

PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE  
 SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE SUB-COMMITTEE  
 MEETING MINUTES



Project:	Clinton Middle School	Project No:	20200640305
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	09/19/2023
Location:	ZOOM	Time:	6:30 PM
Distribution:	Attendees, Project File	Prepared By:	E. Grijalva
MSBA Module:	4- Schematic Design		

**Meeting Agenda**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
1. Call to Order	Michael Ward*	Town Admin- PBC Member
2. Senior Center Housing Invoice for Approval	Steven Meyer*	Superintendent – PBC Member
3. Previous Topics and Approval of August 22, 2023, Meeting Minutes	Chris McGown*	Chair of PBC, Head of DPW
4. Project Budget Update	Chris Magliozzi*	Vice-Chair of PBC
5. Invoices and Commitments for Approval	Brian Delorey*	PBC Member
6. MSBA Board of Directors Update	Brendon Bailey	School Committee Chair
7. LPA A Update	Matthew Varakis	School Committee Vice-Chair
8. Construction Delivery Method Discussion Only	Shane McCarthy	Teacher
9. Community Outreach	Bill McGrail	Finance Committee Co-Chair
10. Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting	Phil Duffy	Director of Community & Econ. Dev.
11. Public Comment	Kelly Turcotte	Special Education Parent Advisory Council
12. Next Meeting	Christine M.	Public
13. Adjourn	Steve O' Connell	Public
	Trip Elmore	DWMP- Project Director
	Mike Cox	DWMP- Project Manager
	Elias Grijalva	DWMP- Assistant Project Manager
	Peter Caruso	LPAA – Project Manager
	Sean Brennan	LPAA- Project Architect
	Eric Moore	LPAA- Sr. Project Architect
	Kevin Seaman	Seaman Engin.
	Lynne Giesecke	Studio 2112

Item No.	Description	Action
16.1	<p><b>Call to Order: 6:34 PM</b> meeting was called to order by PBC Chair, C. McGown with <b>5 of 7</b> members in attendance.</p>	Record
16.2	<p><b>Senior Center Carriage Housing Invoice and Change Order Approval:</b>            Fox Painting Co, Application for Payment No.002 Request, in the amount of <u>\$145,112.50</u></p> <p>A motion to approve Fox Painting Co.'s application for payment request, in the amount of \$145,112.50 was submitted by S. Meyer and seconded by C. Magliozzi.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None; <b>Roll Call Vote:</b> C. Magliozzi (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y); <b>Abstentions:</b> M. Ward (experienced technical difficulties)            All in favor, motion passes.</p>	Record
16.3	<p><b>Previous Topics &amp; Approval of August 22, 2023, Meeting Minutes:</b>            A motion to approve the 08/22/2023 meeting minutes was submitted by S. Meyer and seconded by C. Magliozzi.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None; <b>Roll Call Vote:</b> C. Magliozzi (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y); <b>Abstentions:</b> M. Ward (experienced technical difficulties)            All in favor, motion passes, August 22, 2023, meetings are certified as approved.</p>	Record
16.4	<p><b>Project Budget Update:</b>  <u>M.Cox</u> updates the committee on the current project budget. After tonight's approval of LPA A Amendment No.004, there will be \$41,706.32 left in the budget for future expenditures.</p> <p><u>LPA A Amendment No.004 request.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geotechnical Testing Services:      \$10,010.00             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (4) borings, taking the four corners of the building to confirm the soil condition.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Fire Hydrant Flow Test:                      \$1,925.00             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Confirm that there is enough water pressure so that we do not have to put a fire pump in the building.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amendment No.004 Total:                      <b><u>\$11,935.00</u></b></li> </ul> <p>A motion was made by S. Meyer, and second by M. Ward for the approval of the LPA A Amendment No.004.</p> <p><b>Discussions:</b> None; <b>Roll Call Vote:</b> M. Ward (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y), B. Delorey; <b>Abstentions:</b> C. Magliozzi (experienced technical difficulties)</p> <p>All in favor, motion passes to approve LPA A Amendment No.004 request.</p>	Record

