

**OLD COLONY REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**476 North Avenue  
Rochester, MA 02770**

**Monday  
September 16, 2024**

**SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**Present:** Mrs. Shirley Bourque, Mr. Robert Marshall, Mrs. Mr. Robert Field, Mr. Mark Townsend, Mr. Michael Lorenc, Mr. Robert Gomes, Mr. Brian Day, Mr. Neil Regis, Mr. Eldaro Amaral, Mrs. Maureen Townsend, Mr. Christopher Plonka, Mr. David Hughes, Mr. Stephen Lombard, Mr. Aaron Polansky, Superintendent-Director; Mrs. Sarah Griffith, Business Manager; Mr. Gary Linehan, Principal; Mr. Robert Souza, Facilities Director; Mrs. Jolene Costa, District Committee Secretary

**Absent:** Chief Scott Weigel, Mrs. Debbie Quin, Ms. Elizabeth Sulger, Mr. David Wojnar

**Also:** Mr. Chad Crittenden, PMA Project Director; Mr. Mark Adrean, PMA Senior Associate; Mr. Bobby Williams, HMFH Architects

**Mrs. Bourque called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.**

**All in attendance stood for the Pledge of Allegiance and moment of silence.**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. Robert Marshall and seconded by Mr. Christopher Plonka, it was unanimously**

**Voted: To approve the August 19, 2024 School Building Committee minutes**

**13 – Yes**

**4 – Absent (S. Weigel, D. Quin, D. Wojnar, E. Sulger)**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. David Hughes and seconded by Mr. Robert Gomes, it was unanimously**

**Voted: To approve outstanding invoices for PMA and HMFH.**

**Mrs. Bourque stated the first four (4) PMA invoices were voted on by the School Committee however she wanted the invoices to be voted on by the School Building Committee moving forward.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated a slide with the invoices will be included in the presentation moving forward and the vote to approve invoices will be a standing vote on the agenda.**

**Mr. Marshall inquired about the remaining balance and why it is not being drawn down as invoices are paid.**

**It was explained that the Invoice Register tracks invoices paid for the Feasibility Study using MSBA cost codes. The remaining billable column is not a running total, instead it is buckets of available funds in the budget organized by MSBA cost code.**

**Mrs. Bourque turned the meeting over to Mr. Crittenden from PMA.**

**Mr. Crittenden reviewed the agenda for this evening and where the project is on the MSBA process timeline and stated we are at submission one (1) of three (3), which is the collection of data, before handing the meeting over to Mr. Williams from HMFH.**

**Mr. Williams stated we are at the very end of the PDP Workplan and will be reviewing the site and enrollment options.**

**Mr. Williams stated the Committee must select at least one addition/renovation option and one new construction option.**

**Mr. Williams stated the goal is to eliminate options which drives how the process will move forward.**

**Mr. Williams reviewed the Educational Programming and Visioning Update which outlined the designer guiding principles that were identified out of the last Visioning Session that took place on September 11, 2024.**

**Mr. Williams reviewed the three (3) Site options along with the pros and cons of each with the Committee which are outlined below:**

- **Site Approach 1 is an addition/renovation option only north of the gym with a cost range of \$268M - \$318M. Pros of this build are the maintenance of the current sports fields, allows for development or re-wording of existing building site, and would work for addition/renovation. Cons of this build are the site constraints by utility easement, vernal pool setbacks and existing building and not suitable for new construction without excessive phasing.**

- **Site Approach 2 is new construction option only with a cost range of \$252M - \$297M located on the sports fields. Pros of this build are proper solar orientation can be achieved and existing well could remain. Cons of this build is site is in close proximity to abutters, sports fields would need to be rebuilt and length of construction would be extended.**
- **Site Approach 3 is new construction option only with a cost range of \$242M - \$285M. Pros of this build are maintenances of the sports fields, proper solar orientation can be achieved, would work for new construction or addition/renovation and allows for development or re-wording of existing building site. Cons of this site is the close proximity to abutters and existing well is un-useable.**

**Mr. Williams stated site approach 3 had potential to shift in closer to the vernal pools and existing building and is considered the preferred site with the lowest cost, has the most flexibility and least disruption to the students as a new construction and an addition/renovation option.**

**Mr. Williams reviewed Site Approach 4 and 5 which are not viable options due to the locations either being too close to the cemetery or leaching field.**

**Mr. Williams opened the floor up to the Committee to discuss the options and their preferred site option and stated Site Approach 3 would most likely be a hybrid of option 1 and 3 allowing for more space between the new school and abutters.**

**The Committee's concerns with the sites are outlined below:**

- **Location of secondary roads during construction**
- **Proximity to abutters**
- **Interruption of sports/field use, student walkway, and other everyday operations**
- **Paving options for secondary roads**
- **Parking distance to fields**
- **Location of new fields based upon which option is chosen**
- **Use of well once protection zone shrinks**

**Mr. Williams stated there will be additional studies in the next phase on the location and footprint of the building providing a more accurate diagram that he can't speak to at the moment in terms of distance.**

**Mr. Williams stated choosing a site will help eliminate a few of the 16 options that are currently before the Committee.**

**Mr. Day stated he would rather see the \$10M savings between Site 2 and Site 3 put towards higher enrollment instead of rebuilding fields.**

**General consensus from the Committee is Site 3 is the preferred option while maintaining fields and investing savings into other options.**

**Mr. Williams stated at the end of the project add alternates can be added with a vote if funds were remaining for fields or other options.**

**Mr. Williams stated town water will be put in place prior to the build giving the present school access to water allowing to build in the well protection zone and once complete shrink the area for irrigation purposes and study where the leaching field would be located.**

**Mr. Williams reviewed the Enrollment Comparison – Cost chart with the Committee to show the progression of the total project cost and the incremental cost increase as the enrollment and Chapter 74 programs increase.**

