

## 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: 5/22/2018  
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.	✓	Dan	Landscape
✓	Lisa O'Donnell *	Essex B.O.S.	✓	Jon Rich	WT Rich
	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](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

Item No.	Description	Action
26.1	<u>Call to Order:</u> 7:02 pm meeting was called to order by the SBC Co-Chair A. Cameron with 16 of 17 voting members in attendance. S. Brown 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
26.2	<u>Previous Topics &amp; Approval of May 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes:</u> A motion to approve the 5/8/2018 meeting minutes as submitted made by S. Creighton and seconded by J. Foster. Discussion: J. Foster states on item 24.7.1 the sf conversation seems sparse compared to the discussion that was had during the previous meeting. M. Burton states that the design team will be covering the sf details further tonight and will clarify further notes and approvals in this meetings minutes. Abstentions: M. Tomaiolo. Vote: All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
26.3	<u>Invoices and Commitments for Approval:</u> Garrity and Knisley Invoice No. 10377 for legal counsel re: CM agreement & general conditions in the amount of \$4,800.00 (invoice attached) vote expected. Motion made by S. Creighton to approve invoice no. 10377 in the amount of \$4,800.00 2 <sup>nd</sup> by A. Zaiger. Discussion: None. Vote: Unanimous to approve.	Record
26.4	<u>Schedule/Budget Update:</u> S. Brown reviews the schedule update slide as well as the project budget slide. A recap of the discussion is outlined below: Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 5/23-SD package sent to estimators</li> <li>➤ 5/30-Community Meeting No. 4</li> <li>➤ 6/11-Estimates due</li> <li>➤ 6/11-Reconciliation</li> <li>➤ 6/12-SBC Meeting-Review Cost Estimate/VE</li> <li>➤ 6/26-SBC Meeting-Approve Estimate/VE</li> <li>➤ 7/9-SBC Meeting-SD Approval</li> <li>➤ 7/11-Submit SD to MSBA</li> <li>➤ 7/27-MSBA PS&amp;B Conference</li> <li>➤ 8/7-SBC Meeting-Approve previous minutes of SD approval, update, and send to MSBA</li> <li>➤ 8/15-Responses due to MSBA</li> </ul> Budget: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Currently there is \$34,546.97 left in the project budget for the feasibility and schematic design phase of the project.</li> </ul>	Record
26.5	<u>Estimating/Value Management Overview:</u> S. Brown presents SBC with estimating/value management overview. An outline of the discussion is below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Part of the Project Scope and Budget submittal to the MSBA</li> <li>➤ All districts are required to provide a value engineering list detailing items in the design that could be changed, if necessary, to reduce the cost estimates and keep the project on budget.</li> <li>➤ As design is developed, drawings and specs are developed in more detail, therefore estimate costs are more accurate.</li> <li>➤ Help prioritize design features in order to stay on budget <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Set of drawings and specs result in estimates higher than target budget</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Record

