school has not changed; only the configuration of the classrooms. Mr. Githmark said he is considering some programming changes based on curriculum and staff changes over the next several years and this is why the extra classroom space is being requested. Dr. Pandiscio is proposing eliminating the media center (used to be called the Library). Mr. Pagano said this request might be precedent setting with the MSBA. This is going to test the limits of the MSBA and it will be interesting to see what the MSBA decides. The 4000 sq.ft. allotted for Library space has been reused into common area space for each grade to function as mini-media centers for the staff/kids. With a wireless school, the media will be in their hands. Mr. White inquired if the MSBA would allow the school to contain a Town funded auditorium on site. Mr. Pagano said that the MSBA would push back on that request. A school in Wellesley has to be the same as a school in Holyoke. Towns with more money should not be different from towns that don't; all schools are the same. Mr. White said he thought that the MSBA would like that the Town would get more use out of its school building. Mr. Pagano said the only way around that would be to finish building the school and then have the Town appropriate the money separately to build the auditorium.

Ms. Watson commented that she feels that losing the media center will be a tough sell to the public. She said the taxpayers will feel that it will cost them more in the end because of higher technology needs. It was agreed that the MSBC had voted to give the Superintendent the authority to determine the design of the educational program and it is his decision to defend these choices. Mr. Lucchesi said he understands where Ms. Watson is coming from and that she is sensitive to what people will say. The Committee should be able to have an answer to this decision; that they support the decision of the Superintendent and the Committee is building a school for the future.

Mr. Kaczmarek has finished and delivered The Request for Capital Budget Statement to LPA.

LPA has begun the work for the alternate site on Malden Street. Mr. Senecal is in the process of acquiring the site evaluation conducted for Holden Youth Sports Inc. Mr. Pagano said previous survey work and wetlands mapping would be helpful. Mr. White and Mr. Kaczmarek will help expedite the information from the site evaluation.

Mr. Senecal said another walk-through of the Sherwood School will be held in September/October 2012. The school will be closer to substantial completion at that point. Mountview staff will be invited to attend.

The Green Engineer Charette was held at 9AM on June 21<sup>st</sup>. Approximately 20 people participated. No decisions were made. The meeting was held to learn about sustainable building and its objectives.

LPA will hold a "Stakeholder Meeting" on July 10<sup>th</sup> at the Mountview School at 5PM. The public is invited to attend a walkthrough of the school to see the current conditions of the school. The Committee will then conduct a Committing Meeting at 6PM to discuss what is being submitted to the MSBA in the PDP. This is part of the Town's continued outreach efforts and will be advertised on the Town web site and on the LED message board on Main Street. Mr. Brennan said that the District has created a website for the building project; Mr. Sherman and Mr. Challenger need to determine a domain name to get it up and running. The Stakeholder Meeting event will be publicized on the Town's website. Mr. White said it will be important to point out all of the code violations in the school, and how the building will be difficult to renovate because of way the building is constructed. Mr. Sherman discussed how to structure and deliver that kind of information to the public. Mr. Githmark said that right now, all of the school classrooms are sitting in the hallways because staff is cleaning and conducting maintenance in the classrooms. It was agreed to hold a tour in a small portion of the school that is representative of the conditions in the entire building. Mr. Pagano said LPA will present the design plans to date at the meeting following the tour.

Ms. Watson said she felt there seems to be a consensus among the public that it is cheaper to renovate than to build new. She said it is important to stress during the tour that in its current condition, the school will be very expensive to renovate. Mr. Lucchesi said it important to reign in misinformation. Facts put together by the professionals will sell the project. Mr. White proposed seeking out graduates of the high school who lived through the high school renovation. These graduates could provide testimonials as to what it was like to have to achieve an education during the chaos of a renovation. Mr. Sherman said the public needs to know that it's not about building new or renovating; it's about getting something done at the school and the need to pass the funding for the project.

Mr. Challenger said he and Mr. Sherman met with members of the Ashburnham School Building Committee.

Mr. Senecal said that the Committee needs to vote on the options to study that will be included in the PDP: 1. No Build; 2. Renovation A. Minimum – Fix What is broken, B. Medium – No Reconfiguration, C. Heavy – Blow out walls/new addition; 3. Build new on existing site; 4. Build new on alternate site; 5. Other options consistent with MSBA guidelines and expectations.

Motion by Chris Lucchesi, seconded by Dave White, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PROJECT OPTIONS IN THE PDP PRESENTED BY LPA TO INCLUDE 1. NO BUILD; 2. RENOVATION A. MINIMUM – FIX WHAT IS BROKEN, B. MEDIUM – NO RECONFIGURATION, C. HEAVY – BLOW OUT WALLS/NEW ADDITION; 3. BUILD NEW ON EXISTING SITE; 4. BUILD NEW ON ALTERNATE SITE; 5. OTHER OPTIONS CONSISTENT WITH MSBA GUIDELINES AND EXPECTATIONS.**

Mr. Lucchesi asked how the Committee could conduct a minimal renovation and meet MSBA guidelines. LPA concurred with Mr. Lucchesi's question. However, this is how the MSBA wants the information presented.

