

MEETING MINUTES



MANAGEMENT
PARTNERS, LLC

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

Project No: MP17-114
Meeting Date: 2/1/2018
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.			
✓	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			

Action Items:

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Responsible Party:</u>	<u>Description</u>
7.11	P. Beaudoin	Site: Swing space availability

* 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
19.1	<u>Call to Order:</u> 7:04 pm meeting was called to order by the SBC Co-Chair Caroline Weld 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
19.2.1	<u>Previous Topics & Approval of January 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes:</u> S. Brown explains and reviews the one previous item requiring action. A review of the item is noted below.	Record
7.11	<p><u>Site Understanding:</u> (For previous history of this item, refer to previous meeting minutes)</p> <p>...Additional details and follow up will be provided to the SBC at our next meeting.</p> <p>11/14/2017: P. Beaudoin states that she has a meeting scheduled with the Mayor of the Town of Beverly on 11/20/17. P. Beaudoin is also in communication with St. Mary's in Beverly, and is waiting for a formal response from the school on whether it will fit the needs of MMES. P. Beaudoin is still waiting to hear from Father Jim in Gloucester. P. Beaudoin will continue to pursue these options and will report back to the SBC once she has additional information.</p> <p>11/28/2017: P. Beaudoin states that there are still 3 possible options. Briscoe School in Beverly, The Cummings Center in Beverly, and St. Mary's in Beverly. P. Beaudoin met with officials from Beverly's mayor office, and is waiting to hear whether they would be willing to wait a year before someone would possibly occupy the school. The Cummings Center approached P. Beaudoin and stated that they might have an option that would fit their needs. The Cummings Center is working on putting together a quote and space availability between their many available spaces. P. Beaudoin is still waiting to hear if St. Mary's can provide an estimate for the space. After discussion, the SBC agreed that overall, they would steer towards an option that can either have kids on site or off site based on phasing, modulars, and or an offsite temporary campus. P. Beaudoin to continue development of potential swing spaces.</p> <p>12/12/2017: P. Beaudoin states Cummings Properties has confirmed that they have nothing that fits the District's space needs for the time frame needed. No update from Gloucester or St. Mary's prospect at this time.</p> <p>12/18/2017: No update at this time.</p> <p>1/10/2018: No update at this time.</p> <p>1/22/2018: No update at this time.</p> <p>2/1/2018: No update at this time.</p>	P. Beaudoin
19.2.2	<u>Previous Topics & Approval of January 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes:</u> A motion to approve the 1/10/2018 meeting minutes as submitted made by A. Oldeman and seconded by A. Ingaharro. Discussion: None. Vote: All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
19.3	<u>Design Update:</u> J. Laposta provides the SBC with a design/project update. JCJ recaps Community Meeting No. 3 that occurred yesterday, Wednesday 1/31/18, in the MMES auditorium. JCJ brought the scheme boards to tonight's meeting if any member of the SBC would like to see the comments that were left by community members. J. Laposta states there was a lot of conversation about the school, the auditorium, enrichment programs, etc.	Record
19.4.1	<u>Review Cost Estimates:</u> M. Burton provides cost estimate information to the SBC. M. Burton states that as part of the PSR submission, both the designer and the OPM are required to	Record

	<p>provide cost estimates in the submission. Once estimates are received, they are reconciled, and then provided to the SBC as part of the submission. M. Burton discusses the cost estimate sheet that was handed out to the SBC. A recap of the discussion is outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The #'s are conservative, and as design is developed, the #'s will change. ➤ Orange box is soft costs ➤ Blue box is construction costs ➤ The estimates are sf driven ➤ Modular's are non-reimbursable ➤ Legal fees are an estimate ➤ OPM fee is at a 3.5% cap set by the MSBA ➤ The Designer fee is at a 10% cap set by the MSBA ➤ Owners contingency is estimated at 5% of construction cost ➤ CM @ Risk for preconstruction services is estimated at \$100k. ➤ The MSBA has caps on site work at 8% of total construction, total construction cost is capped at \$336 a sf, and FF&E/Technology are capped at \$2400 total per student. ➤ MMES will receive 1 incentive point from the MSBA for CM @ Risk since the project started as the MSBA was removing this incentive point. 	
19.4.2	<p><u>Review Cost Estimates:</u> After reviewing the information provided in the cost estimate sheet, the SBC discussed the information at length. A recap of the discussion is outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The costs have room for improvement as sf could be removed ➤ R-1 does not meet the space summary sheet ➤ AR-2-renovating a partial existing building would mean in 50 years that it partially will be 100 years old ➤ AR-2-gymnasium and auditorium do not meet the space summary ➤ AR-2 would be a substantial renovation, with significant seismic upgrade, bracing, etc. ➤ N-9-phasing and construction have longest time frames of all schemes ➤ N-1 does not provide independent access to community space ➤ N-3 offers potential for addition if bubble occurs ➤ N-3 has separate access from community wing vs academic wing 	Record
19.5	<p><u>Preferred Option Discussion:</u> A motion was made by S. Creighton and seconded by L. O'Donnell to select N-3 as the preferred option as part of the Preferred Schematic Report submission to the MSBA. Discussion: A. Urbas would like to take the time to further evaluate and review the cost review sheet provided to the SBC. Financially though, A. Urbas felt that N-3 is the most supportive. A. Oldeman also believed that N-3 offers a lot of flexibility in terms of budget and design. S. Creighton reiterates that the SBC needs to be reminded that this is not the final budget, but a conservative tool for the SBC to review and understand at this point of the project. All in favor: Unanimous, vote passes.</p>	Record
19.6	<p><u>Schedule/Look Ahead:</u> S. Brown discusses the 2-month calendar slides. The information is outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The SBC meeting scheduled for 2/5/18 is no longer needed since the preferred option was selected tonight. ➤ 2/13/18-Joint SBC/SC Meeting-Approve PSR Submission ➤ 2/21/18-Submit PSR to MSBA ➤ 3/13/18-SBC Meeting-CM @ Risk Prequalification Process 	Record

