Approved by the HW Cutler Building Committee on May 28, 2024

HAMILTON-WENHAM
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
5 School Street, Wenham, MA 01984 · Tel. 978-468-5310

HAMILTON-WENHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

Virtual Meeting **Monday, April 18, 2024**

Zoom Call **5:30pm**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Eric Tracy (SBC)
Dave Polito (SBC)
Rebecca Butler (SBC)
Carolyn Shediac (SBC)
Stacy Bucyk (SBC)
Vincent Leone (SBC)
Peter Clay (SBC)
Allison Goodchild (SBC)
Shane Lougee (SBC)
John McGrath (SBC)
Sarah Bilello (SBC)

GUESTS PRESENT:

Kevin Nigro (PMA)
Nick Masse (PMA)
Doug Roberts (JCJ)
Alicia Caritano (JCJ)
Peter Morgan (JCJ)

HAMILTON-WENHAM
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
5 School Street, Wenham, MA 01984 • Tel. 978-468-5310

- **5:36 PM**
  - Open Meeting

- **5:37 PM**
  - Approve meeting minutes from March 25, 2024.
    - David Polito motions to approve. Stacy Bucyk seconds the motion.
    - Discussion: none.
    - VOTE: 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 4 not present
  - Approve invoices for PMA Consultants and JCJ Architecture for the month of March 2024.
    - Dave Polito motions to approve. Peter Clay seconds the motion.
    - Discussion: none.
    - VOTE: 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 4 not present

- **5:39 PM**
  - Budget Update
    - PMA presented a budget update and highlighted that the second ProPay reimbursement is being submitted shortly as PMA and HWRSD continue to coordinate on documents required.

- **5:44 PM**
  - Community Outreach
    - PMA presented the most recently completed and upcoming community outreach events, highlighting the community forum #3 was held, and the mother's club meeting was held since our last meeting.
    - PMA noted that Community Forum #4 is being planned and date is 5/15/24 tentatively scheduled.
    - ET presented the survey results thus far from the Survey posted.
      - DP inquired if people are able to take the survey multiple times. ET noted potentially, but the data is mostly individual across the data, and we opened it because people were not accessing the survey when they had to sign in.

- **5:48 PM**
  - Schedule Update
    - PMA presented an overview of the schedule update – what has been completed recently and what is coming up, highlighting next Monday is the SBC's selection of the preferred option to enter schematic design with.
    - PMA noted that the MSBA's FAS (Facilities Assessment Subcommittee) ensures that the District is providing a facility that will deliver the educational program as described in the educational plan and with compliance.

- **5:51 PM**
  - Designer/OPM Updates
    - Design Options Progress Update
      - JCJ presented the test-fit options progress that has been completed since the last meeting. All design progress shown is noted as a work in progress and nothing is definitive at this stage.

- DP noted a kids walking path for students to walk in without walking across traffic, would be beneficial and decrease congestion along Asbury along that it adds congestion to Asbury St.
- CS asked about special learning programs, and if those are being included in all models? JCJ responded that they are incorporated in all models.
- ET notes that the space summary may change on the size of the building and we learn more information that advises the design.

- Review PSR comparative cost estimates
  - PMA presented the PSR cost estimates. PMA noted that the designer's estimator and PMA's estimator both created estimates based upon the same specifications provided, and then reconciled the estimates together with the PMA/JCJ team for a half a day. The numbers presented are the reconciled estimate values. As part of the MSBA prescriptive process, we will continue to do iterations of the estimates and this is a snapshot in time. The PDP was accepted by the MSBA, allowed the project to move into PSR. The PSR estimates are based off existing conditions continuing to be studied, more information received from the Town, and allows us to evolve the options and make them more distinct. The MSBA wants both estimators to have the same thing, apples to apples – to more fine tune the understanding of what the market is.
  - PMA noted that C1.0, the code upgrade/base repair option, is for the MSBA's information only, for cost comparison purposes. The MSBA requires to break out construction and total project costs – which includes furniture, internet technology, moving, OPM fee, architect fee, any potential legal fees, etc. During this PSR phase, we dove a lot more into the site and what we're able to do and how it can be laid out according to site conditions. Additionally, we had a sustainability workshop and a first responder's meeting that both will have a hand in the design of the building/site.
  - PMA noted that in option C3.4, it includes shoring at the corner of a building, and these are the types of engineering solutions that increase costs, and we will be exploring all options that may eliminate the need for these types of avenues.
  - JCJ notes that by nature, as we get more information from our subconsultants, they will help inform the design and provide more detail as to what may be driving the costs in either direction. Additionally, there are placeholders for what we need so we have conservative cost estimates to make sure we have sufficient contingency.
  - PMA noted that all these costs are based upon the project delivery method of Construction Manager at Risk. A Construction Manager would be brought into the project during pre-construction to help inform the design – constructability, biddability, and logistical coordination. The other project delivery method is a Design-Bid-Build by a General Contractor, which would be an approximate 3-8% savings in costs. With that project delivery method not established yet, we typically like to estimate with CM-at-risk, as they are known to be higher than DBB. These are estimates in progression. This isn't the budget going to voters with – we continue to work with this value to better meet the needs of the District.
  - PMA noted that one of the major aspects of this process is the evaluation of our space summary against our educational plan. We have some square footage that could be ineligible, however this is a good back and forth to try to argue to the

MSBA that that's how the District has successfully delivered education to the students of Hamilton-Wenham. We want to make sure to get the District as much eligible costs as possible.

- PMA noted that we had our estimators spend more time and detail on the estimates of the options at the Cutler site, understanding that the Winthrop options are off the table, and to assist with focusing our efforts.
- ET notes that the cost will evolve over the schematic phase. There are ineligible costs within these estimates, so you will soon see a shift – what type of block, floor materials, wall materials, etc that change these prices up or down. MSBA – The project team will review glass choices, roofing, etc, and maybe adjust the footprint of the building to squeeze as much reimbursable costs as possible. ET noted that he was apart of an MSBA building project in previous District, and they wanted a 2nd floor running track in their Gym – the MSBA wouldn't reimburse and the Town elected to go forward anyways because they wanted it. We will have more realistic costs in November, before finishing up the schematic phase in December.
- PMA noted that every project has a value management process – this is where we will evaluate all options to see how much can we bring equal value at lesser costs. PMA noted that we are going to work to get value as low as possible while maintaining the educational plan and intent to serve the District with the right fit.
- DP notes that he does understand the financial implication on a community like Hamilton-Wenham, which has such a small commercial tax base. I take it very seriously, on my vision for what's best for the community at large and how this affects everyone in Town from homeowners, taxpayers, students, and the first group of students and it may be tough for large project in a small town, but we need to think about what's best for our community. My children will never see this building, and my youngest child may be out of district. However, I understand the long term beneficial affects that an undertaking like this will have for our community in the future. It can be confusing, it can be hard to understand – but I have been longest tenured member of this committee and I enjoy starting to see this come together. We did, at one point, have costs of an addition/renovation of both Winthrop and Cutler – two separate projects would be an additional cost of doing both schools. 150 million dollars is a tough look but what we can have makes me excited for what this Hamilton-Wenham community can be, after seeing and understand the state of our facilities.

- Preview of Preferred Option Evaluation matrix for SBC Vote to Select Preferred Option on 4/22
  - PMA presented the evaluation matrix that will be sent to all SBC members to grade the options based upon the evaluation criteria. PMA noted that these evaluations are being requested in a quick turnaround time – due Monday by 3:00pm.
  - ET emphasized PMA's notion for a quick turnaround and appreciates the committee's efforts over the weekend to get this done.
  - ET notes that there is a FAQ section on the project website, and advises all members of the committee to review those questions prior to completing the evaluation.

- **6:38 PM**
  - Items Unanticipated by the Chair
    - SL inquires on clarification needed on the Winthrop sites – the Winthrop site wasn't approved by the MSBA and now it is back – any reason?
    - PMA noted that the MSBA did not choose the Winthrop site, but as part of our process in studying a potential combination of the school populations, with the Winthrop Site being an alternative site, the MSBA requires us to proportionally study that building on that site. However, we now know that the Winthrop School site is not an option, as it has been taken off the table due to the lease agreement. MSBA requires us to look at every avenue for the four grade reconfiguration options they agreed to support.

- **6:46 PM**
  - Vote to Adjourn
    - Dave Polito motions to adjourn. Peter Clay seconds the motion.
    - VOTE: 10 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

NOTE: All Meetings will be held the 4th Monday of every month at 6:30 PM. (Intermittent meetings may be had to break down information provided to the SBC).