

Present: Jeff Adams, Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, Walter Birge, Stan Durlacher, Michelle Ernst, John Flaherty, Tim Hult, Karla Johnson, John Lindner, Brian Miller, Peter Nobile, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Sergio Siani, Bill Tice, Jerry Wedge, Elise Woodward

Also Present: David Saindon, KVA, Jeanne Roberts, Leland Koehler/Rice, Michael Rosenfeld, Lisa Pecora-Ryan, OMR

Absent: Joseph Morahan, Diana Rigby, Margaret Waterman, Richard Waterman, Chris Whelan

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Jerry Wedge at 6:00 PM.

II. Reading of Minutes

Jerry Wedge asked if there were any recommended changes to the minutes of April 6, 2011. A motion was made to approve the April 6, 2011 minutes by Bill Tice and seconded by Louis Salemy. The motion was unanimously approved.

III Review Preliminary Evaluation of Proposed Alternatives – Lisa Pecora-Ryan, OMR – David Saindon, KVA

Lisa started with a project update. The PDP with the ten options was submitted to MSBA on April 1st and are waiting for their response. Last week we met with the sustainable consultants and initiated some sustainable design discussions and tonight we will look at five developed alternatives, which are derivatives from the 10 options that were part of the PDP.

David Saindon presented the cost comparison analysis that was issued to the MSBA on April 7th as a supplement to the April 1st PDP submission. David noted that this is a comparative analysis and not a budget, but an analysis that compares estimated construction hard costs and project softs of all the options to one another to help determine which options should further be developed and studied. David explained some of the cost drivers such as (1) what is required to implement the scope of the project and (2) how long will it take to implement the scope of the project. Essentially, schedule and "owner" project requirements (temp trailers, logistics) are considerable cost drivers to a project. It should also be noted, that OMR's cost estimator estimated the costs of each option as well. KVA then extracted the two estimates that were performed to compare an "apples to apples" analysis to test the accuracy and reconcile the two independent estimates that were performed. After review of the two estimates, it was determined that the estimates were within 2-3% of one another, a very good sign on the accuracy of the estimates considering we're in a conceptual phase of the project. After review of the KVA cost comparison, the committee requested that KVA take another look at the forecasted schedule duration of option 3, which was indicated at 36 months as compared to the other reno/new options being at 42-46 months. KVA will review and report back to the committee their findings and opinions of the schedule for option 3. In addition, the committee had a spirited discussion on the following; exposure regarding renovations (construction and owner exposure), general noise regarding each option, student and staff site logistics, and time (schedule).

Leland discussed the revised options to Option 4, 6 and a combination of 9 and 10. After the committee reviewed the options as presented by OMR and a discussion ensued, Jerry suggested that the committee narrow the options down to two, one being Option 6 and two being Option 12. The committee members present were not opposed to this suggestion of proceeding to further study option 6 (reno/new hybrid) and option 12 (new building) while the district awaits a response from the MSBA regarding the PDP submission.

IV. CCHS Site Building Committee Report – Peter Badalament

Peter formed a site-based building committee at CCHS so that teachers and staff members who have concerns about what is going on with the building project have a forum to get together to talk about the issues and an opportunity for Peter to report out from the building committee to this site-based group. The goal is to keep the faculty, staff and the students well informed of what's going on with this committee's work.

V. Subcommittee Reports

Michelle reported that the 3rd community forum was held last Thursday and the next one is May 19th. The newsletter will be out in another two weeks. Carlisle has a forum tomorrow night in Carlisle.

Peter Nobile reported that the Sustainable Subcommittee will be meeting again on April 21st

VI OPM Report – KVA:

The PDP was submitted to MSBA April 1st and the Cost Comparative Data was submitted on April 7th. David has three invoices that need approval: KVAssociates, Inc. \$30,510; OMR Feasibility Study and Amendment #1 \$66,250 for a total of \$102,635.

A **Motion** was made by John Flaherty to approve the three invoices totaling \$102,635 and seconded by Peter Badalament. The motion was unanimously approved.

VII. **Additional Items – Jeanne Roberts:**

We have an additional service for the envelope consultant for \$2,585 which needs approval before the IDT Charrette on April 26th. A **Motion** was made by Jerry Wedge to approve additional services for the envelope consultant, Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc., for a cost not to exceed \$2,585. So moved by Sergio Siani, seconded by John Flaherty. The motion was unanimously approved.

VIII. **Public Comments:**

None.

IX. **Adjourn**

A motion was made to adjourn by Brian Miller and seconded Michelle Ernst at 800 PM. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Leona Palmaccio

Approved: 5/4/11