	<p>2. VE (value engineering) process is undertaken and those items are eliminated or modified or reflected in the subsequent design submittal. After reviewing the information presented, the SBC had many questions regarding VE. The questions and answers are listed below:</p> <p>Q: What will be our approach to VE?  A: Start with what we know today. Drawings and specs sent to estimators. Big ticket items that will affect the project will be reviewed and considered. i.e. Roof material, site, glass and glazing, etc.</p> <p>Q: When will the SBC vote to formally approve VE?  A: 6/23</p> <p>Q: is VE identified by room or type of areas?  A: can be product specific/room specific/area specific.</p> <p>Q: 4 rooms still need to be voted on, 2 prek, and 2 “STEM” or “SPED” rooms  A: prek is decided upon by SC, and “STEM” or “SPED” will need to be voted tonight based on sf.</p> <p>Q: Is the life cycle of the product detailed?  A: not in estimating, but as part of VE can be presented</p>	
26.6	<p><u>Project Update:</u> JCJ presented the SBC with a project update. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Prior to meeting JCJ/DWMP sent SBC design memo outlining SD estimation. The memo is a preamble to the real detailed information on specifications and room data sheets.</li> <li>➤ Flooring was not specified. JCJ to confirm and provide info to the SBC.</li> <li>➤ Concern over “extras” presented in the interior finishes</li> <li>➤ Interior finishes sub committee will need to be formed to make decisions on finishes</li> <li>➤ AC in gymnasium-is it worth cooling gymnasium for 3-4 times a year when the gymnasium will be full for an event</li> <li>➤ MEP decision was voted upon at last SBC meeting: Dehumidification system with partial AC in administration and media center.</li> </ul>	Record
26.7.1	<p><u>Design Update/Landscape Design:</u> D. Solien from Horiuchi Solien Landscape Architects, presents the SBC with proposed landscape design slides. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Existing Conditions</li> <li>➤ Proposed Site Plan</li> <li>➤ Existing vs. Proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent drop-off que: existing 680ft, proposed 700 ft</li> <li>• Bust staging: existing 2 buses, proposed 2 buses</li> <li>• Pre-k playground: 1,622sf, proposed 2,584 sf</li> <li>• K-1 playground: 1,664 sf, proposed 2,367 sf</li> <li>• Grades 1-5 playground: existing 5,583sf, proposed 8,268 sf</li> <li>• Hard surface playcourt: existing 24,000 sf, proposed 8,070 sf</li> <li>• Raised garden beds: existing 12 beds (8+ small), proposed 12 beds</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Playground equipment-preschool age (sensory and motor skills, role play, imagination and friendships, themed play, springers, seesaws, balance and movement, swings, carousels and spinners)</li> </ul>	JCJ

- Playground equipment-school age (6+ years): Agility, balance, coordination, rule play scenarios, friendships, urban climbing, carousels and spinners, balance and movement, slides
- Nautical theme
- Nature theme
- Inclusive play (sensory skills, motor skills, cognitive skills, social skills)
- Musical equipment
- Hard court games
- Playground surfacing: engineered wood fiber (most economic, requires maintenance, accessibility questions)
- Playground surfacing: poured in place rubber (custom shapes/colors, shock absorption, accessible, higher cost)
- Playground surfacing: combined rubber/wood fiber (economics, safety)
- Shade structures
- Outdoor classrooms
- Kitchen gardens
- Butterfly gardens
- Rain gardens
- Proposed site plan

After D. Solien presented the slides, the SBC had discussion. Questions and answers outlined below:

- Main entry loop will have 27 parking spots in middle and 10 spots on the side.
- Service entrance will have 16 parking spots
- Emergency vehicle access around building:
  - Q: Is it necessary to have pavement all the way around building for emergency access including fire and police vehicles?
  - Need to meet with fire and police and determine what is required for them to have access in case of an emergency. Need to determine fire truck radius, egress, muster points, etc. Once meeting is scheduled, team to propose plan that has less pavement, and determine if more is necessary
  - Q: Any expectations of pervious pavement?
  - A: Have not determined yet
  - Q: can the amount of bituminous pavement be reduced?
  - A: need to meet with fire and police and determine what is required
  - Q: is it necessary to have 2 retaining walls?
  - A: grading along side of building needs to be evaluated further. Need to determine whether retaining walls of that size are necessary or if could be solved with fill and grading
  - Q: where will snow be stored?
  - A: could be stored and edge of driveways, various areas on main loop, and back by the service area.
  - Q: could the basketball court double as additional parking?
  - A: could fence off and open if needed for special events
  - Q: what material will the retaining walls be constructed of?
  - A: WT Rich to review plans and provide cost estimates on various materials for the retaining wall

