

**Mountview School Building Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2013**

7PM

HMLD

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

Others Present: Elizabeth Helder, Recording Secretary

Others Absent: Bill Senecal, LPA, Mike Pagano, LPA

1. Public Comment

No one from the public was present at the meeting.

2. OPM Update

Gary Kaczmarek reported that he had received comments back from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) regarding the submittal. He, Mr. Githmark and Mr. Gasbarro had a conference call with Chris Alles with the MSBA on Friday, February 22nd to review the MSBA's concerns. Mr. Githmark sent answers to the four concerns to the MSBA on Monday, February 25, 2013. Mr. Kaczmarek said he and the school district would still need to sit down with the DESE and explain several of the deviations to the DESE's standard design format for the Special Education classrooms. The School District will need to explain why they prefer the SPED classrooms together rather than separated (the DESE format).

The Committee discussed two of the MSBA's preliminary questions after a cursory review of the Committee's schematic design proposal that was submitted to the MSBA on February 14, 2013. These questions were about the projected costs of the estimated square footage and why the subcontractor estimates are lower than other middle school projects currently being built through the MSBA. Mr. Kaczmarek said he would continue to work on responses to the MSBA as he receives them. The Committee reviewed an updated Total Project Budget (3011) document.

Ms. Watson passed along a question from the School Committee. Present enrollment is 760 and the building is designed for 800 students. What happens if student enrollment is increased? Is there space on the new building/property to build an addition? Mr. Lucchesi said that 1. If you diagnose/breakdown the square footage from the MSBA there is a 15% fluff number in the design enrollment figure (this would bring the total maximum enrollment figure to 920 students and 2. No, the building as designed will not easily accommodate an addition. However, he said the MSBA program would not support this because the infrastructure isn't built to support it. Mr. Gasbarro said there are other ways to accommodate a larger student population: Special Education students could be sent to a different school, the third art room could be turned into another classroom, and each classroom, designed for 24 students could handle an additional one or two students.

Mr. White reminded Committee members that the Committee fought the MSBA to approve and enrollment of 800 students; the MSBA only wanted to approve a building for 760 students. He said there would be ample room in the building for an increase in population.

Mr. Kaczmarek reported he has been talking with NSTAR. NSTAR has indicated that they will want to bring the gas line up the sidewalk on the left side of Shrewsbury Street. He said he has asked DPW Director John Woodsmall for a cost analysis and timeline to remove the sidewalk, dig a trench, sink the pipe, and reinstall the sidewalk, and pay for a police detail. He was unsure if the DPW would do the work (to save money), or if NSTAR would subcontract it out. This approach is a less invasive and more cost effective installation approach.

3. Community Outreach

Mr. Challenger reported that he and Mr. White presented the Feasibility Study and Schematic Design Presentation to the School Committee on February 24th. It was well received and the School Committee thanked the Committee for their hard work.

Mr. Challenger said that an op-ed by Mr. White would run in the Landmark on February 28th. Mr. Lucchesi's op-ed in the Landmark ran in the February 21st edition.

The Committee reviewed a flyer created by Mike Sherman that will be inserted in HMLD bills in March.

Mr. Gasbarro suggested that the School Committee schedule a vote to endorse the project at its next meeting.

Mr. Challenger reported that the Holden Finance Committee had voted to endorse the project.

Mr. Githmark reported that he and Mr. Sherman would give a presentation to the parents at Davis Hill Elementary School on Monday, March 4th at 7PM. Other presentations include Dawson Elementary on March 6th 7PM, Mayo Elementary on March 19th at 7PM, and Mountview on March 21st at 7PM. These dates will be advertised in the Landmark, the Town website, the Town's Electronic sign, and Cable TV Channel 11. Mr. Sherman also said that The Landmark would cover one of the elementary school meetings and write a story which will help generate more publicity.

Tours of Mountview will also be conducted prior and during the presentation on March 21st.

Ms. Watson will invite each SIMCO representative to their respective school's meeting.

The Committee discussed whether to give a presentation at the Special Town Meeting. Ms. Watson suggested that the Committee should highlight the deficiencies and costs involved of keeping the current building and that the decision on the use of the existing school belongs to the Town not the Committee.