Mr. Senecal said that when the PSR is submitted to the MSBA on August 9<sup>th</sup>, LPA will have proven to the MSBA which solution is the best solution that meets the educational objectives of the community. Mr. White disagreed, saying he felt that it is the final decision of the MSBA which solution they will pay for.

Mr. Senecal provided an updated Summary of Deliverables that was emailed to the Committee on 6/12/12. The Committee reviewed each deliverable and the status of the item.

Mr. Pagano said that legal title was not necessary for the Malden Street property at this time.

Discussion was held regarding completion of Local Actions and Approvals – Summary of Deliverables 3.1.7.

The Committee discussed its tight meeting schedule after the PDP is submitted on July 12<sup>th</sup>. The Committee discussed holding a meeting to present the PDP to the public. The Committee discussed what is coming between the 4 weeks between the filing of the PDP and the filing of the PSR. It might be necessary to meet more than once a week between July 10<sup>th</sup> and August 9<sup>th</sup> in order to allow the committee to fully debate all of the building options. Mr. White said that he felt that the building decision would be abundantly clear based on all of the information gathered by the end of July as to which building choice is the best option for the Town. Mr. Senecal proposed presenting a different building option at each meeting starting at the July 17<sup>th</sup> meeting to keep the Committee updated and in the loop.

The Committee and LPA discussed taking an extra month for PSR submission and submit the PSR in September 2012 for review by the MSBA in November 2012. All involved agreed that it was important to take the time to complete this critical planning and design phase correctly. Mr. Kaczmarek will call the MSBA to determine if it is possible to change the PSR submission date.

Future meeting dates include: July 10<sup>th</sup> at 5PM at Mountview School Walk Through; July 17<sup>th</sup> at 6PM; July 23<sup>rd</sup> 7PM School Committee Meeting; July 31<sup>st</sup> at 6PM and August 7<sup>th</sup> at 6PM.

Mr. White said that Town officials should be invited to the Walk-Through Tour and Committee meeting on July 10<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. White said by racing through this heavy schedule will not allow the Finance Committee and the Selectmen their due diligence to weigh in on the direction the Building Committee intends to support. He suggested posting an informational joint meeting for July 24<sup>th</sup> between these groups to provide a history of the project to date and here is where we are now. Mr. Brennan said that the Committee has been charged by the Town to make the final building design decision. The Building Committee might not have all of the information to make a decision to recommend to these officials. He suggested meeting with the Fin Com and the Selectmen in September or October to inform them of the Building Committee's decision. Mr. White said it was important to allow these officials to participate in the project and take "a bite of the apple." It is important politically to include these officials in what is going on. We are not asking them to endorse the Committee's decision; just keep them informed of the progress of the project. Mr. Brennan suggested holding the meeting on July 17<sup>th</sup>. LPA said that site graphics should be available for both sites by July 17<sup>th</sup>. After a lengthy discussion, the Committee agreed to invite the Finance Committee and the Selectmen to a joint meeting at the July 10<sup>th</sup> Mountview Walk Through at 5PM at Mountview School. Mr. Challenger will send out a press release to the local meeting announcing the joint meeting.

Mr. Sherman left the meeting at 8:30PM.

Mr. Kaczmarek reported that he met with the Town Manager, Jacquie Kelly, and Mr. Challenger to discuss hiring an OPM consultant to help him with the preliminary OPM process on an as needed basis. During the early phases of this fast-paced project, it is important to make sure that all the paperwork is being processed properly. The budget contains money to support hiring an OPM consultant to provide services through the schematic design process. The position is under the bid threshold and will not require going out to bid. However, Mr. Kaczmarek reported that he solicited three quotes for OPM services to comply with purchasing laws. He added that the consultant he would like to hire also has experience working with the MSBA and filing for CM at RISK. He said he was looking for a vote of support from the Committee.

Motion by David White, seconded by Peter Brennan, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO SUPPORT HIRING AN OPM CONSULTANT AS NECESSARY TO KEEP THE PROJECT SUCCESSFUL.**

Mr. Kaczmarek suggested that the Committee consider adding some type of Public Comment to the meeting Agenda. The group discussed a public comment policy.

Motion by David White, seconded by Peter Brennan, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADD PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE MEETING AGENDA AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH MEETING TO ALLOW FOR COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC. THE COMMITTEE WILL NOT ENGAGE IN DISCUSSION WITH THE PUBLIC DURING THIS AGENDA ITEM.**

**2. Approval of Previous Minutes**

Motion by Peter Brennan, seconded by Dave White, it was **VOTED 7-0-1 WITH 1 ABSTAINED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 12, 2012 MEETING MINUTES. (ABSTAINED: LUCCHESI.)**

**3. Adjournment**

Motion by Margaret Watson, seconded by Dave White, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 26, 2012 MEETING AT 9:20PM.**