26.8	<p><u>Project Update:</u> JCJ presents the SBC with project update slides. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Meetings and Interviews (budget collaboration, landscape design, safety and security)</li> <li>➤ June 12: SBC Meeting (review cost estimates, review any ve if required, determine which ve concepts to further study)</li> <li>➤ June 26: SBC meeting (review ve concepts and design updates, initial approval of design scope and budget)</li> <li>➤ July 9: Joint SC &amp; SBC meeting (approval to submit SD package to MSBA)</li> <li>➤ Building Systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical: displacement dehumidification, fin-tube or radiant panel heating at perimeter</li> <li>• Electrical: emergency generator: approx. 100-125kw, 100% LED lighting system with automated control</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net Zero: estimated to be an additional \$40-50 sf, approx. a \$3.3M to \$4.2M premium</li> <li>• Not a common choice for MSBA projects: only a few projects have considered it, none completed to date</li> <li>• Requires geothermal: 70 closed loop wells/ 18,400 sqft</li> <li>• Would require an all electrical system: expansive photovoltaic system required, exterior envelop improvements necessary, glazing solar gain insulation</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Decision Point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• -LEED Silver (recommendation) 2% reimbursement</li> <li>• A motion was made by S. Creighton and seconded by G. Scharfe to select LEED Silver as the preferred sustainability building option. Discussion: S. Creighton asks whether the MSBA requires a certification? A: yes, MSBA requires at least LEED Silver for new construction. Vote: All in favor, motion passes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Record
26.9.1	<p><u>Design Update:</u> JCJ presents the SBC with design update slides. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Area Update. Please see page 42 of design presentation to view the table. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parks &amp; Rec: 1800 nsf at PSR, 2,610 SF 5/22</li> <li>• Total Gross Square Feet: 82,800 SF at PSR, 84,062 SF 5/22</li> <li>• Increase from PSR: 1,262 SF</li> <li>• Changes made to reduce gross square feet include moving the mechanical and electrical rooms into the first and second floor classroom wings and changed the orientation of kindergarten rooms. No longer have garage doors on kindergarten classrooms, and reduced amount of sf in corridors.</li> <li>• Need to review and determine reduction of glass on classroom doors.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Decision Point: 1,262 SF over from PSR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q: extra “STEM” or “SPED” rooms, and 2 extra pre-k rooms, do we need to vote tonight?</li> <li>• A: MSBA at PSR agreed to allow them in the program but haven’t agreed yet whether they will be considered reimbursable.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prek decision will be made by SC. STEM or SPED rooms are swing space need to be voted on tonight.</li> <li>• A motion was made by A. Zaiger and seconded by S. Creighton to proceed with SD plans and 1,262 SF as presented by JCJ. Discussion: the team needs to review amount of glass and shades. The team will review and see what reductions can be made. Vote: All in favor, motion passes.</li> </ul>	
26.9.2	<p><u>Design Update:</u> JCJ presents the SBC with design update slides. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Updated upper level, lower level, hub, cafeteria/gym/auditorium, and community spaces floor plans</li> <li>➤ Building Massing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main entry from 5/8, updated entry with less glass 5/22</li> <li>• Exterior from 5/8, updated exterior gym with cementitious fiber board instead of brick</li> <li>• Flat roof on gym</li> <li>• Proposed exterior envelope materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brick, cementitious fiber board, metal panel</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Roofing options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PVC w Ribs</li> <li>○ Asphaltic Shingles</li> <li>○ Standing seam metal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pricing Alternates: Gymnasium &amp; Prek-K Roof: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Flat roof/tpo membrane (\$675,000 25-30 years, \$1,500,000 over 50 years)</li> <li>○ Gabled/Asphaltic Shingle (\$725,000 20-25 years \$1,115,000 over 50 years)</li> <li>○ Gabled/Sarnafil w/ribs (\$885,000 25-30 years \$1,370,000 over 50 years)</li> <li>○ Gabled/Standing Seam (\$1,360,000 50 years \$1,360,000 over 50 years)</li> <li>○ Assumes 4.5% escalation year-over-year</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Record
26.10	<p><u>Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated (48 hours prior to meeting):</u> Any member of the SBC that wishes to be a part of the Interior finishes subcommittee, MEP, and or Landscape, please email DWMP to schedule and include in further details.</p>	Record
26.11	<p><u>Public Comments:</u> None.</p>	Record
26.12	<p><u>Adjourn:</u> A motion was made by G. Scharfe and seconded by J. Foster to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: None. Vote: Unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 9:36 pm.</p>	Record

**Attached:**

SBC Meeting Agenda, Sign In Sheet, SBC Meeting No. 25 5/8/18 Meeting Minutes, Manchester Memorial Elementary School Presentation 5/8/18

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC.**

Project: Manchester Memorial Elementary School  
Meeting: School Building Committee  
Meeting No. 26– 5/22/2018  
Page: 7

---



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.**