

PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Project:	Clinton Middle School	Project No:	202000640305
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	04/25/2023
Location:	Zoom	Time:	6:30 PM
Distribution:	Attendees, Project File	Prepared By:	E. Grijalva

Present	Name	Affiliation	Prese	Name	Affiliation
x	Michael Ward*	Town Administrator -PBC Member		Mike Burton	DWMP
	Sean Kerrigan	Selectman	х	Trip Elmore	DWMP
х	Brendon Bailey	School Committee Chair		Steve Brown	DWMP
х	Matthew Varakis	School Committee Vice-Chair	х	Elias Grijalva	DWMP
x	Steven Meyer*	Superintendent – PBC Member		Mike Cox	DWMP
	Brian Farragher	Director of Facilities	х	Rachel Rincon	DWMP
х	Chris McGown*	Chair of PBC, Head of DPW		Kathryn Crockett	LPAA
	Courtney Harter	CMS Principal	х	Peter Caruso	LPAA
х	Shane McCarthy	Teacher	х	Sean Brennan	LPAA
	Bill McGrail	Finance Committee Co-Chair	х	Christina Bazelmans	LPAA
х	Chris Magliozzi*	Vice-Chair of PBC	х	Eric Moore	LPAA
	Michael Moran*	PBC Member			
х	Brian Delory*	PBC Member			
	Timothy O'Toole*	PBC Member			
	Phil Duffy	Director of Community & Econ.			
	Kelly Turcotte	Special Education Parent Advisory			
	Laura Taylor	Parent-Teacher Association			
	Angelica Arroyo	English Learners Parent Advisor			

ltem No.	Description	Action
11.1	Call to Order : 6:37 PM meeting was called to order by PBC Chair C. McGown with 5 of 7 voting members in attendance.	Record
	*PBC Member M. Ward joined @ 6:53 PM.	
11.2	Previous Topics & Approval of March 21, 2023, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 03/21/2023 meeting minutes was submitted by S. Meyer and seconded by C. Magliozzi.	Record
	Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: S. Meyer (Y), C. Magliozzi (Y), B. Delory (Y), C. McGown (Y) Abstentions: None	
	All in favor, motion passes, March 21, 2023, meetings are certified as approved.	
11.3	Clinton Senior Center Award – Painting Repairs	Record
	C.McGown shares that Fox Painting was the low bidder for the Clinton Senior Center and received positive recommendations from engineers and previous Clinton town hall projects.	
	A motion was made by S. Meyer and seconded by B. Delory to approve Fox Painting's proposal of <u>\$210,000.00</u> .	
	Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: S. Meyer (Y), C. Magliozzi (Y), B. Delory (Y), C. McGown (Y) Abstentions: None	
	Motion passes to approve Fox Painting Proposal.	
11.4	Invoices and Commitments	Record
	Invoice 1 : DWMP March Invoice No. 008, in the amount of <u>\$15,000.00</u>	
	A motion was made by B. Delory and seconded by C. Magliozzi for the approval of DWMP Invoice No. 008	
	Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote M. Ward (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran(Y), C. McGown Abstentions: None	
	Motion passes to approve DWMP Invoice No. 008 for payment.	

	Invoice 2 : LPA A March Invoice No. 003, in the amount of <u>\$39,646.00</u>	
	A motion was made by S. Meyer and seconded by C. Magliozzi for the approval of LPA A Invoice No. 003	
	Discussion : None. Roll Call Vote M. Ward (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran(Y), C. McGown Abstentions: None	
	Motion passes to approve LPA A Invoice No. 003 for payment.	
	DWMP Amendment No.001 : DWMP Fee Cost Estimate, in the amount of <u>\$6,600.00</u>	
	A motion was made by C. Magliozzi and seconded by B. Delory for the approval of DWMP Amendment No.001 PSR Estimate.	
	Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote M. Ward (Y), S. Meyer (Y), C. Magliozzi (Y), M. Moran(Y), C. McGown Abstentions: None	
	Motion passes to approve DWMP Amendment No.001.	
	Budget Revision Request	
	T. Elmore briefly explains the funds being transferred.	
	 Moving funds from Class Code 0003-0000 -Environmental& Site to Class Code 0001-0000- OPM Feasibility in the amount of \$30,0000.00 0003-0000 - Class Code Remaining Balance: \$61,860.00 	
	 Moving funds from Class Code 0004-0000-Other to class code 0001-0000- OPM Feasibility in the amount of \$60,600.00 <u>0004-0000 – Class Code Remaining Balance: \$38,432.32</u> 	
	• <u>Conclusion:</u> Transferring \$90,600.00 from two different class codes to the 0001-0000 OPM feasibility.	
	Discussion: None	
11.5	PDP Submission Update	Record
	T. Elmore informs the SBC & PBC that we received comments from the MSBA on the PDP submission on April 18, 2023, and we must respond within 14 Days. Our plan is to respond to the MSBA by May 1 st .	
	Discussion: None	

11.6	LPA A Option Design Update	Record
	S. Brennan recaps the MSBA process and updates the SBC/PBC where we stand today on	
	the project.	
	Module 3 Feasibility Study:	
	 Preliminary Design Program – submitted 03.28.2023 	
	 Preferred Schematic Report – upcoming submission 06.28.2023 	
	P. Caruso shares that LPA A held a sustainability workshop with representatives from the	
	town, OPM, and LPA A consultants to discuss the sustainability goals for this project.	
	Sustainability Workshop	
	Site & Location	
	Alternative transportation methods	
	Siting of the building	
	Access to open space	
	Opportunities for health and wellness	
	Exterior lighting	
	Landscape – native and drought-tolerant plants	
	Rainwater management – low-impact development	
	Energy Conservation Measures	
	HVAC System	
	All electric options	
	Building Envelope	
	Lighting design and target improvement beyond code Demostic bet water system and plumbing fixtures	
	 Domestic hot water system and plumbing fixtures Process loads 	
	 Passive strategies Renewables 	
	Renewables Water Use	
	Outdoor Potable Water use reduction	
	 Rainwater capture/reuse 	
	 Efficient Water Fixtures – Waster sense labeled. 	
	 Water metering prerequisite/data sharing and water sub-metering credit 	
	Bottle Fillers	
	 Commercial Kitchen – process water reduction 	
	Indoor Environmental Quality	
	Air Quality	
	Visual Comfort	
	Thermal Comfort	
	Acoustic Comfort	
	Green Cleaning	
	LEED and NE-CHPS Comparison	
	Pros/Cons of each	

Discussion:

B. Delory asks if we have to file for LEED standards.

T. Elmore explains that we must file to get two reimbursement incentive points from the MSBA. We're shooting for LEED SILVER.

C.Maglioizzi states I'm assuming we need to get those incentive points to get our maximum reimbursement from the MSBA for this project.

T. Elmore confirms that we do and states to achieve LEED Silver we need to score 50 points.

Option Design Update

Addition/Renovation -AR.1 (700 Enrollment) - 147,000GSF

- Adding a large addition on the east side of the 1st-floor building
- Adding a small addition to the northwest side of the 1st-floor building
- Complete Reno New windows, exterior walls, MEP system, roof finishes, furnishing, and equipment.
- Corridors will have skylights for natural light.
- Classroom any interconnecting wall will be blown out; spaces are 10% under according to MSBA requirements for this enrollment.
- Traffic Parent drops off in the back; Bus drops off in front of the building.
- Modular classrooms are required for swing space.

Addition/Renovation - AR.1 (550 Enrollment) - 134,500 GSF

- Adding a small addition to the northwest side of the 1st-floor building
- Adding a small Addition on the East side of the floor building
- Complete Reno New windows, exterior walls, MEP system, roof finishes, furnishing, and equipment.
- Traffic Parent drops off in the back; Bus drops off in front of the building.
- Modular classrooms are required as swing space.
- Corridors will have skylights for natural light.

Addition/Renovation - AR.2 (700 Enrollment) – 167,000 GSF

- Adding a large addition at the northwest side of the 1st & 2nd floors
- Adding a large addition at the southeast side of the 1st & 2nd floors
- Complete Reno New windows, exterior walls, MEP system, roof finishes, furnishing, and equipment.
- Modular classrooms are required for swing space.

Addition/Renovation- AR.2 (550 Enrollment) – 153,000 GSF

- Adding a large addition at the northwest side of the 1st & 2nd floors
- Adding a large addition at the southeast side of the 1st only

- Complete Reno New windows, exterior walls, MEP system, roof finishes, furnishing, and equipment.
- Modular classrooms are required for swing space.