<p>16.5</p>	<p><b>Invoices and Commitments for Approval</b></p> <p>Invoice 1: DWMP Invoice #013, in the amount of \$15,000.00</p> <p>A motion was made by M. Ward and seconded by B. Delorey for the approval of the DWMP August invoice.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None; <b>Roll Call Vote:</b> M. Ward (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y), B. Delorey; <b>Abstentions:</b> C. Magliozzi (experienced technical difficulties)        All in favor, motion passes to approve DWMP invoice.</p> <hr/> <p>Invoice 2: LPA A Invoice #008, in the amount of 35,540.00</p> <p>A motion was made by M. Ward and seconded by S. Meyer for the approval of the LPA A August Invoice.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None; <b>Roll Call Vote:</b> M. Ward (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y), B. Delorey; <b>Abstentions:</b> C. Magliozzi (experienced technical difficulties)        All in favor, motion passes to approve LPA A invoice.</p>	<p>Record</p>
<p>16.6</p>	<p><b>MSBA Board of Directors Update</b></p> <p><u>T. Elmore</u> shares a few slides from the MSBA Board of Directors meeting that took place on August 30, 2023. The MSBA accepted the project at an estimated total project cost of \$142,184,781.00, with a proposed square footage of 136,000, and a grade configuration of grades 4-8. The MSBA has invited the Town of Clinton into Schematic Design (SD).</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None</p>	<p>Record</p>
<p>16.7</p>	<p><b>LPA A Update</b></p> <p><u>P. Caruso</u> introduces two of LPA A sub-consultants L. Giesecke from Studio 2112, landscape architect, and Kevin Seaman from Seaman Engineering, Mechanical engineer. He demonstrates the updated floor plans and some of the changes made since the last presentation.</p> <p><u>L. Giesecke</u> demonstrates the up-to-date site plan and traffic pattern. (refer to meeting packet)</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b>  <u>C. McGown</u> asks, can the buses queue along those two lanes near the rain garden?        S. Brennan confirms the buses can. They could start queueing all the way back to the intersection.  <u>M. Varakis</u> asks if we know how many buses are utilized at the middle school on a typical day.  <u>S. Meyer</u> replies for 12 buses.  <u>M. Varakis</u> states that hopefully, we will have more room than we have today.</p> <p><u>S. Meyer</u> states that during the executive meeting, we discussed relocating the playground closer to the basketball court so that the basketball court and the play area are close in proximity.</p>	<p>Record</p>

L. Giesecke suggests moving the playground north of the landscape berm, right outside the fourth-grade wing, taking advantage of that unprogrammed space, and maintaining the Flexible Greenspace for the PE classes.

S. Meyer likes the suggestion because the playground would be right outside their classroom. A good transition for the students.

S. Meyer asks about area 14 – Multipurpose field, has it been decided if that area will be grass or turf?

L. Giesecke confirms it is grass.

E. Moore states if interested, we can always do an add-alternate in exploring a synthetic turf field.

M. Varakis states that he thinks it's a smart play to at least evaluate it so we can understand the potential cost associated with synthetic turf.

T. Elmore states that if turf is a selected option, then that will increase the budget by an estimated 1 million dollars. It's a significant upgrade.

L. Giesecke explains that there will long long-term operational cost savings.

P. Duffy asks if there is any plan to account for pedestrian circulation along West Boylston Street, there is an existing sidewalk in front of the middle school leading up to the High school.

T. Elmore replies that the sidewalk will remain because we are not disturbing any of that area along West Boylston Street.

L. Giesecke comments there will be pedestrian connections to this within the project.

P. Duffy asked the committee what they thought about the limited pedestrian accommodation.

C. McGown states he is not sure if any upgrades would be part of this project.

C. Magliozzi states he thinks the design team should spend some time thinking about how they can improve the street.

P. Duffy states it might be a good opportunity to look at it within the scope of this project.

C. McGown agrees that the sidewalk is in disrepair and one way or another, it should be upgraded whether it's part of this project or not.

S. Brennan gives an overview of the implications of the MSBA, recently adopted amendments to their energy efficiency credits, and the impact of the new stretch code that the state of Massachusetts adopted.

