

Present: Jeff Adams, Dave Anderson, Peter Badalament, Walter Birge, Stan Durlacher, Michelle Ernst, Nathaniel Fisher, John Flaherty, John Lindner, Tony Logalbo, Brian Miller, Roy Mulcahy, Peter Nobile, Diana Rigby, Louis Salemy, Charlie Sample, Bill Tice, Elise Woodward

Also Present: David Saindon, KVA, Jeanne Roberts, Lisa Pecora-Ryan, Leland Koehler/Rice, OMR, Maureen Kirkpatrick, Jim Liddick, Turner Construction, Fabian Fondriest, and Maureen Spada, Louis Salemy, Pamela Gannon, Phil Benincasa, Melissa McMorrow and Jennifer Munn from the Concord-Carlisle School Committee

Absent: Tim Hult, Karla Johnson, Sergio Siani, Richard Waterman

I. Call to Order

Stan Durlacher called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and welcomed the Concord-Carlisle School Committee. The Concord-Carlisle School Committee made a motion to approve the replacement of three Building Committee members; appoint Nathaniel Fisher who will be replacing Ben Rizkin, Tony Logalbo who will be replacing Chris Whelan and Roy Mulcahy who will be replacing Joe Morahan.

II. Reading of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the September 4, 2012 minutes by Walter Birge and seconded by Bill Tice. The motion was unanimously approved.

A motion was made to approve the September 12, 2012 minutes by Brian Miller and seconded by Peter Nobile. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. Correspondence:

Diana Rigby called attention to correspondence in the packet; a letter from Mary Pichetti, Director of Capital Planning for MSBA to Bill Plummer regarding questions on the MSBA's Designer Selection Panel; a letter dated October 23, 2012 from legal counsel Rick Manley regarding the question about the debt approval process for regional schools and the town vote; MSBA letter from Mary Pichetti dated October 25, 2012 regarding Concord-Carlisle's building project on MSBA's website.

IV. MSBA Update:

Stan Durlacher discussed the MSBA letter from Mary Pichetti dated October 25, 2012 regarding the reinstatement of funding for the project. MSBA is clear that upon the completion of the action items and execution of the First Amendment to the PFA, the MSBA will re-instate its funding for the Project. The action items highlighted in the letter are: DESE requested clarification on the Pathways & Lighthouse programs; the District will need to submit a signed space summary for review and acceptance as part of an amendment to the PFA; the district should review whether the physics and biology room locations should be interchanged; the MSBA will require, until the GMP is executed, that the District submit a letter to the MSBA by the 12th calendar day of each month signed by the Chair of the Building Committee outlining the status of the Project Schedule with specific design and construction milestones, any changes to the design from the Design Development submittal, and any budget variances or budget revision requests; the District must submit a revised Total Project Budget to reflect the reconciled estimate based upon the Design Development submittal, for MSBA review and acceptance and incorporation into an amendment to the PFA; and the District is responsible for knowing and understanding it's obligations under the Open Meeting Law and Public Records law. Stan reported that the Regional School Committee will have a discussion and vote to approve a new position for a Building Project Communications Manager who will work for and report to the Chair of the School Building Committee. The latest date for submission to the MSBA is November 13th; we expect to have everything ready on or before that date.

Members were interested in discussing the pros and cons of authorizing the design team to move into construction documents and to consider the dollars that we would encumber or put at risk with that authorization. David Saindon, KVA, waiting could take 4 to 6 weeks, the critical path is the delivery of the 90% CD's which is going to encompass the early release packages (steel & concrete) and working with Turner that is the critical path. The goal is to start construction in March of next year. If we wait it pushes construction out. After a lengthy discussion it's correct to say that if we move forward as of today we can stay on the schedule that we originally proposed but if we don't we are going to slip the construction start date by a month of two and then the project completion date by potentially four months because of the winter (weather dependent).

Motion: Jeff Adams made a motion to authorize OMR to proceed into construction documents (CD's) effective immediately but at risk until the PFA Amendment is formalized; seconded by Elise Woodward. The motion was unanimously approved.

V. KVA Update:

- A motion was made to approve amendments for the bus depot study authorized by the Building Committee at the September 4, 2012 meeting: KVA Amendment #2 in the amount of \$14,000, Turner Amendment #1 in the

amount of \$4,327, and OMR Amendment #15 in the amount of \$24,389 for a total amount of \$42,716. So moved by Walter Birge and seconded by John Flaherty. The motion was unanimously approved.

- A motion was made to approve Budget Revision Request #6 to move exact value of \$42,716 from the Owner's contingency into the consultant values within the budget. This is a MSBA required approval since we are moving money between cost codes. So moved by Tony Logalbo and seconded by Michelle Ernst. The motion was unanimously approved.
- A motion was made to approve OMR Amendment #16 in the amount of negative \$4,796, Accounting for Feasibility Study Phase Savings. So moved by Walter Birge and seconded by Peter Badalament. The motion was unanimously approved.
- A motion was made to approve OMR Amendment #17 for Plexiglass cover for site model for an amount of \$649. So moved by Walter Birge and seconded by Michelle Ernst. The motion was unanimously approved.
- A motion was made to approve payment of invoices for OMR in the amount of \$74,890.12, KVA Invoices in the amount of \$43,295, and Turner Construction invoices in the amount of \$21,937 as indicated on Invoice Summary MSBA Reimbursement Package #17 for period ending September 30, 2012 for a total of \$140,122.12. So moved by John Flaherty and seconded by Walter Birge. The motion was unanimously approved.