New Construction - NC-1 (700 Enrollment) - 150,000 GSF

- Located to the east of the existing middle school on the current softball and baseball fields.
- Three Story Building
- Modulars will not be needed.
- The existing building will be demoed after the completion of the new building, where the car park will be relocated.

New Construction - NC-1 (550 Enrollment) - 134,000 GSF

- Located to the east of the existing middle school on the current softball and baseball fields.
- Two-story building
- Modulars will not be needed.
- The existing building will be demoed after the completion of the new building where the car park will be relocated.

New Construction - NC-1R (700 Enrollment) 147,000 GSF

- Located to the east of the existing middle school on the current softball and baseball fields.
- Two-story building
- Modulars will not be needed.
- The existing building will be demoed after the completion of the new building.

New Construction - NC-1R Hybrid (550 Enrollment) 134,000 GSF

- Located to the east of the existing middle school on the current softball and baseball fields.
- Two-story building
- Modulars will not be needed.
- The existing building will be demoed after the completion of the new building.

Discussion:

S. Brennan recommends building options NC-1 (700 enrollment) and NC-1 (550 enrollment) floorplans to carry forward into the remainder of the PSR.

M. Ward agrees that a two-story building makes more sense than a three-story one, financially.

C. Magliozzi states the recommended options are cheaper, but we have no economic feedback about these options. We don't know any numbers.

T. Elmore explains that we did have some numbers running for the PDP, the numbers that are out for schools right now are somewhere in the range of \$1,000 a square foot. When we first looked at the PDP, option NC1 was coming in around 153,000 GSF and now we're at 147,000 GSF. You're talking 6,000 GSF, that's almost 6 million dollars. And that's all on the district because you're going to, you're going to cap out the MSBA reimbursement because of their restrictions. And so, that would be all districts, you know, funding.

C.McGown states I think that's why we have the Add/Reno options in there but the add/reno options might or might not be less expensive, depending on, the MSBA reimbursements for the classroom space and stuff like that and the disruption of the people but that's where I think we'll see if there are differences in costs that are substantial.

T. Elmore states that the plan is to get these floorplans further defined and then get them to the estimators by Mid-May and by the beginning of June, we" have estimates back and I take that information and build a spreadsheet that captures all project cost, then I take a stab at trying to figure out what is going to be deemed reimbursable and not reimbursable. This is where the bad news comes in and suddenly, the 75% reimbursement realistically comes back to under 50%. So, the idea would be that we would have numbers at the beginning of June, and we'd call another remote meeting where we could review the numbers and what local share impact is likely to be prior to the public meeting and all boards meeting on June 14th because we will have numbers for that meeting.

M. Varakis asks how much of a runway you're going to give for people to digest this information, because if you're running up to me at the beginning of June, and then you hit us with two or three sets of numbers that this board can evaluate on. What's the percentage of Add/Reno versus New Construction? I mean, they're going to need more than like six days to digest this and then bring it public.

T. Elmore states that the current tracking timeline has us trying to get on the August 30 board of directors meeting where the MSBA bless, going into schematic design. Now if we miss the August meeting, we are potentially impacting the project for six months.

C.McGown states it all depends really on how compelling and accurate the numbers are because if you start getting into stuff and there's a lot of questions, we're getting back to maps runway concept, you know in the delay. The biggest difference in cost here is not the difference between two similarly sized buildings, it's going to be the difference in a renovation and the non-reimbursable costs being clearly spelled. So, one versus the other and the disruption somehow quantified both monetarily and emotionally disruption.

T. Elmore states It always is a challenge when you're talking about the disruption, and you're talking about the length of time the renovation is going to take. The new building just shows the nature of the building and the hopscotching effect that you would have in a renovation is just going to elongate a time. There will be quite a bit of disruption. And for a long time, like three years. That's a hard thing to quantify in money.

11.5	Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting. Discussion: None.	
11.6	Public Comment: Discussion: None	Record
11.7	 Next Meeting: SBC Meeting No. 013 – June 6th, 2023 – Cost numbers to be made public. Public Community Meeting – June 14th, 2023 – Community public presentation SBC Meeting No. 014 - June 21st, 2023 – Vote on preferred solution 	Record
11.8	 Adjourn: 7:36 PM A motion was made by B. Delory and seconded by C. Magliozzi to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: 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. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.