



**PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

Project: Clinton Middle School
Subject: School Building Committee Meeting
Location: Clinton Middle School
Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: 202000640305
Meeting Date: 06/20/2023
Time: 6:30 PM
Prepared By: E. Grijalva

Present

Name	Affiliation
Michael Ward*	Town Administrator -PBC Member
Brendon Bailey	School Committee Chair
Steven Meyer*	Superintendent – PBC Member
Brian Farragher	Director of Facilities
Chris McGown*	Chair of PBC, Head of DPW
Chris Magliozzi*	Vice-Chair of PBC
Michael Moran*	PBC Member
Brian Delorey*	PBC Member
Phil Duffy	Director of Community & Econ. Dev.
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Elias Grijalva	DWMP
Peter Caruso	LPAA
Sean Brennan	LPAA
Eric	LPAA

*PBC Voting Members

Description

Action

13.1	<p>Call to Order: 6:36 PM meeting was called to order by PBC Chair C. McGown with 6 of 7 voting members in attendance.</p>	Record																																																
13.2	<p>Previous Topics & Approval of June 6, 2023, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 06/06/2023 meeting minutes was submitted by S. Meyer and seconded by B. Delorey.</p> <p>Discussion: None. Abstentions: None</p> <p>All in favor, motion passes, June 6, 2023, meetings are certified as approved.</p>	Record																																																
13.3	<p>Invoices and Commitments</p> <p>Invoice 1: Central Mass Signal, LLC June Invoice, in the amount of \$29,687.51</p> <p>A motion was made by C. Magliozzi and seconded by M. Moran for the approval of the Central Mass Signal June Invoice.</p> <p>Discussion: None. Abstentions: None</p> <p>All in favor, motion passes to approve Central Mass Signal June Invoice for payment.</p>	Record																																																
13.4	<p>Public All Boards Meeting Update</p> <p>T. Elmore briefly shares a few pictures from the All-Boards Public meeting that took place on June 14, 2023 and shares the estimated local share cost ranges for each building option, which is represented in the chart below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="980 281 1321 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th>Evaluation Criteria</th> <th>BR</th> <th>AR-1</th> <th>AR-2</th> <th>AR-1.5</th> <th>NC-1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Enrollment</td> <td>-</td> <td>700</td> <td>700</td> <td>700</td> <td>700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Educational Program Fulfillment</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Space Summary</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site & Facility Goals & Objective</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Energy Efficient & Utilities</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction Phasing Impact</td> <td>5-10 YRS</td> <td>4 YRS</td> <td>4 YRS</td> <td>4 YRS</td> <td>3 YRS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Local Share</td> <td>\$113 - \$125M</td> <td>\$78- \$86M</td> <td>\$86- \$95M</td> <td>\$74 - \$81M</td> <td>\$83- \$92M</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Discussion: None</p>	Evaluation Criteria	BR	AR-1	AR-2	AR-1.5	NC-1	Enrollment	-	700	700	700	700	Educational Program Fulfillment	1	3	4	3	5	Space Summary	1	3	1	2	5	Site & Facility Goals & Objective	4	4	4	4	4	Energy Efficient & Utilities	4	4	3	4	4	Construction Phasing Impact	5-10 YRS	4 YRS	4 YRS	4 YRS	3 YRS	Estimated Local Share	\$113 - \$125M	\$78- \$86M	\$86- \$95M	\$74 - \$81M	\$83- \$92M	Record
Evaluation Criteria	BR	AR-1	AR-2	AR-1.5	NC-1																																													
Enrollment	-	700	700	700	700																																													
Educational Program Fulfillment	1	3	4	3	5																																													
Space Summary	1	3	1	2	5																																													
Site & Facility Goals & Objective	4	4	4	4	4																																													
Energy Efficient & Utilities	4	4	3	4	4																																													
Construction Phasing Impact	5-10 YRS	4 YRS	4 YRS	4 YRS	3 YRS																																													
Estimated Local Share	\$113 - \$125M	\$78- \$86M	\$86- \$95M	\$74 - \$81M	\$83- \$92M																																													
13.5	<p>SBC/PBC Recap and Discussion</p>	Record																																																

T. Elmore briefly recaps each 700-enrollment building option as a refresher for discussion and before voting proceeds.

- AR.1(700) Mainly Renovation – 145,500 SQFTT
 - Total Project Cost Range: **\$137 to \$151**
 - MSBA Reimbursement Range: **\$58 to \$65**
 - Potential Local Share Range: **\$78 to \$86**
 - Project Duration: **4 years**
 - Disturbance to the learning environment: **Very High**

- AR.2(700) Addition/Renovation – 156,000 SQFTT
 - Total Project Cost Range: **\$148 to \$164**
 - MSBA Reimbursement Range: **\$63 to \$69**
 - Potential Local Share Range: **\$86 to \$95**
 - Project Duration: **4 years**
 - Disturbance to the learning environment: **High**
 -

