

**SCITUATE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2018**

1. Call to order at 6:36 PM by Chair Payette

Members Present: Chair Michael Payette  
Superintendent Lawrence Filippelli  
Sal Gelsomino  
Brian Piccolo  
Joseph A. Casali  
Raymond Grigelevich  
Carolyn Dias  
Michael Hassell  
Paul Lamoureux  
Dennis Lessard  
Nicholas Piampiano  
Robert Corrente

Legal counsel, Sarah F. Malley, Esq., from Gorham & Gorham, Inc., was also present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Payette.
3. Discussion on minutes from April 4, 2018

It was discussed that the minutes from April 4, 2018 had an error in the Public Comment section, Brenden Machowski's name was spelled incorrectly, and his comment was about windows in the school bond, not barn. It was also discussed that under Section 4(A), paragraph 3 that "lower bleachers" should be changed to just "bleachers." A motion was made by Chair Payette to accept the minutes as corrected, it was seconded by Member Piccolo, and was voted unanimously.

4. New Business

- A. Discussion/Action/Vote – Schematic Designs from RGB and Gale & Company

Tracey Donnelly, Project Manager from RGB was present. She represented to the Board that Gale was looking into the situations with the windows at the school in the 1958 portion of the building. She said that some did not close completely and were causing a loss of energy. She said that Gale was looking into the possibility of keeping the existing windows, but just repairing them. They could try to get some replacement parts and has already contacted the manufacturer of the windows which were installed in 1994. She said they need to figure out what the lifespan of the windows are with replacements, and decide if it is better to just replace.

Member Dias asked Ms. Donnelly about the cost of replacement windows versus the costs of repairs. Ms. Donnelly stated that she was not sure at the moment but was looking into it and could provide an analysis. Ms. Donnelly was more concerned about the life expectancy of

the existing windows. Member Craven was concerned about how a full replacement of the windows in the 1958 portion of the building could expose materials that would be costly to remove. Member Piccolo wanted to know if that was remedied in the 1994 window replacements. Ms. Donnelly stated that if Gale was to replace the windows, they would do so in the same manner that occurred in 1994, so anything in the ceiling would not be disturbed. Ms. Donnelly assured the Board that she will continue to gather more information on window replacement versus repairs.

John Perry, Chief Civil Engineer from Gale Associates submitted documents to the Board for review. He then discussed the status of the test pits. Test pits for the field were done, but not for the septic. He said the field pits were mostly fill of a sand and gravel material, with some large boulders and organics, and no sounds of groundwater. Member Grigevich was concerned about rumors of hazardous materials being in the fill. Mr. Perry stated that the fill looked clean, but was not specifically tested for hazardous materials.

Mr. Perry then went on to discuss three designs submitted to the board for the field work. The first option would require about 14,000 yards of import material to fill in the grading, the leech field would be next to the field, and retaining walls would be required. The second option would require only 623 yards of import fill, the site would be lowered by approximately three feet in order to balance the site. There are no wetlands, so they can cut some of the trees and grade down to the woodline and existing practice field. Only a minimal retaining wall would be needed, and a driveway for emergency vehicle access was also included in the design. Bleachers would be put on a pad and could fit about 100-200 people. Some members were concerned about the bleachers being located on only one pad and with a limited number of people being able to use them. John said that it was possible to extend the pad. Member Hassell stated that he would get information for the Scholastic League on the seating requirements to host meets.

Mr. Perry then went on to discuss the third option. This option would require lowering the field by approximately six feet, importing about 19,238 yards of fill, and the use of extensive retaining walls. This option would keep the existing grade at the tree line, but would cut into the grade at the other side of the field. At this point, member Ferrara arrives to the meeting. Mr. Perry discussed the limitations on the accessibility of the site and stated that a lift would be required.

Mr. Perry compared the costs of all three options. The first option about cost approximately \$3.5 million with the contingencies, the second option would cost approximately \$3 million, and the third option would cost about \$3.4 million. All costs include the septic system. Ms. Donnelly pointed out that the septic was not included in the original estimates, but is included in these estimates. After discussion on the pros and cons of each plan, the Board decided that the second option appeared to be the best design and was the most cost-effective option. Members asked further questions about the accessibility of the practice field. Mr. Perry stated that he would confirm that it is not required to have an ADA accessible path to reach the practice field, but if it is required, that they could add a pathway to the design.

Member Hassell had questions about pumps and maintenance plans. Mr. Perry stated that it was under investigation, but they are currently planning on a drip systems because it

requires less space to operate. Mr. Piampiano suggested doing test pits for the septic further north than where the design currently put it. Mr. Perry agreed that it was a good idea and would look into it. There was some questions about if the current septic is only used for the high school, or if some of the middle school is drained into it. It was agreed that more investigation was needed.

