

MEETING MINUTES



MANAGEMENT
PARTNERS, LLC

Project: Manchester Memorial Elementary School
Subject: School Building Committee/School Committee Meeting
Location: Manchester MS/HS – Library
Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: MP17-114
Meeting Date: 6/26/2018
Time: 7:00 PM
Prepared By: C. Shefferman

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
✓	Caroline Weld *	SBC Co-Chair	✓	Jim LaPosta	JCJ
	Ann Cameron *	SBC Co-Chair	✓	Daniel Ruiz	JCJ
✓	Pam Beaudoin *	Superintendent	✓	Lauren Braren	JCJ
✓	Avi Urbas *	Dir. of Fin. & Ops		Emily Czarnecki	JCJ
✓	Alva Ingaharro *	Essex	✓	Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	John Willis *	Principal MMES		Steven Brown	DWMP
✓	Jay Pagliarulo	Dir. of Facilities	✓	Christina Shefferman	DWMP
✓	Andy Oldeman *	Man. Fin. Comm.	✓	Jon Rich	WT Rich
✓	Lisa O'Donnell *	Essex B.O.S.			
✓	Remko Brueker *	Manchester			
✓	Adam Zaiger *	Manchester			
✓	Tyler Virden *	Essex			
✓	George Scharfe *	Manchester			
✓	Gordon Brewster *	Manchester			
✓	Charlie Hay *	Essex			
✓	Sarah Creighton *	Manchester			
✓	Maggie Tomaiolo *	Essex			
✓	Jake Foster *	Essex			

* SBC Voting
Member

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7
978.499.2999 ph
978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

Item No.	Description	Action
29.1	<u>Call to Order</u> : 7:04 pm meeting was called to order by the SBC Co-Chair C. Weld with 16 of 17 voting members in attendance. M. Burton of DWMP notes the meeting will follow the Power Point presentation that is being projected on the screen and to follow the agenda that was provided to the SBC prior to the meeting via Dropbox.	Record
29.2	<u>Previous Topics & Approval of June 12, and June 19, 2018 Meeting Minutes</u> : A motion to approve the 6/12/2018 & 6/19/2018 meeting minutes as submitted made by A. Oldeman and seconded by A. Ingaharro. Discussion: None. Vote: All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
29.3	<u>Invoices & Commitments for Review and Approval</u> : None.	Record
29.4.1	<u>Meeting Goals</u> : M. Burton presents the meeting goals to the SBC. Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recap previous VE discussion • Review draft of Total Project Budget • Complete VE exercise • Review soft costs 	Record
29.4.2	<u>Budget Update</u> : Currently there is \$29,531.77 left in the project budget for the feasibility and schematic design phase of the project. The budget is 95% encumbered, 75% expended, and 82% phase elapsed.	Record
29.5.1	<u>VE Recap</u> : M. Burton provides the SBC with a VE Recap. At the last SBC meeting the category 1 and category 2 VE items were accepted. Currently the total construction cost including the accepted VE items is \$43,018,118. The team will be reviewing the category 3 and 4 VE items tonight.	Record
29.5.2	<u>VE Recap</u> : M. Burton discusses the GSF that has been accepted with current VE items is 81,286. If the remaining VE items this evening that affect GSF are accepted, we could end up with a GSF of 77,084.	Record
29.5.3	<u>VE Recap</u> : M. Burton discusses total construction cost budget analysis slide. A recap of the discussion is below: Budget Analysis-Total Construction cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All current VE 1's and 2's • GSF=81,286-Total Construction cost estimate \$43,018,118- Total construction cost per GSF \$529.22 • All current VE 1's and 2's plus pending item(s) above • GSF=77,084-Total construction cost estimate \$41,750,575-Total construction cost per GSF \$541.62 Budget Analysis-Direct Building Costs (excludes all site, building demo, abatement, phasing premium, general con/req/bond/ins., CM fee, CM contingency) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All current VE 1's and 2's • GSF=81,286-Building Construction cost estimate \$29,162,119-Building construction cost per GSF \$358.76 • All current VE 1's and 2's plus pending item(s) above • GSF=77,084-Building construction cost estimate \$27,894,576-Building construction cost per GSF \$361.87 	Record

