

PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES



Project: Clinton Middle School
Subject: School Building Committee Meeting
Location: ZOOM
Distribution: Attendees, Project File
MSBA Module: 3- Feasibility Study

Project No: 202000640305
Meeting Date: 08/22/2023
Time: 6:30 PM
Prepared By: E. Grijalva

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Senior Center Housing Invoice and Change Order
3. Previous Topics and Approval of July 18, 2023, Meeting Minutes
4. Invoices and Commitments for Approval
5. Facilities Assessment Subcommittee Update
6. LPA|A Update
7. Construction Delivery Method Discussion Only
8. Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting
9. Public Comment
10. Next Meeting
11. Adjourn

Name	Affiliation
Brendan Bailey	School Committee Chair
Steven Meyer*	Superintendent – PBC Member
Chris McGown *	Chair of PBC- Head of DPW
Chris Magliozzi*	Vice-Chair of PBC
Michael Moran*	PBC Member
Brian Delorey*	PBC Member
Kelly Turcotte	Special Education Parent Advisory
Trip Elmore	DWMP- Project Director
Elias Grijalva	DWMP – Assistant PM
Peter Caruso	LPA A – Project Manager
Sean Brennan	LPA A – Project Architect
Eric Moore	LPA A – Sr. Project Architect
Tina	Public
Joel Bates	Public
Sam Dov	Public

Item No.	Description	Action
15.1	<p>Call to Order: 6:32 PM meeting was called to order by PBC Chair, C. McGown with 5 of 7 members in attendance.</p>	Record
15.2	<p>Senior Center Carriage Housing Invoice and Change Order Approval:</p> <p>Fox Painting Co, Application for Payment No.001 Request, in the amount of <u>\$71,487.50</u></p> <p>A motion to approve Fox Painting Co. application for payment request, in the amount of <u>\$71,487.50</u> was submitted by C. Magliozzi and seconded by M. Moran.</p> <p>Discussion: None Roll Call Vote: C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y) Abstentions: None</p> <p>All in favor, motion passes.</p> <hr/> <p>Fox Painting Co, Change Order Request, in the amount of <u>\$18,000.00</u></p> <p>A motion to approve the Fox Painting Co, Change Order Request, in the amount of <u>\$18,000.00</u> was submitted by B. Delory and seconded by C. Magliozzi.</p> <p>Discussion: B. Delorey asks if we have the funds to pay for this. C. McGown confirms there are funds available. Currently, the project is still under budget. Roll Call Vote: C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y) Abstentions: None</p> <p>All in favor, motion passes, July 18, 2023, meetings are certified as approved.</p>	Record
15.3	<p>Previous Topics & Approval of July 18, 2023, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 07/18/2023 meeting minutes was submitted by S. Meyer and seconded by M. Moran.</p> <p>Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y) Abstentions: None</p> <p>All in favor, motion passes, July 18, 2023, meetings are certified as approved.</p>	Record
15.4	<p>Invoices and Commitments for Approval</p> <p>Invoice 1: DWMP Invoice #012, for the month of July, in the amount of <u>\$15,000.00</u></p> <p>A motion was made by B. Delorey and seconded by S. Meyer for the approval of the DWMP July invoice.</p>	Record

Discussion: None.
Roll Call Vote: C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y)
Abstentions: None
 All in favor, motion passes to approve DWMP July invoice.
Invoice 2: LPA|A Invoice #007, for the month of July, in the amount of \$52,700.00

A motion was made by **B. Delorey** and seconded by **C. Magliozzi** for the approval of the LPA|A July Invoice.

Discussion: None.
Roll Call Vote: C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y)
Abstentions: None

All in favor, motion passes to approve LPA|A July invoice.

LPA|A Amendment No.003 Request for Approval, in the amount of \$17,600.00

T. Elmore explains this amendment is for the survey required to finalize the deed. National Grid has requested a new survey to be completed, due to the existing survey being 20 years old, therefore a new survey is needed to finalize the Deed.