**Old Base Requirement:** (PSR Design – Program No Longer Exist)

- LEED for Schools Certified or NE-CHPS Verified
- Exceed Current Energy Code by 10%
- Specific IAQ Points Required – LEED or NE-CHPS

**Previously for an Additional 2% reimbursement:**

- Exceed current energy code by 20%

**Base Requirement**

- LEED for Schools Silver or NE-CHPS Verified
- Meeting new Stretch Code
- Minimum IAQ Points – LEED or NE- CHPS
- For an additional 3%: meet OPT in Specialized Code

- For an additional 1%: Achieve two additional IAQ points in LEED or CHPS
- **4% additional available in total**

S. Brennan states our greatest opportunity to make and implement these changes is now, early in the process, so we can avoid costly change orders, but most important is locking in your percentage reimbursement rate and the scope of work at the end of Schematic Design.

#### **New Stretch Mandatory Code Requirements** (refer to meeting packet)

- C402.1.5- Envelope Backstop – New set of criteria. Not included in PSR Design. Computational software that allows us to understand how well the building is performing.
- C402.3- Rooftop Solar Ready – Owned in PSR Design.
- C402.5 Air Leakage Testing – New set of criteria. Not included PSR Design. Stretch code is now required. Rely on Mechanical ventilation and reduce the amount of leakage and thermal loss or infiltration into the building.
- C402.7 – Thermal Bridge Derating- New criteria. Not included in PSR Design. Derating the performance of your wall system
- C403 – Building Mechanical System w/ Energy Recovery – PSR Design had efficiency criteria that were met or exceeded. The new code raises the bar.
- C404- Service Water Heating - PSR Design had efficiency criteria that were met or exceeded. The new code raises the bar.
- C406 Additional Efficiency Measures- PSR Design had efficiency criteria that were met or exceeded. The new code raises the bar.
- EV Parking – PSR Design had efficiency criteria that were met or exceeded. The new code requires 10% of your spaces EV Wiring. PSR was close to 10%. Marginal change.

#### **Discussion:**

C. Magliozzi asked if you had any idea what the increase in electrical costs would be.

K. Seaman replies with the favorable cost of natural gas and high increase rates of electricity, the electric approach does add more cost compared to the burning of natural gas. The trend is steering away from fossil fuels.

C. Magliozzi asked if there is any way to get some data on lifecycle costs relative to equipment replacement, so the committee can evaluate before deciding. How soon does this decision have to be made?

K. Seaman shares that the green engineer has completed energy models for this school.

S. Brennan replies within two weeks, to a month.

T. Elmore recommends that LPA|A reach out to the Green Engineer, so they can demonstrate some operational cost modeling and some life cycle cost in the next meeting on October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2023, so the committee can make an informed decision.

16.8	<p><b><u>Construction Delivery Method Discussion and Vote:</u></b></p> <p>T. Elmore briefly recaps the Facts, Advantages, and Disadvantages of each Construction Delivery Method, CM @ Risk (Chapter 149a) vs. Design Bid Build (Chapter 149)</p> <p><b><u>Discussion:</u></b>  <u>M. Ward</u> asks are Construction Managers (CM) able to manage the process of subcontractor competitive bidding.  <u>T. Elmore</u> confirms and explains that as a town you have 18 trade categories from mechanical, and electrical, to plumbing and so on, that are directly bid by the town to the filed sub-bidders'. Once the proposals are received, the accepted low-qualified bidder is then assigned to the CM. The CM is the one who owns the subcontractor at the time that you assign it to them. They also buy approximately 25 other trades independently with input from the team. We are involved in the de-scoping and the understanding of what they're procuring from a scope standpoint. Typically, that's where the OPM and the architect will represent the town and really understand what we're buying.</p> <p><u>M. Ward</u> is the CM fully transparent?  <u>T. Elmore</u> replies that it's a fully open-book process. If we want to see something, we get to see it.  <u>M. Ward</u> comments that we haven't done it before in this town but I'm willing to give it a try.  <u>C. Magliozzi</u> shares that he likes the transparency of CM@ Risk and if any problems arise, we can proactively resolve those problems. Whereas a Design Bid Built, we're forced to be combative, where we're forced to rely on the documents, and if we can't resolve the problem then it ends up in court. I come from a construction background, and we don't do Design Bid Built projects, we only do CM @ Risk projects.  <u>B. Delorey</u> commented that he agreed that the CM at Risk method is the way to go.  <u>M. Ward</u> asked if our current consultants, OPM and Designer have any experience with CM @ Risk.  <u>T. Elmore</u> states I have completed 8 public projects using CM @ Risk since 2004, I also have had numerous discussions with the IG's office regarding improving the process, so, I have extensive experience with CM@ @ risk and so does Eric Moore from LPA A, has numerous CM @ Risk projects. So, your team has the experience to do this.  <u>C. McGown</u> commented on past experiences with Design, Bid, and Build projects going to litigation and the Town not winning the legal cases, which M. Ward agreed with. The CM at Risk may proactively help the Town come to a more favorable conclusion at the end of the project.</p> <p>A motion was made by S. Meyer and seconded by B. Delorey for CM @ Risk (Chapter 149a) as the Construction Delivery Method.</p> <p><b>Roll Call Vote:</b> C. Magliozzi (Y), B. Delorey (Y), M. Ward (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y), <b>Abstentions:</b> None      Motion passes to use CM @ Risk, as the construction delivery method for this project.</p>	Record
16.8.1	<p><b>If CM at Risk is voted to proceed, the Designation of the Qualification, Proposal, and Interview voting members need to be established and approved.</b></p>	Record

T. Elmore explains the next couple of steps, submitting the MA Inspector General application, Designation of Qualifications, Proposals, and Interview. The voting members need to be established and approved for this process.

**1. MA Inspector General Application to use CM @ Risk as the Construction Delivery Method**

- Complete Application > Submit Application > 60 Days IG Application Review > IG Approval to use CM @ Risk

**2. Develop, issue, and review CM Risk Qualifications to get shortlisted.**

- Create a Request for Qualifications (RFS) > Approve and Issue RFQ > Receive CM Firm Qualifications > Review Qualifications and Select 3-4 firms to submit proposals.

**3. Develop, issue, and Review CM @ Risk Proposals/Interviews to select the CM**

- Create a Request for Proposal (RFP) > Approve and Issue RFP > Receive CM Firm Proposals > Score Proposals > Interview Firms > Negotiate and Award CM

**• CM Subcommittee Criteria**

- At Least (2) members from SBC/PBC, (1) member from OPM, and (1) member from Architect.
  - OPM Representative: Trip Elmore
  - LPA|A Representative: Eric Moore

C. McGown states that M. Moran is not present at this meeting, and we don't want to exclude him from tonight's decision for the CM subcommittee selection. We will be meeting in two weeks; we can vote then, on October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

16.9

**Community Outreach Update**

T. Elmore talks about public outreach.

- The project message needs to come from within the community.
- Keeping the public informed with accurate information
- Address Concerns and issues at local events
- There is one shot at getting this done, so the community needs to understand how important it is to vote.
  - There is no "costs nothing" approach, it only costs most in the future.
    - Example:
      - Spencer East Brookfield HS's original construction project budget was \$60 Million. The project failed to move forward.
      - 10 years later. The same project is now 112 million. Passed the local vote.

The point is that it only costs more if this project does not pass the first time and the need does not go away.

**Discussion:** None

15.10	<b>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</b> Discussion: None	Record
15.11	<b>Public Comment:</b> Discussion: None	Record
15.12	<b>Next Meeting:</b> 10.03.2023 – CMS Building Committee Remote @ 6:30PM – Remote via ZOOM 10.17.2023 – CMS Building Committee Remote @ 6:30 PM – Location: TBD 11.14.2023 – CMS Building Committee Remote @6:30 PM – Location TBD 12.19.2023 – CMS Building Committee Remote @6:30PM – Location: TBD  <b>Discussion:</b> None	Record
15.13	<b>Adjourn: 8:16 PM</b> motion was made by <u>M. Ward</u> and seconded by S. Meyer to adjourn the meeting.  <b>Discussion:</b> None; <b>Roll Call Vote:</b> C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y) <b>Abstentions:</b> None All in favor, the meeting is adjourned.	Record

Sincerely,

**DORE + WHITTIER**

Elias Grijalva

Assistant Project Manager

Cc: Attendees, File

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