	<p>After reviewing the VE recap slides the SBC asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: What is driving the cost of the project so high? • A: The particular site is difficult, involves phasing, fill, grading, wetlands surround the building. 	
29.6.1	<p><u>Anticipated Total Project Budget:</u> M. Burton discusses the approximate total project budget with current accepted VE items. The slide is outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Feasibility=Budget Value \$650,000 ➤ Legal Fees=Budget Value \$70,000 ➤ OPM Fee=Budget Value \$1,918,000 ➤ A&E Fee=Budget Value \$4,766,300 ➤ Pre-Construction=Budget Value \$146,000 ➤ Construction-PSR=\$44,505,250, Budget Value=\$43,018,118, Delta from PSR=\$1,487,132 ➤ Misc. Project Costs=Budget Value \$450,000 ➤ Modulares=\$200,000 ➤ Furniture & Equipment=Budget Value \$858,485 ➤ Technology=Budget Value \$600,000 ➤ Subtotal=\$52,676,903 ➤ Construction Contingency=budget Value \$1,720,725 ➤ Owner's Contingency=Budget Value \$430,181 ➤ Total=\$54,827,809 <p>After review, the administration let the SBC know that there is no longer a need for classroom modulares, just a trailer for 4 desks for administration.</p>	Record
29.6.2	<p><u>Anticipated Total Project Budget:</u> M. Burton discusses the approximate total project budget with ALL VE Items accepted. The slide is outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Feasibility=Budget Value \$650,000 ➤ Legal Fees=Budget Value \$70,000 ➤ OPM Fee=Budget Value \$1,918,000 ➤ A&E Fee=Budget Value \$4,766,300 ➤ Pre-Construction=Budget Value \$146,000 ➤ Construction-PSR=\$44,505,250, Budget Value=\$41,750,575, Delta from PSR=\$2,754,675 ➤ Misc. Project Costs=Budget Value \$450,000 ➤ Modulares=\$200,000 ➤ Furniture & Equipment=Budget Value \$858,485 ➤ Technology=Budget Value \$600,000 ➤ Subtotal=\$51,409,360 ➤ Construction Contingency=budget Value \$1,670,023 ➤ Owner's Contingency=Budget Value \$417,506 ➤ Total=\$53,496,889 <p>Outline of discussion and questions below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Q: What is the effective reimbursement rate? ➤ A: 24-25% of eligible costs, with site being the biggest cap, and construction is capped at \$326 a sf. ➤ Q: What is the status of prek? 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A: Prek was voted by the SC to only include 2 classrooms at this time. The SC felt that at this time they did not have enough enrollment to support the additional 2 classrooms and would not be explored further. ➤ Decision Point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was made by S. Creighton and seconded by J. Foster to accept the SC recommendation and vote to proceed with 2 prek classrooms. Discussion: None. Vote: All in favor, motion passes. ➤ Q: Why do these VE steps have to be taken? Its unfortunate part of the process with not enough time to develop design, systems, etc. ➤ A: Following the MSBA process which requires a lot of design before the SD submission. 	
29.7	<p><u>Design Update:</u> L. Braren presents the SBC with updated design slides. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reduction of the gymnasium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No bleachers, bigger court • Q: Can you remove all bleachers, and just have a court regulation size? • A: yes, just court and hoops ➤ Decision point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC voted and approved to move forward with a regulation size gym with bleachers on one side of the court. 	Record
29.8.1	<p><u>Finalize Remaining VE List-Vote Final Approved VE:</u> J. Rich discusses the final remaining VE list. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Minor changes=deleted the outdoor benches next to basketball court, reduction of \$30,000. ➤ New site plan has been incorporated, but it was partially included under C-31. Overall an additional \$250,000 in additional savings. ➤ Removed 200sf from each project rooms. 	Record
29.8.2	<p><u>Finalize Remaining VE List-Vote Final Approved VE:</u> After taking the 2 PreK classrooms out and the 1 and 2 category VE items, the total construction cost is \$42,797,000. C. Hay felt that taking A-04 and A-08 don't affect program therefore should be taken. A motion was made by S. Creighton and seconded by L. O'Donnell to take A-04 and A-08. Discussion: R. Breuker felt cutting the PreK already dramatically changes the building, taking the sloped roofs and changing to flat pitched roofs will dramatically change the building. A. Ingaharro doesn't mind the flat roof. A. Oldeman agrees with R. Brueker that changing the roof changes the massing and neighborhood feel of the building. A motion was made by A. Oldeman and seconded by J. Foster to retract the original motion to remove and accept VE items A-04 and A-08. A motion was made by J. Foster and seconded by S. Creighton to take \$400,000 further from envelope of the building for further development in DD. Discussion: Removing nothing specifically, just further design reduction in DD. Vote: 16 members approved, 1 member opposed. Motion passes.</p>	Record
29.8.3	<p><u>Finalize Remaining VE List-Vote Final Approved VE:</u> The SBC further discusses the VE item A-25, regarding the gym size and bleachers. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Decision Point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. motion was made by G. Scharfe and seconded by S. Creighton to reduce the gym by 750 sf and keep it a regulation size gym, one side of 	Record