C. Magliozzi asks if there is a source for this fund.

T. Elmore confirms that the funds are available.

The motion was made by **B. Delorey** and seconded by **S. Meyer**, for the approval of LPA|A Amendment No.003.

Discussion: None.
Roll Call Vote: C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y)
Abstentions: None

All in favor, motion passes to approve LPA|A July invoice.

15.5

Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (FAS) Update

The following items were topics of discussion during the FAS meeting:

- Appreciation of the Educational Program and responses to comments.
- Opportunity to increase World Language program offerings for all students including English Learners.
- Consideration to adjust Health and Physical Education program schedules to extend throughout the school year.
- Proposed use and staffing considerations for the proposed Media Center and Maker Space.

Record

- The size of the proposed parking in relation to the building as well as refinements to integrate safety measures, designated parking areas and green space; (combined what were two bullets)
- Anticipated further refinement of the building massing to clarify scale and volumes, character, and experience upon entry.
- Appreciation of the layout of the academic and public spaces.
- Distribution and use of Special Education spaces and DESE submittal process.
- Student class size and age requirements related to sub-separate classrooms within a 4-8 grade configuration; and,
- Opportunities for renewable energy use such as geothermal wells, solar panels and other potential energy saving resources.

Discussion: None

15.6

LPA|A Update

Record

S. Brennan demonstrates the updated floor plans, site plan, and traffic patterns, since the Preferred Schematic Report submission on June 20, 2023. (Refer to the meeting packet for visual slides)

Key differences in Updated floor plans

- Common spaces are now the collaborative space.
- Color reinforces wayfinding to identify grade neighborhoods.
- Locker rooms switched sides giving more opportunities for further efficiency.
- Locations of Skylights that will bring light into the 2nd and 1st floors
- The upper floor can view into the Gymnasium.
- Bathrooms have sinks on the exterior side without doors, which reduces the amount of loitering.

S. Brennan talks about the new energy code and its implications for projects funded by the Massachusetts School Building Authority.

Old Base Requirement:

- 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**

	Discussion:	
15.7	<p>Construction Delivery Method Discussion Only:</p> <p>T. Elmore explains the different construction delivery methods: CM at Risk (MGL Chapter 149a) versus Design Bid Build (MGL Chapter 149).</p> <p><u>Project owner requirements and considerations are as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Impact • Design • Schedule • Risk Assessment (repair project, lack of swing space, impact on School), • Owners Expertise <p><u>MGL 149: Design – Bid- Build Facts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You are purchasing a building in accordance with plans and specifications. • Selection is bid/price based (lowest bidder wins) • Design is finished, then the bid to GC and subcontractors (After MSBA PFA) – You will not know the number until after. • Traditional Massachusetts project delivery method • Sealed bid, fixed price • Contract value based on a “lump sum” amount. • “Closed Book” construction budget accounting <p><u>MGL Chapter 149a: CM at Risk Facts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You are hiring a construction manager firm that manages the construction of buildings and provides input during the design process. They will help estimate the project and review the drawings. They are part of the team. • Selection is qualifications and cost based. • CM provides pre-construction (Prior to MSBA PFA) & and construction services. – This option costs a little more, but it is helpful when creating our budget. They will have more input on schedule, phasing, and logistics. • CM participates in the sub-contractor prequalification process. • Option for early release bid packages or “fast-track” schedules – If the design is finishing in October and we want to start construction the following summer, we have the option to do an early release package for site work, abatement, demolition, etc. This allows work to start earlier. • Contract value based on a “Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)” Cost of work + General Conditions + negotiated CM Fee • GMP Assembled with assumptions and allowances for phasing/ logistics (during schematic design – potential for additional reimbursement for unforeseen items. • “Open Book” construction budget accounting. 	Record