**Mr. Williams stated the goal is to narrow down to 2 enrollment goals leaving 4 to 5 options to study in next phase and design team ability to focus on a higher level of detail along with one (1) site.**

**Mr. Williams stated the 560 enrollment option can be dropped however once submitted to the MSBA they can come back and request it be carried forward as an option.**

**Mr. Williams opened up the floor to the Committee for discussion regarding their preferred 2 to 3 enrollment options.**

**Committee members voiced concern with the 810 enrollment and the effect on the sending school districts along with the Operating Budget.**

**Mr. Polansky stated he will advocate for Site 3 and 728 and 776 enrollment options.**

**Mr. Williams reviewed the Educational & Facility Goals document and the relationship between the goals and each site and enrollment option which has been scored and totaled using 0, 1, 2, and 3.**

**Mr. Williams stated the ratings on the document are as follows:**

- **1 Somewhat Meets Goals**
- **2 Meets Goals**
- **3 Exceeds Goals**

**Mr. Williams reviewed each facility and educational goal including pros and cons of each based upon site option and enrollment and connection between the visioning and scoring.**

**Mr. Polansky stated with the inclusion of HVAC along with Carpentry and Electrical there are opportunities for outbuildings to be created by the vocational programs for additional spaces if needed in the future.**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. David Hughes and seconded by Mr. Robert Gomes, it was unanimously**

**Voted: To approve Site Option 3 as the preferred choice of the School Building Committee**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. David Hughes and seconded by Mr. Michael Lorenzo, it was unanimously**

**Voted: To eliminate 560 and 620 enrollment as preferred options**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. Mark Townsend and seconded by Mr. Robert Gomes it was**

**Voted: To eliminate 810 enrollment as a preferred option**

**12 – Yes**

**1 – Opposed (B. Day)**

**4 – Absent (S. Weigel, D. Quin, D. Wojnar, E. Sulger)**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. Robert Marshall and seconded by Mr. Mark Townsend, it was unanimously**

**Voted: To approve 728 enrollment as the preferred option to be studied**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. David Hughes and seconded by Mr. Robert Gomes, it was**

**Voted: To approve the 776 enrollment as the preferred option to be studied**

**11 – Yes**

**2 – Opposed (Mark Townsend, R. Marshall)**

**4 – Absent (S. Weigel, D. Quin, D. Wojnar, E. Sulger)**

**Mr. Marshall requested any materials used during the meeting including the presentation be shared sooner if possible.**

**Mr. Day inquired about what the staff increases will look like with the enrollment increase and potential costs associated.**

**Mrs. Bourque stated this does not tie us to the enrollments and at one point there will need to be a vote to choose one moving forward.**

**Mr. Williams stated the site developments and locations will have much more detail and information for the Committee to review moving forward.**

**Mr. Crittenden reviewed the Preliminary Design Program Overview which is the MSBA checklist.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated these documents were shared this afternoon for review by the Committee.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated there is an update under the MSBA K-12 Market Data due to a MSBA Board meeting that took place on August 28, 2024.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated the construction cost cap has increase from \$605/SF to \$645/SF to catch up to the market conditions and explained in a year this cost will be locked in for this project unless there is another change prior to.**

**Mr. Crittenden reviewed the difference in the hypothetical district share amount and hypothetical MSBA grant cost scenarios with the increase in the construction cost cap to \$645.**

**Mr. Crittenden reviewed the local funding process with the committee citing language directly from the Old Colony Regional Agreement regarding the process for incurring debt under M.G.L Chapter 71, Section 16(d) or Section 16(n) and apportionment of capital costs/debt.**

**Mr. Crittenden summarized the difference between section 16(d) and 16(n) which is as follows:**

**Section 16(d)**

- Motion & vote by School Committee**

- **Notice issued to member communities within 7 days**
- **Member communities have 60 days to express disapproval via majority vote at Town Meeting, if any community disapproves then debt shall not be incurred**
- **Debt exclusion still requires vote in each community where applicable**

**Section 16(n)**

- **Identify special election date (35-day minimum notice required)**
- **Motion & vote by School Committee**
- **Election warrant issued to registered voters minimum 10 days prior to election**
- **One polling location in each community, open 4-8 hours, District responsible for election costs.**
- **Results from all member communities combined, majority vote prevails**
- **Debt exclusion still requires vote in each community where applicable**

**Mr. Crittenden stated that 90% of the apportionment of capital costs/debts are calculated by enrollment per town at Old Colony by October 1 and the additional 10% by the foundation enrollment which is based upon the number of students in all public, private and parochial schools in grades kindergarten through grade twelve residing in each member town on October 1.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated the vote to decide is approximately a year away and stated if 16(d) is chosen and fails you can then vote 16(n) which comes with additional costs.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated the vote for the building is expected to take place at the fall town meetings.**

**Mrs. Townsend inquired about the responsibility of the cost of the town meeting.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated they will get more information on who covers the cost of the Town Meeting under 16(d).**

**Mr. Crittenden reviewed the project timeline and next steps after the submission of the PDP and through the next year.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated a vote needs to be taken to approve the submission of the PDP to the MSBA.**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. David Hughes and seconded by Mr. Robert Marshall, it was unanimously**

**Voted: To approve the submission of the Preliminary Design Program to MSBA.**

**Mr. Crittenden stated the next meeting has not been determined yet and asked the Committee to choose a date this evening.**

**It was determined the next meeting will be as follows:**

**School Building Committee Meeting – Monday, October 21, 2024 – 6:00 p.m.**

**Meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Jolene Costa  
District Committee Secretary**

---

**Mrs. Shirley Bourque, Chairperson**

---

**Date**