Mr. Lucchesi said that a condensed version of the project should be presented at the Special Town Meeting. Mr. White concurred that it should be targeted to address any negative comments that people might make towards the project. Mr. Sherman agreed adding that the presentation should take no more than 20 minutes.

Mr. Lucchesi reported that he and resident Glen Gaudette will meet to start to schedule phone banks and organizing a letter writing campaign. Ms. Watson said she would be in charge of monitoring correspondence to the newspapers to ensure that information remains factual.

Mr. Mills on of the Holden School Committee Representative will contact all the daycare businesses in Town.

The Committee agreed to seek a resident to write a "speak out" in The Landmark addressing the reasons why the existing school cannot be saved/reused.

4. New Business

The Committee discussed moving the Ballot Election from April 11th to the Town Election/Special Primary on April 30th.

Mr. White said he was against moving the Ballot Election date and felt that it should remain separate. Mr. Sherman said that the ballot vote merits its own decision. The vote should happen immediately after the Special Town Meeting on April 8th while the subject and information is still fresh in voters' minds. Additionally, the project is under a tight timeline; moving the election from 11th to the 30th will delay actions that need to be taken by LPA and Mr. Kaczmarek. Mr. Kaczmarek concurred adding that a schedule has already been created to keep the project moving forward. Any delay costs money and time. Mr. Lucchesi said that this was a local decision and he did not want it held during a Primary Election.

Motion by Dave White, seconded by Chris Lucchesi it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO KEEP TO BALLOT ELECTION FOR THE DEBT EXCLUSION FOR THE MOUNTVIEW SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 11, 2013.**

The Committee reviewed the language of the Special Town Meeting Warrant Articles. This language has been approved by the MSBA. Ms. Kelly said the language had also been approved by Town Counsel and the Articles had been set by the Selectmen on February 25, 2013.

Ms. Kelly reported that one of the Selectmen had inquired if funds from the Feasibility Study could be used to offset the cost of the Special Town Meeting and Ballot Election. Mr. White said he didn't care; it is Town money one way or the other. Mr. Lucchesi said he didn't disagree with Mr. White. However, the money borrowed was specifically supposed to be used to fund the project through Schematic Design. He could argue that the Committee is overstepping its bounds by using the money in a way that the borrowing vote did not allow for this type of spending. He said that the Town Clerk's budget included the cost to hold one Special Town Election each year. Ms. Kelly asked if the money existed in the borrowing to pay for it. Mr. Kaczmarek confirmed that there was money available in the Feasibility Study. Mr. Challenger said that after reviewing the language in the borrowing, he said that from a Finance Committee position he did not feel comfortable using the Feasibility Study money to pay for these expenses.

Mr. Lucchesi inquired if the Selectmen were willing to pay legal expenses to determine a legal opinion whether the Committee's Feasibility Study can pay for these expense.

Mr. White said the Committee was splitting hairs; the money was going to come from the general government fund or the borrowing plus \$1000 to pay for the legal opinion.

Motion by Mike Sherman, seconded by Chris Lucchesi, it was discussed not to incur any legal expenses to determine whether the committee is authorized to pay for special town meetings and elections

After some consideration the motion maker and seconder withdrew their motion.

Town Manager Kelly said that Town Counsel had already questioned whether the MSBA would approve the use of the Feasibility Funds to pay for these elections. Mr. Kaczmarek said the MSBA would strike the expense as "non reimbursable."

Mr. Lucchesi said "As long as we can do it, I am happy to fund it."

Motion by Chris Lucchesi, seconded by Dave White, it was **VOTED 6-1-1 WITH 1 OPPOSED AND 1 ABSTAINED THAT THE COMMITTEE IS WILLING TO FUND THE DEBT EXCLUSION ELECTION FOR THE MOUNTVIEW SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT PENDING LEGAL REVIEW AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE COMMITTEE HAS THE AUTHORITY TO DO SO. (OPPOSED: WATSON, ABSTAINED: SHERMAN.)**

Ms. Watson suggested tabling the discussion until the next meeting.

5. Adjournment

Motion by Dave White, seconded by Erik Githmark, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 26, 2013 MEETING AT 9:09PM.**

APPROVED: