

**SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**



Project: Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical High School
Subject: School Building Committee Meeting No. 33
Location: ZOOM
Distribution: Attendees, Project File
MSBA 6- Detailed Design
Module:

Project No: MP20-28
Meeting Date: 12/14/2023
Time: 4:00 PM
Prepared By: E. Grijalva

Present

Brian Mushnick*	SBC Chair
Karen Maguire*	Superintendent
Dan Haynes*	Business Admin.
Jonathon Dowse*	SBC Member
Harry Takesian*	Facilities Director
Michael Procaccini*	SBC Member
Brendan Bowen*	SBC Member
Bob Foley*	Adult Ed. Dir
Dana Walsh	TCRVTHS Principal
Trip Elmore	DWMP- Project Director
Mike Cox	DWMP - PM
Elias Grijalva	DWMP- Assistant PM
Rachel Rincon	DWMP- Assistant PM
Steven Powers	Samiotes
Vladimir Lyubetsky	DRA- Project Manager
Ti Johnson	Warner Larson Landscape Arch.
Allison Gramolini	Warner Larson Landscape Arch.
Kristy Lyons	Consigli- Sr. Pre-con Manager
Jeffrey Pilat	Samiotes

***SBC Voting Member**

Item No.	Description	Action
33.1	<p>Call to order: 4:02PM meeting was called to order by SBC Chair B. Mushnick, 8 of 11 voting members in attendance.</p>	Record
33.2	<p>Previous Topics & Approval of November 02, 2023, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the <u>November 02, 2023</u>, previous meeting minutes as submitted was made by B. Bowen and seconded by J. Dowse.</p> <p>Discussion: None; Roll Call Vote: M. Procaccini (Y), D. Haynes (Y), K. Maguire (Y), B. Bowen (Y), J. Dowse (Y), B. Foley(Y), H. Takesian (Y), B. Mushnick (Y); Abstentions: None; All in favor. Motion passes.</p>	Record
33.3	<p>Invoices and Commitments for approval:</p> <p>Invoice 1: DWMP November Invoice, in the amount of <u>\$200,000.00</u> A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by M. Procaccini for the approval of the DWMP November invoice.</p> <p>Discussion: B. Mushnick explains that the district had budgeted one million dollars to get us to this point, which was short of what we needed. Both OPM and Designer have been working out of their pocket, hoping to get repaid if the vote went through. This will help them get through to the end of the year. Roll Call Vote: M. Procaccini (Y), D. Haynes (Y), K. Maguire (Y), B. Bowen (Y), J. Dowse (Y), B. Foley(Y), H. Takesian (Y), B. Mushnick (Y); Abstentions: None; All in favor. Motion passes.</p>	Record
	<p>Invoice 2: DRA November Invoice, in the amount of <u>\$300,000.00</u> A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by D. Haynes for the approval of the DRA November invoice.</p> <p>Discussion: None; Roll Call Vote: M. Procaccini (Y), D. Haynes (Y), K. Maguire (Y), B. Bowen (Y), J. Dowse (Y), B. Foley(Y), H. Takesian (Y), B. Mushnick (Y); Abstentions: None; All in favor. Motion passes.</p>	
	<p>V. Lyubetsky explains amendment No.006 is for additional geotechnical engineering and additional survey services performed by O'Reilly, Talbot & Okun (OTO) and Samiotes.</p> <p>Amendment No. 006, request for approval in the amount of <u>\$123,200.00</u>. The motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by D. Haynes for the approval of DRA Amendment No.006.</p> <p>Discussion: B. Mushnick asked was this not accounted for in the original contract or is this an amendment to what we've already done and need additional information?</p>	

	<p>T. Elmore states that certain services are considered additional services to the architect's contract, and they are included within the budget. B. Mushnick is any of this reimbursement? T. Elmore yes, it is reimbursable.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: M. Procaccini (Y), D. Haynes (Y), K. Maguire (Y), B. Bowen (Y), J. Dowse (Y), B. Foley(Y), H. Takesian (Y), B. Mushnick (Y); Abstentions: None; All in favor. Motion passes.</p>	
33.4	<p>Consigli Contract T. Elmore indicated that the Consigli contract is in progress, awaiting signatures for finalization. We anticipate obtaining all required signatures by December 21st. Discussion: None</p>	Record
33.5	<p>DRA Permitting and Design Update</p> <p>V. Lyubetsky provides a brief update on the programming meetings; re-interviewing various departments, confirming programs, and equipment needs. The main topics for today's discussions will be (1) site permitting, and (2) site plan design.</p> <p>(1) Site Permitting Steve Powers Samiotes Engineering Civil Engineer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filed an abbreviated notice of resource area delineation with the Franklin Conservation Commission in September. • Hired a local environmental scientist for this task and submitted findings to the Conservation Commission for approval. • The goal is to understand and lock in on wetland resources early in the process to understand site constraints. • Buffer zones surrounding the wetlands will need to be taken into consideration and permitted through the local conservation commission. • (6) distinct wetland areas demonstrated • Conflict arises in the interpretation of the Massachusetts wetlands protection act. • Stormwater management areas considered local wetlands under local bylaw. • Current Challenge: The Town peer reviewer claims bordering vegetated wetlands due to alleged constriction deviations from approved plans. This area exceeds 5000 SQF, triggering the need for an additional permit DNF and falls into state permitting NEPA category. Anticipate potential delays in the project timeline. <p>B. Bowen asks for clarification on the timeline for a response and the probability of the approval for the construction infill after the February submission. S. Powers expresses optimism about the project's changes of approval. The success of the project hinges on negotiations with the conservation commission and demonstrating a commitment to replicate and preserve areas, aligning with the two to one replication concept commonly found in local bylaws.</p>	Record

	<p>B. Bowen asks in those 15,000 SQF of replicated area would be on site somewhere, correct?</p> <p>S. Power replies yes, one area in the rear has been identified.</p> <p>B. Bowen asks does that satisfy the 15,000 SFQ requirement or do we need additional areas?</p> <p>S. Power replies we plan on needing additional areas, it also depends on what the Conservation Commission is going to want to see.</p> <p>B. Bowen asks, are there subsequent restrictions that we would have based on these locations? I believe some areas that are being considered are areas for potential future expansion.</p> <p>V. Lyubetsky states we will be permitting those areas as part of this project.</p> <p>D. Haynes asks is this common for two experts in wetlands to disagree of whether it is or is not a wetland?</p> <p>S. Power replies it is common.</p> <p>Permitting Timeline Vladimir Lyubetsky DRA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to meeting packet for visual. • Pink Bar: Potential for MEPA filing if wetlands exceed 5ksf 4-6 months. <p>B. Bowen asks what are the ramifications if we have to file with MEPA?</p> <p>T. Elmore states without question, it will have a financial impact. It's something we need to study further to understand the financial impact.</p> <p>Potential MEPA Permits Trip Elmore DWMP (Refer to meeting packet for visual)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional services will be needed. • Budget purposes: \$90K – 140K • Impact to Timeline = 9 months <p>(2) Site Plan Design Ti Johnson Warner Larson Landscape Architect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing revisions from original site plan design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option 1: New Access drive for construction and emergency access ○ Option 2: Existing power line access path to remain – construction traffic and emergency access only. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could serve buses to exit after picking up and drop off. ▪ Could serve as an adult education entrance point. • Changed the main bus circulation, full functional site plan where buses are traveling in a clockwise rotation around the back of the building. • Maintenance shed shifted to the north. <p>B. Bowen asks do we trigger anything, zoning wise?</p> <p>V. Lyubetsky replies that we do not have a final design, this will need to be modified to avoid triggering zone issues.</p>	
33.6	Solar Field Update	Record

	<p>T. Elmore shares that we have engaged with Recycle Solar company and requested pricing for removing the solar field. We also requested the same information from Luminance.</p> <p>K. Maguire states that D. Haynes had a conversation with Blake from Luminance. regarding, exploring various scenarios was, such as removing the contract entirely, buying materials independently, or transitioning to a different arrangement. The details of costs and procedures for each option were part of the conversation with Blake.</p> <p>Discussion: None</p>	
33.7	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting.</p> <p>Condominium abutter meeting update:</p> <p>K. Maguire comments a veteran, expressed interest in the project. The veteran, residing in condos near the school, raised concerns about the proximity of the school and mentioned the possibility of a fence. The school representatives suggested the addition of more parking spaces but didn't provide a definitive answer about the fence. There's a consideration to repurpose the solar array fence for a property line fence near the condos. The veterans wanted prior notification for any blasting activities, expressed concern about potential impacts on their property, and sought clarification on the project's work hours.</p> <p>T. Elmore comments on the surveying process for structures within the zone, stating that typically, surveys cover both the inside and outside, with details depending on the property owner. They mentioned a notice for blasting activities, emphasizing transparent communication and adherence to local ordinances for work hours, which generally restrict construction activities between certain hours.</p> <p>S. Johnson comments there is an extensive and strict process for notifying residents about blasting activities to ensure they are well-informed.</p> <p>DRA Reimbursable Expense</p> <p>T. Elmore explains that part of the process is to register this project as a LEED or CHIPS project, and DRA started the process, submitted the application and made a payment of \$1,700.00 to move things forward. We're looking to get this reimbursable expense approved.</p> <p>A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by B. Bowen for the approval of the DRA Reimbursable expense for LEED school registration fee, in the amount of \$1,700.00.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: M. Procaccini (Y), D. Haynes (Y), K. Maguire (Y), B. Bowen (Y), J. Dowse (Y), B. Foley(Y), H. Takesian (Y), B. Mushnick (Y); Abstentions: None; All in favor. Motion passes.</p>	

33.8	Public Comment: Discussion: None	Record
33.9	Next Meeting: <u>Building Committee Meeting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Committee Remote Meeting – January 18,2024; Location: ZOOM • Building Committee Remote Meeting – February 15, 2024; Location: ZOOM • Building Committee Remote Meeting – March 21, 2024; Location: TBD Discussion: None	Record
33.10	Adjourn: 5:35PM _motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by B. Bowen to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: None; Roll Call Vote: M. Procaccini (Y), D. Haynes (Y), K. Maguire (Y), B. Bowen (Y), J. Dowse (Y), B. Foley(Y), H. Takesian (Y), B. Mushnick (Y); Abstentions: None; All in favor, meeting is adjourned.	Record

Sincerely,
 DORE + WHITTIER

Elias Grijalva
 Assistant Project Manager
 Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.