- AR.1.5(700) Addition/Renovation– 150,000 SQFT
 - Total Project Cost Range: **\$134 to \$148**
 - MSBA Reimbursement Range: **\$60 to \$66**
 - Potential Local Share Range: **\$74 to \$81**
 - Project Duration: **4 years**
 - Disturbance to the learning environment: **High**

- NC.1(700) New Construction – 136,000 SQFT
 - Total Project Cost Range: **\$135 to \$149**
 - MSBA Reimbursement Range: **\$52 to \$57**
 - Potential Local Share Range: **\$83 to \$92**
 - Project Duration: **3 years**
 - Disturbance to the learning environment: **Low**

Discussion:

C. McGown shares that his two top options are AR1.5 & NC1.

C. Magliozzi agrees and states that one option satisfies the educational process. Our school committee and our school department have both said we have an educational problem and a programmatic problem, and you know doing the Base Repair doesn't solve it. Again, see what solves the problem the best and disrupts our children the least. I have a hard time essentially sentencing children for four years of the renovation project.

S. Meyer states that you can't overlook the disruption to students.

P. Duffy asks what the differences between AR1.5 and NC.1, in terms of fulfilling the educational program.

E. Moore explains in any of the reno options, we're constrained by the existing spaces such as the existing cafeteria and gymnasium. We can't move those spaces around. One of the things we talked about was having an area to come in and having that community use of the spaces and having a central area to access both of those. You can't do that when they are on opposite sides of the building. Also, since AR1.5 uses existing spaces, the rooms are not always going to be the right size for what you need and they're not always going to have the right relationship with each other.

S. Brennan additionally the other thing that was part of the educational program was to have a nice separation between the upper and lower school. AR1.5 doesn't quite accomplish that. However, in the new construction option, we have a building that is split.

T. Elmore states a renovation project versus new construction has very different risks associated with it. There are unknowns that you hit in a renovation project. When you're in the demo phase and you're trying to figure out how to replumb these first-floor areas. You're going to cut out most of these hallway slabs and do you influence any of the structural members underneath? All I'm trying to do here is point out the facts, that there will be unknowns and more risk. So, it's just a factor whereas new construction, you're doing it in sequence, do things in the proper order, and you're not going to impact what's in the ground.

P. Duffy asks if you have done soil testing.

T. Elmore explains that we have structural soil testing data from the last project, which saved the project money.

M. Moran asks what the next steps are.

T. Elmore replies that after you pick the option, we'll be moving forward into Schematic Design (SD), which refines the plans better.

M. Moran asks if there will there be any differences in operating costs in NC1 vs AR1.5.

E. Moore you get better insulation value in building option NC-1 versus AR1.5.

PBC vote for the preferred option.

A motion to submit option **NC1- 700 Enrollment**, as the PBC recommended building option for the PSR submission was made by C. Magliozzi, 2nd by B. Delorey.

Discussion: None

	All in favor, motion passes to approve NC1-700 enrollment as the preferred option.																																									
13.6	<p>Permanent Building Committee Vote to submit PSR to MSBA A motion to submit the Preferred Schematic Report to the MSBA was made by C. Magliozzi ,2nd by B. Delorey.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Call Vote</th> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>Abstain</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Michael Ward</td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Steve Meyer</td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Chris Magliozzi</td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Michael Moran</td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Brian Delory</td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Timothy O' Toole</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Chris McGown</td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i><u>Vote on the motion:</u> Those FOR 6 Those AGAINST _____; ABSTAIN _____</i> Motion: <u>Passes</u></p> <p>(An official copy will be provided for the PSR submission) Discussion: None</p>	Call Vote		Yes	No	Abstain	1	Michael Ward	x			2	Steve Meyer	x			3	Chris Magliozzi	x			4	Michael Moran	x			5	Brian Delory	x			6	Timothy O' Toole				7	Chris McGown	x			Record
Call Vote		Yes	No	Abstain																																						
1	Michael Ward	x																																								
2	Steve Meyer	x																																								
3	Chris Magliozzi	x																																								
4	Michael Moran	x																																								
5	Brian Delory	x																																								
6	Timothy O' Toole																																									
7	Chris McGown	x																																								
13.7	<p>Local Actions Letter Approval Letter T. Elmore explains that part of the PSR submission is to put together a local action letter which is standard MSBA language on your letterhead that just states that we've had these open public meetings and that they have been posted. No voting needed. Discussion: None</p>	Record																																								
13.8	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting. Discussion: None.</p>	Record																																								
13.9	<p>Public Comment: Discussion: None</p>	Record																																								
13.10	<p>Next Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>07.18.2023</u> - CMS Building Committee Virtual ZOOM Meeting No.014 @ 6:30 PM 	Record																																								
13.11	<p>Adjourn: 7:39 PM A motion was made by S. Meyer and seconded by B. Delorey to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: None. All in favor, the meeting is adjourned.</p>	Record																																								

Sincerely,
DORE + WHITTIER
 Elias Grijalva
 Assistant Project Manager

Project: Clinton Middle School
Meeting: School Building Committee
Meeting No. 013 – 06/20/2023
Page: 6

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.