	<p>bleachers, and an off-center court. Discussion: A. Oldeman states that this would impact the view to the stage. S. Creighton asks JCJ whether the stage could be moved to the center of the court? JCJ to review. P. Beaudoin reminds the SBC that the stage will be replacing the existing auditorium. Many community members were hesitant about the removal of the auditorium and want to make sure don't dismiss the use of the stage for current auditorium use activities. Vote: 8 approve, 7 oppose. Motion passes.</p> <p>➤ Decision point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was made by C. Weld and seconded by A. Urbas to take and accept VE items A-07 and A-07a, delete outdoor classroom deck and railing, and accept A-08a, and delete remaining overhands. This does not affect entrance canopies. This does not affect the "eye brow" at first floor classrooms. Discussion: everyone opposed. Vote: motion does not pass. A motion was made by L. O'Donnell and seconded by C. Hay to keep both A-07 and A-07a. Discussion: is it common to have a 2-story elementary school? Yes, there are some that have been designed recently by JCJ. Vote: 12 approve, 3 oppose. Motion passes. 	
29.8.4	<p><u>Finalize Remaining VE List-Vote Final Approved VE:</u> After further discussion and review of VE, the SBC discuss that currently the total project budget is estimated at \$53.3 million.</p> <p>➤ Decision point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was made by J. Foster and seconded by C. Hay to accept the current total project budget of \$53.3 million and to no longer move forward with accepting any additional VE items. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion: R. Breuker is concerned there are more VE items on the table to take. Concerned that the communities won't approve, might look too fancy. ○ MSBA process once you lock in and sign 3011, making a deal that it can't go up, and has to stay within that budget. ○ S. Creighton asks whether to further explore the idea of single phasing and have whole school in modulars will help save money. Modulars are non-reimbursable though and therefore would result in \$2million cost direct to district without reimbursement. ○ C. hay states that if the SBC approves and takes remaining category 3 VE items would reduce to \$53 million. ○ Vote: 13 approve, 2 oppose. Motion passes. <p>M. Burton states that he will update the 3011 sheet by Thursday and send to the SBC to review. On 7/9/18 we will be asking the SBC to approve the SD submission which includes the Total Project Budget and Total Construction Cost. The project team will be submitted the SD package to the MSBA on 7/11/18.</p>	Record
29.9	<p><u>Project Team Amendments:</u> M. Burton discusses the OPM and Design project team amendments. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <p>➤ MSBA provides dates from all elementary schools and OPM and Design costs on their website. OPM fee is capped at 3.5%, and Designer at 10%.</p> <p>➤ DWMP Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attached graph which shows people and time allocated for OPM. • M. Burton allocated 20% to project=1day a week 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Brown allocated 60% to project=3days a week • C. Shefferman allocated 50% to project=2.5 days a week • Rate is higher due to coverage needed for additional construction time from phasing. <p>➤ JCJ Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D. Ruiz states that they have essentially done the same thing DWMP has and figured based on months/duration of time, assigned people per time needed, etc. • JCJ proposal includes hazmat, monitoring and 3 early release packages, modular package. <p>➤ G. Scharfe asks whether WT Rich considered the single-phase option considering a shorter schedule and determining whether will save money?</p> <p>➤ J. Rich states that if they did full modulars, they will still need to demo the building, still a very aggressive 15 months, but could shave off 10 months. The CM's GC's, bond insurance, etc. will not change.</p>	
29.10	<p><u>Schedule/Look Ahead:</u></p> <p>➤ 7/9/18-Joint SBC/SC Meeting-Vote to approve SD submission and 3011</p>	Record
29.11.1	<p><u>Total Project Budget Sheet Review:</u> M. Burton discusses total project budget spreadsheet. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <p>➤ Misc. Costs: \$450,000-includes bringing power to the site from Eversource, transformer hook up, temporary power, etc.</p> <p>➤ Testing: \$100,000-includes independent testing, soil compaction reports, concrete, steel, a 3rd party agent</p> <p>➤ A motion was made by C. Hay and seconded by A. Ingaharro to use the recommended cap of FF&E and Technology from the MSBA at \$2400 total. Discussion: None. Vote: Unanimous to approve, motion passes.</p> <p>➤ Other Costs: \$250,000-catch all for unforeseen. Some moving costs. Adds up quickly.</p> <p>➤ Legal Costs: \$70,000-if go over would come out of 1% owner contingency</p> <p>➤ Decision Point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was made by A. Urbas and seconded by A. Oldeman to move take \$100,000 from other costs and move to legal costs. Discussion: none. Vote: Unanimous to approve. All in favor: motion passes. 	Record
29.12.1	<p><u>Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated (48 hours prior to meeting):</u> Will not need the SBC meeting on 8/7 since we will have approval on the 9th with a certification form sign, will act as the approval of the meeting minutes and approval of the SD submission.</p>	Record
29.12.2	<p><u>Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated (48 hours prior to meeting):</u> A working group will meeting to discuss and review both DWMP and JCJ proposals on 6/29. The working group includes S. Creighton, A. Ingaharro, A. Urbas, J. Foster and P. Beaudoin.</p>	Record
29.13	<p><u>Public Comments:</u> None.</p>	Record
29.14	<p><u>Adjourn:</u> A motion was made by G. Scharfe and seconded by A. Oldeman to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: None. Vote: Unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.</p>	Record

Project: Manchester Memorial Elementary School
Meeting: School Building Committee
Meeting No. 29– 6/26/2018
Page: 7

Attached:

SBC Meeting Agenda, Sign In Sheet, SBC Meeting No. 28 6/19/18 Meeting Minutes, Manchester Memorial Elementary School Presentation 6/26/18

DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC.



Christina Shefferman
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.