

		<p>decision. SCo notes Reynolds was supposed to be temporary but there are other buildings. SCo notes the building next door needs about a million in renovations to get up to code. SCo notes Guiteras is being phased out and is that an option for the district? FC notes it is a very large amount of space. AM notes the district needs to have this conversation with the town. DS has questions about the floorplans and asks about the size of the wellness center? Is it the same size as it currently is and notes they currently have classes in there. MK notes the district has a meeting with PE tomorrow to discuss this. DS also asks about the engineering room being in different area than the construction room. MK notes they discussed this in a meeting and there are options for this and how they distribute the teachers and classes. DS also asks about the business rooms and that they are far away from the school store which is part of the program. PE took notes of this. MK notes future CTE program is for an EMT program or CNA and needs to be associated with PE health and questions where the classroom is located. LP notes she had a program review meeting with MK team this week to go through the spaces and confirm things are covered and located where they need to be and PE is still working on this.</p>
--	--	--

SCHEDULE

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:08	PMA	Master Project Schedule: Update 03/14/24: PMA reviewed upcoming important dates and meetings. PMA presented the milestones for the completion of the SD phase, followed by the milestones for the Design Development phase. PMA noted the next upcoming important SBC meeting is on 3/21. These are critical for budget/value management.
05/31/23:09	ALL	Key Dates: Update 03/14/24: 30Jun24: Construction Contract Award deadline to qualify for housing aid incentives (RIDE legislative update). PMA/PE meeting with RIDE on Monday to discuss HVAC/NE-CHPS.

BUDGET

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:09	PMA/SBC	<p>Project Budget: Update 03/14/24: Scoping Session/Value Management: PMA shares an update on the estimates from the two cost estimators Ellana and PM&C. AM asks if we got confirmation from RIDE that funds can be transferred from project to project? WH says we have heard this from RIDE that we can offset the cost of the high school with the Middle/Elementary school project costs. PMA notes we have sent meeting minutes back to them confirming and we have not heard differently. PMA also advised that in order to do this, the MOA will need to be updated. LP notes they only want to go through our MOA once. ET asks what is included in the markups category? PMA notes the markups include design and pricing contingency, GC's and GR's, OH&P, escalation, bonds and insurance. PMA shares a series of charts breaking down the overall costs of the project and each individual project. The project specific charts are broken up by direct cost, markups, contingency, escalation, and other costs. Estimates for the high schools were reconciled in Unifomat by category to within 5% to ensure the same scope is carried.</p> <p>Chart 1 – Shows the cost of the five projects and the alternates on a pie chart. These costs were taken from the estimate of record (PM&C) and were reconciled with OPM's estimator (Ellana). The cost of each section of the chart is shown below. MHHS - \$139,911,487 KMS - \$11,812,238 HC - \$9,274,964 RW - \$4,054,743 CA - \$5,374,746 ALTERNATES - \$9,760,694</p> <p>Chart 2 – MHHS - Shows MHHS reconciled estimate broken out in 4 categories (Direct Cost, Markups, Contingency and Escalation). The cost of each section of the chart is shown below. Direct Cost - \$106,094,872 Markups - \$17,902,384 Contingency - \$11,670,436 Escalation - \$4,243,795</p> <p>Chart 3 – KMS – Shows the reconciled estimate for KMS broken up into five categories (Markups, Site, Roofing, Exterior and Other). This identifies the scope and budget currently carried at KMS. Markups - \$3,473,770 Site - \$1,657,975 Roofing - \$1,525,033</p>

Exterior - \$162,292
Other - \$4,993,168

Chart 4 – Rockwell – Shows the reconciled estimate for Rockwell broken up into five categories (Markups, Site, Roofing, Exterior and Other). This identifies the scope and budget currently carried at Rockwell.

Markups - \$1,192,428
Site - \$250,314
Roofing - \$0
Exterior - \$140,490
Other - \$2,471,511

Chart 5 – Colt Andrews – Shows the reconciled estimate for Colt Andrews broken up into five categories (Markups, Site, Roofing, Exterior and Other). This identifies the scope and budget currently carried at Colt Andrews.

Markups - \$1,580,617
Site - \$598,083
Roofing - \$33,851
Exterior - \$43,908
Other - \$3,118,287

Chart 6 – Hugh Cole – Shows the reconciled estimate for Hugh Cole broken up into five categories (Markups, Site, Roofing, Exterior and Other). This identifies the scope and budget currently carried at Hugh Cole.

Markups - \$2,727,602
Site - \$1,142,771
Roofing - \$1,392,750
Exterior - \$78,326
Other - \$3,933,515

Chart 7 – Reconciled Estimate – The Target Budget Comparison chart shows both reconciled estimates compared to the \$200M voter approved project budget and the target tax impact share that the SBC is working towards. The light purple line shows the target for \$180M Project Budget which comes to a total of \$143.8M construction cost. The dark purple line shows the target for \$200M Project Budget which comes to a total of \$161.1M construction cost. PMA notes we are waiting on a revised tax impact projection from PFM, and PMA will update the charts after to show the revised target construction cost to meet the target tax impact that the SBC can work towards through value management.

WH notes the team has a meeting with TRC today to confirm scope at Colt Andrews with the street and other items included in the project. The high school will also be reviewed. WH notes we had a more complex design initially and the TRC was not in agreement that it would be acceptable. AM asks about the markups and if they are carried for each project or one overall and split up per project. PMA and PE note it is by project and AM notes we could see a savings in this if the project goes out as one bid for all. WH shares the updated budget. WH notes the Stage II adjustment is based on the tax impact calculator. WH also notes the team is meeting with PFM next week and the new target reduction will be updated based on his response. WH notes there are ways to bring the estimates down and we are working with the design team and estimators on this. AM asks about contingencies and how these are being decided. JD notes PE is working with PMA and the strategy would be understanding where they are in the design process and making sure there is design contingency, or it will be expressed in the estimators' numbers. AM asks if we should be looking at risk yet? JD notes it may be too soon to look at risk. JD also notes by having bid alternates the project can back into the budget and as the numbers come down some of these can come back into the project. JD notes as drawings are detailed further and we progress along there is less need for design contingency. LP notes as they go through DD phase there are items that may come up that could turn into a cost and the contingencies are used for things like this.

PE Value Management

LP shows a list of the Add and Deduct Alternates as well as the VM already used. LP notes some of these items came up in the user meetings. LP notes they have been working on bringing the costs down architecturally like tightening up the design, moved media center to one floor, roof simplified, structure shape has been simplified, terrazzo floor changed to polished concrete, student lockers removed mostly

		<p>after discussions with the district which allowed the corridors to be smaller. LP shares a Value Management slide with options to capture savings.</p> <p>Deduct Alternates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Remove Balcony in Auditorium ● Reduce Size of Gymnasium ● Remove Central Administration <p>Add Alternates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Replace Air Source with Geothermal ● 20% Air Source 80% Geothermal ● Prefabricated Storage Structures ● Field Irrigation ● Lights for Tennis Courts ● Press Box at Baseball and Softball ● Increase Plantings <p>Value Management Already Used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced building size by 11% ● Media Center on One Floor ● Omit Standing Seam Roof ● Simplify Form of Building ● Change Terrazzo to Polished Concrete ● Reduce Amount of Student Lockers <p>Value Management Items to Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduce Window Wall Ratio to Minimize Curtainwall ● Remove Overflow Drains and Add Scuppers ● Remove 1st Floor Conc Curb (Typ. Wall Section), Replace with Stud ● Eliminate Exterior Perforated Metal Screen and Gates between Wing A & B (Open Courtyard) ● Eliminate Auditorium Mechanical Room – Roof Mount Equipment ● Replace Some Hurricane Glass with Metal Infill Panel ● Plumbing Fixture Reductions (7 Wcs, 2 Urinals, 5 Lavs) ● Replace Some Masonry with Panelized Cladding at Clerestory Glazing ● Remove South Solar Shades on Classrooms and Offices (use Interior Shades for Glare Control) ● Revise Building to Type IIB, Add Firewalls and Reduce Fireproofing ● Reduce Masonry at the Auditorium and Clad In a Lightweight Panel ● Reduce Wall Tile in The Corridor From 5’-6” To 3’-6” ● Eliminate the East Bridge, that Connects Wing A and B ● Use 100% Topsoil on Site And Add More Berms ● Reduce Parking ● Breakout Cost of Baseball Field and Synthetic Track for Potential Funding
--	--	--

MISCELLANEOUS

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:10	PMA/PE/SBC	Project Communication/Community Outreach: Update 03/14/24: No community outreach updates, PMA will continue to work with TL.
05/31/23:11	Record	New Business: Update 03/14/24: No new business was discussed.
05/31/23:12	Record	Adjournment: Update 03/14/24: Next meeting date on 3/21, 2024 @ 8:30AM Motion to adjourn made at 9:22. Motion: AM Seconded: TT Discussion: None Vote: All in favor (9 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain)

PMA Consultants assumes, to the best of our knowledge, that the above content of these Meeting Minutes depicts all that transpired during this Project meeting. All attendees are required to address by memo or via e-mail, any omissions, errors, or inconsistencies in the reporting of these Meeting Minutes, to the writer, within two (2) business days of receipt of these Meeting Minutes.