

WEBSTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE  
OPEN SESSION MINUTES (M.G.L. C.39) OF DECEMBER 17, 2020

Date: December 17, 2020

Present: Dave Hurton - Chairman - *Voting Member*  
Ted Avlas – *Vice Chairman Member - Voting Member*  
Ruthann Goguen - Superintendent  
Monique Pierangeli – Business Manager  
Gina Nieves - *Voting Member*  
Al Young - *Voting Member*  
Tony Paranto - *Voting Member (6:20 pm)*  
Tim Bell - Town Accountant

Absent: Doug Willardson - Town Administrator  
Sheila Blythe – *School Committee Voting Member*  
Lisa Kontoes - *BOS Member - Voting Member*  
Fran Thomas - Principal  
Ted Tetreault - Building Inspector

Attendees: Ken Guyette - OPM

**I. Call to order:** Mr. Hurton called the meeting to order at 6:07 pm.

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

- October 7, 2020  
Motion – Ted Avlas  
Second – Gina Nieves  
Vote: Yes – 4; No – 0, Abstain - 0 (Mr. Paranto was not present until 6:20)

**III. Update on Designer Panel Finalist and Top Candidate:**

Ms. Pierangeli updated committee members on the DSP process. Superintendent Goguen, Ted Avlas and Ms. Pierangeli participated in a lengthy 2 hour meeting on November 17th with OPM Ken Guyette listening in. Participants reviewed the 10 proposals. Proposals received were very strong and the committee discussed and voted by points on their top 3 candidates. The selection was narrowed down to 3 finalists, Flansburg, Dore & Whittier and Mille Dyer Spears (MDS). The 3 finalists would then participate in interviews on December 1st with the same Designer Selection Panel. Five questions were shared with the District for review and then given to the Architect's to come up with a 30 minute presentation. After the presentation we had the opportunity to have a Q & A. The DSP committee then had discussions about the finalist and looked to the district for their input. It is not uncommon for the DSP to take the district's thoughts and give them a lot of weight towards the decision making process. The district's 3 members supported Dore & Whittier for their history with Webster and the community knowledge they have for successfully completing two projects. The DSP in this case did

not support the districts wishes to put forward Dore and Whittier and when the voting was completed Dore & Whittier lost by 1 vote with the final ranking being Flansburg 39, D&W 38 and MDS coming in third. The district was disappointed in the final ranking, but all candidates were very well qualified and Flansburg is definitely a very strong candidate, had a great presentation and Ms. Pierangeli is confident that they will come in and do a great job on behalf of the Town of Webster. Superintendent Goguen stated the process was very thorough and the 3 members unanimously felt that D & W had the community trust and was supported by the district, but Flansburgs proposal was very impressive and had experience with Chapter 74 and renovations projects. Ms. Goguen also felt educational consultant had experience in chapter 74. Mr. Avlas stated that it was a two step process and the first step was to come up with the top 3 and Dore and Whittier was clearly the top candidate in a landslide and could have easily been appointed at that point, but when the decision was made to have interviews, everything prior gets thrown out and you start from scratch. The DSP was impressed with the 3D presentation from Flansburg and it is very rare for the panel not to support the local district. It was very disappointing, but we respect the choice and Flansburgh is a very good firm and we are ready to move forward and Mr. Avlas has confidence in OPM Ken Guyette to lead us through a successful project.

**IV. Flansburg Fee Proposal:**

Mr. Guyette reviewed the proposal for Flansburg. He entered into fee negotiations for the scope of work which was already defined in the RFS. After some back and forth they came up with an agreement that fits within the budget. A standard contract is already defined by the MSBA . The proposal outlines all the sub consultants they will be using and in addition there are several extra services that are defined such as traffic, wetlands, site survey and some hazmat. It is important to note that hazmat survey services are included in the basic services contract for the architect umbrella. What you see here is strictly for site. These fees fall in line with other projects and are comparable. Mr. Hurton asked if with the negotiations and reduction of fees there was any scope of work that was reduced because of this. Mr. Guyette stated no, that there is still the same level of service and this was part of the negotiation process and was able to make this work. Ms. Pierangeli asked Mr. Guyette to explain the fee structure for some of the additional proposals that were included, for example the reimbursable fees, are those on top of the contracts or included in. Mr. Guyette stated that those proposals are a “not to exceed” and cannot be over that contract amount. Mr. Bell, Town Accountant stated that he thinks that is not how the contract reads. Mr. Guyette will get clarification for the fee proposals that reimbursables are included.

**V. Flansburg Contract for Execution:**

Mr. Hurton asked if there were any additional comments in regards to the contract before approval. Town accountant Tim Bell stated that the contract does state that there is a 1 ½ service fee if the payment isn't made within the 30 day period. Most of the time we don't see this charge, but if we are only meeting once a month we may not be able to make payment in the 30 day window. Mr. Guyette noted that in many cases the committee will appoint a member to approve and sign warrants so bills can be processed within the allowed window if necessary. Mr. Hurton requested that we put a designee on the next School Building Committee Agenda.

Motion to approve the contract for Flansburg and bring to the school committee for final approval.

Motion: Tony Paranto

Second: Gina Nieves

Vote: Yes – 5, No – 0; Abstain - 0

**VI. Colliers MSBA Monthly Report**

Mr. Guyette stated as part of the process is to put together a monthly report for the MSBA. Ken presented the reports to the committee that will be submitted which includes payments and schedule of the project which brings us through the end of the feasibility process in 2022.

**VII. Approval of Warrant: No Warrant - Passed over**

**VIII. Meeting Schedule:**

It is recommended that the Building Committee should start to meet monthly now that the architect will be fully onboard and there will be much more activity moving forward. Next Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 21st. The committee will be meeting on the third Thursday of the month.

**VIII. Adjourn:**

Motion to Adjourn 6:48 pm

Motion: Ted Avlas

Second: Al Young

Vote: Yes – 5, No – 0; Abstain - 0

Respectfully submitted,

Monique Pierangeli