CM @ Risk Selection Process – 2 ½ to 3 months duration

- 1) OIG Application
- 2) Form Prequalification / CM Selection Committee
- 3) Develop an Issue RFQ with the owner.
- 4) Develop and issue an RFP with the owner.
- 5) Conduct Interviews
- 6) Select Top choice, Construction Manager

Design Bid Built: Advantages

- o Familiar delivery method
- o Simple procurement process to manage.
- o Lowest price proposed & accepted.
- o Simple accounting (GC/GR)

Construction Manager At Risk: Advantages

- o Qualifications-based selection
- o The builder assists with budgeting, logistics and constructability.
- o Schematic Design Estimate (reconciled) set budget (Prior to MSBA PFA)
- o Fast track scheduling allows the use of Early Release Packages (ERP)
- o CM joins the “Team” during the design phase and provides input as documents are developed.
- o Negotiations and a “Team” atmosphere reduce the likelihood of claims and schedule extensions.
- o CM assumes risk for project cost and schedule.

➤ **DBB: Disadvantages**

- o Linear process: may mean longer schedule durations.
- o Construction cost not known until bids received; may require re-design/rebid (AFTER PFA)
- o The designer must develop a project phasing and schedule approach.
- o GC project management, safety, and field supervision is minimal.
- o Increased probability of disputes/claims
- o No GC input in design, planning, constructability, or budgeting
- o Full costs not realized until completion.

➤ **CMR: Disadvantages**

- o Requires OPM/Design team to be familiar with the GMP model.
- o The two-step procurement process takes time.
- o Additional CM costs related to preconstruction services.

Conclusions

- o DBB is best suited for less complicated/complex projects with a straightforward design.
- o CMR is best suited for complicated/complex project design, phasing, logistics, and schedule management challenges, or strict schedule limitation.

Discussion:

M. Moran asked who determines the fee schedule for CM @ Risk.

T. Elmore explains once we prequalify construction managers, we then issue an RFP Request for Proposals. The CM applicants will then submit a proposal that includes a fee amount, and project team member rates, which will ultimately determine the fee schedule.

C. Magliozzi do the design professionals have any opinion about how much value is gained by going CM @ Risk?

S. Brennan responded that there is a lot less work, it allows less time for this committee to spend on reviewing and processing the information and potentially holding up the flow of construction.

P. Caruso states that he is a big supporter of CM @ Risk. The process is more integrated with the team and we're able to descope the non-file subcontractors alongside the CM.

T. Elmore empathizes that this is an open-book process, you get a chance to see what's behind the scenes.

C. McGown when do we decide which path to go?

T. Elmore replies at the next PBC meeting, in September.

C. McGown after the vote, how do we start the process of choosing the Construction Manager?

T. Elmore states first we get the vote, then we submit an application to the Inspector General which may take up to sixty-plus days to get the application reviewed by the Office of Inspector General. We anticipate it will take a minimum of three to four months to get the CM on board. Then we want them on board two to three months prior to the submittal of the schematic design. Once we bring them on board, we put in the contract that they're being hired for a stipend, typically around twenty-five to thirty thousand, and then we are obligated to pay them that amount to help us get an estimate for the schematic design submission, produce a schedule, and do a phasing plan. (Refer to CM Selection Process slide)

15.8

Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:

Discussion: None

Record

15.9

Public Comment:

Record

	<p>T. Elmore mentions that National Grid has approved the survey scope per conversation with Mike Ward.</p>	
15.10	<p>Next Meeting:</p> <p>09.19.2023 – CMS Building Committee Remote @ 6:30 PM – Location: TBD 10.17.2023 – CMS Building Committee Remote @ 6:30 PM – Location: TBD</p> <p>Discussion: None</p>	Record
15.11	<p>Adjourn: 7:22 PM A motion was made by M. Moran and seconded by C. Magliozi to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: C. Magliozi (Y), M. Moran (Y), B. Delorey(Y) S. Meyer (Y), C. McGown (Y) Abstentions: None</p> <p>All in favor, the meeting is adjourned.</p>	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.