MSBA Monthly Updates – Brian reported that since the last meeting we published the August and September reports. In August we reported about the bus depot study and we reported we were not moving into CD's at the time and gave the permitting update. The following month, September, we reported the project remains held but that we cleared the site permitting process.

VI. **Trade Pre-Qualification Process**

David Saindon went through the Trade Pre-Qualification Process – it's a process of evaluating trade contractors on specific classes of work to determine if the trade contractor is qualified to provide a bid. A prequalification committee needs to be established which we will do tonight. The Committee is made up of a representative of designer, representative of CM firm and two representatives appointed by the high school building committee.

VII. **Establish Pre-Qualification Committee**

Representative of Designer – Lisa Pecora-Ryan

Representative of CM Firm – Maureen Kirkpatrick

Two Representatives appointed by the building committee – traditionally one is the OPM – Brian Dakin, and Richard Waterman from the building committee (Richard not present tonight).

A **Motion** was made to approve the structure of the Pre-Qualification Committee with the authorization to fill the seat if Richard Waterman accepts. So moved by Tony Logalbo and seconded by Bill Tice.

VIII. **OMR Update:**

Lisa Pecora-Ryan reported they are currently working on the response to the MSBA's DD comments, this work will complete the design team's remaining 5% work left in the DD Phase. We can now get our consultant's back on board to begin the CD Phase and setting up meetings with Turner & KVA to review the drawings and begin work on the construction document phase.

IX. **Next Meeting** will be November 14, 2012. At that time we will reassess the schedule as it relates to the sub-committee meetings.

X **Additional Items**

Stan reported that since we are receiving hundreds of emails we will be publishing a list of Frequently Asked Questions to help address some of the questions.

Stan Durlacher gave a presentation that he personally wanted to do; it has nothing to do with the building committee, school committee, or school administration.

Stan did a Model School Analysis and the reason for it was to see what a model school would mean for our particular site. Stan personally feels there is no way of what he knows or believes to be accurate that there are cost savings or time savings on a model school on our hilly and swampy site.

XI. **Public Comments:**

Lisa Bergen, Concord. Ms. Bergen stated that she wasn't clear about when the subcommittee and building committee meetings would be held. She would like clarification on that. Ms. Bergen also stated that she appreciates the efforts and time of the building committee.

William Plummer, Concord. Mr. Plummer stated that he appreciates Mr. Durlacher's presentation on the model school and was surprised it wasn't in the options back in May 2011. He feel site12R1 would have supported a model school. He would like someone who is not so close to the project to take a look at a model school such as Natick.

Chris McKinney, Concord. Mr. McKinney stated that he would like to see on the Building Committee Website minutes, forum, and media articles that say the bus depot is going to be destroyed.

Paul Horwitch, Concord. Mr. Horwitch stated that he was at one of the forums and he remembers that someone said the bus service was going to be outsourced. He stated that in the documents that were handed out there is a letter indicating there is no legal way that the debt that has been voted could be legally rescinded. If there were to be a town meeting that voted overwhelming to revisit the issue, it would be politically difficult to build something in the face of opposition.

David Allen, Concord. Ms. Allen stated that when the plans were made to change the plans and keep the transportation building Mr. Bill Plummer, who made the proposal was not consulted. Mr. Plummer was not consulted about the model school either. He stated the credibility of the building committee was at stake.

Stan Lucks, Concord. Mr. Lucks stated that losing time on the schedule would have potential cost impacts. Mr. Lucks stated that he has put questions in writing and hopes they will get answered.

Mark Gailus, Concord. Mr. Gailus stated that having communication in the community is important. He stated that some people on the school committee and administration should have been close enough to the issue of outsourcing to know that parents of elementary school children would have an issue with outsourcing.

Abe Fisher, Concord. Mr. Fisher stated that communication should be done with simple clear sentences. He'd like to have an open, public and complete review of what went on before. He also stated that 25% of the school do not have lockers.

Tanya Gailus, Concord. Ms. Gailus stated that she thinks the transportation depot should stay where it is.

Cynthia Rainy, Concord. Ms. Rainy stated that in order to move forward we need to build the school that the MSBA has approved. As a community we need to move forward.

Lisa Bergen, Concord. Ms. Bergen stated the community would like to hear about the remediation of the high school and how the students would be affected.

Terry Rothermel, Concord. Mr. Rothermel stated there was a vote to establish a committee to study the busing issue and the vote was pretty clear. He stated that the committee has ignored the town meeting vote and has established their own committee.

Paul Horwitch, Concord. Mr. Horwitch stated that there is history about changing decisions. Are we destined to build the building we voted on originally or is there some wiggle room? Suggested going back to town meeting to see how many people want to see a model school built.

Andrew Kirkpatrick, Concord. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated he would like to thank the committee for the FAQ's and does support the building project. He has concerns about the overall costs. He would like the FAQ's expanded.

David Karr, Concord. Mr. Karr stated that he would like to know why the seniors have their lockers taken away.

David Allen, Concord. Mr. Allen stated that \$92.6 million is the ceiling and it ballooned 25% since January. There will be land fill remediation costs and the JV fields will have to be replaced. These all add up to more costs.

John Lindner, teacher serving on the building committee. He feels the one thing people have lost site of in this whole process is the students. When the design & site of the school was chosen, it was what would be the least impact on the students in the schools, what would create the least impact on teaching and what would cause the least disruption to the students & community as we move forward. We need to think about why we're here

XII. Adjourn:

A motion was made to adjourn by Walter Birge and seconded by Bill Tice at 8:40 PM. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Leona Palmaccio