Mr. Perry then went on to discuss options for the retaining walls. He said he likes to use the ready-made rock walls.

Member Dion had some questions that her constituents were concerned about. First, she wanted confirmation on the wetlands situation. Mr. Perry stated that their expert has found no wetlands. Second, she wanted to know if there were dangerous debris in the field soil. Mr. Perry stated that the fill appeared to be clean with no sign of debris such as glass or metal. He also stated that they would be putting down new top soil and then the turf will cover that, so even if debris was present, it would not present a problem. Next, Ms. Dion wanted to know the track would fit into the design. Mr. Perry stated yes, because they were cutting into the existing practice field. Finally, she wanted to confirm that the track would fit scholastic regulations. Mr. Perry said yes.

Member Hassell had questions if the track could be rotated a bit eastward to have more room for the septic. Mr. Perry said that more fill would be needed if they did that. Mr. Perry said that the rotation was not needed if there were viable sites further north for the septic.

Members had questions about lighting the field. Mr. Perry said that they would use a Hoffman Box, but the location was yet to be determined. There were also questions about the score board. Mr. Perry said the current scoreboard would be used, but they would change its location. Member Piccolo said that he wanted to keep an eye on further expansion and designing the new field in ways that could make future expansion easier and more cost effective. There were also questions about how more bleachers could be added in the future. Member Dion stated that it was pertinent to remember that any money saved on the field is to be used on the school buildings.

Discussion went back to the septic system. Mr. Perry stated that they were calculating use on the number of current students and staff, and were under the presumption that all students would not regularly shower after gym class. Member Ferrara asked if showers after major sporting events would be calculated into the capacity. Mr. Perry stated that showers were possible, but every day after-gym showers were not calculated since it is no longer customary for students to shower after gym class. Member Casali stated that they could also compare flow charts with similar sized schools. Mr. Perry discussed prior work his company has done at King Phillip High School in Wrentham, Massachusetts. Mr. Perry also stated that they would work with the student population projections to make sure that the system would accommodate projected student population growth.

Members also had questions about the location of the bleachers and the finish line. It was pointed out that the finish line was on the opposite side of the bleachers. Mr. Perry stated that he would try to correct that in the design. There were also questions about water access at the field

in order to clean up. Mr. Perry said that they would put in quick connects and a two inch water line. There were also questions about if the lighting would be able to accommodate night games. Mr. Perry said that they would put in the footings and poles that would allow lighting that is compliant with night games.

Mr. Perry also pointed out that the cost estimates included the installation of a shock pad. He said that while a shock pad is not currently required, the trend in the sporting world is moving towards making them required.

Members had questions about the size of the new track. Mr. Perry said that it would not be too much wider, but mostly would be longer than the current track. The new lanes would be 42” wide, which complies with regulations.

Member Ferrara wanted to know if it was possible for a storage area to be included in the future, to store athletic equipment. Member Craven said that storage could be added to the back of one of the buildings. Chair Payette stated that money saved on the field is to go to the buildings, but that the Board could get creative to try to make storage for athletic equipment possible.

Member Ferrara asked Mr. Perry if the Board agreed on the second option, would the school department incur extra costs if DEM did not approve the septic, and the designed needed to be redone. Mr. Perry said he hoped they were two separate issues. Mr. Perry said he just needed to know if the Board was conceptually in agreement with the second option.

Discussion went back to the septic system and DEM approval. Due to strict timelines, there was discussion on finding out if it could be submitted as a repair versus a new construction, because repairs are reviewed quicker and require less scrutiny.

Chair Payette made a motion to give conditional approval on the second option; if the septic makes changes to the second option, the Town shall not incur additional design costs. Member Dias seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously with the exception of Member Casali who was advisory only.

## 5. Adjournment

Chair Payette made a motion to adjourn, it was seconded, and all members approved unanimously at approximately 8:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sarah F. Malley*

Sarah F. Malley, Esq.  
Gorham & Gorham, Inc.

[https://gorham291-my.sharepoint.com/personal/bradgorham\\_gorhamlaw\\_com/Documents/Server/Documents/Attorney/David/Town of Scituate/SCITUATE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT/RIDE Committee & Bond 2016/Meeting Minutes of April 11, 2018.docx](https://gorham291-my.sharepoint.com/personal/bradgorham_gorhamlaw_com/Documents/Server/Documents/Attorney/David/Town of Scituate/SCITUATE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT/RIDE Committee & Bond 2016/Meeting Minutes of April 11, 2018.docx)