	➤ 3/27/18-SBC Meeting-Update on MSBA FAS Meeting	
19.7	<u>Next Steps:</u> See information above in 19.6.	Record
19.8	<u>Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated (48 hours prior to meeting):</u> None.	Record
19.9.1	<p><u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Eli Boling, a Town of Manchester Selectmen, provided comments on the schemes. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ R-1 is politically dead on arrive. It doesn't provide a future for the school. No improvement of educational spaces. ➤ N-9 doesn't offer a vastly different advantage to the town and district. Politically won't get support since its \$6 million more than the other new options. ➤ N-3 best option since it offers separate community access, and potential for expansion. ➤ Voters are looking for flexibility and future expansion which N-3 offers. 	Record
19.9.2	<u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Andre Kuehne, from the Town of Manchester, stated he preferred N-3.	Record
19.9.3	<p><u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Steven Bates, from the Town of Manchester, provided comments on the schemes. An outline of the discussion is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Afraid of losing a space like the auditorium since it has the acoustical capabilities. ➤ Potential for an option for a new gym and leave auditorium <p>J. Laposta provided an answer by stating that the challenge is to keep just the auditorium, structurally cannot be supported since the gym and the auditorium share a joint wall. The gymnasium can be designed to address acoustics, sound implications, and be used for performances where it actually can accommodate everyone from the school. Just to renovate the auditorium would cost significantly in seismic updates.</p>	Record
19.9.4	<u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Erin Greenland, from the Town of Manchester inquired when construction will start? M. Burton provides an answer by stating that in each scheme the # of phases, and timeframe were considered and evaluated as part of the cost estimates. N-1 is the quickest since the whole building will be built in one phase, N-3 is the second quickest since it has two phases, and N-9 being the longest with 3 phases. N-3 has potential to not have any modulars, which can be a large cost savings. It is anticipated to start construction in Fall of 2019, and the school to be completed 2-3 years from then.	Record
19.9.5	<u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Axel Magnuson, from the Town of Manchester, asked what the teachers from the SBC feel is the best design? M. Tomaiolo responds by stating she preferred N-3 the most. The classrooms are nicely grouped, the specialists are put together, it feels welcoming, and likes that the community space has separate access. P. Beaudoin states she also prefers N-3 the most and likes it for the same reason M. Tomaiolo stated, and that it also feels very warm and welcoming.	Record
19.9.6	<u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Miriam Bradford, from the Town of Manchester, inquired if the vote doesn't pass for the project, what happens? P. Beaudoin responds stating that they would need to vote again in the spring if it doesn't pass. A failing vote though puts the project in jeopardy and loss of funding from the MSBA if it doesn't get approval in the 120-day window set by the MSBA. Project delay means escalation, and more money for the towns to pay. L. O'Donnell states that a failed vote means costs for	Record

	maintaining the existing structure that will be very expensive and potential threat for the students and staff to be affected by these existing issues.	
19.9.7	<u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Shannon Erdmann, a MERSD School Committee Member, stated that based on the #'s provided tonight, and that price of the building at \$49 million, makes sense with current trends and current market prices. M. Burton states there is information on the MSBA website that reflects trends, past and current projects, and pricing for their project.	Record
19.9.8	<u>Public Comment:</u> A member from the public, Greg Federspiel, the Town of Manchester Administrator, asked whether they would be able to get MSBA to say they will not pay or contribute to a reno, then it would help stop the debate on whether R-1 would be a viable option. The team stated that the data is there, the sf provided in the R-1 scheme does not meet the space summary qualifications set forth by the district as part of their educational plan.	Record
19.10	<u>Adjourn:</u> A motion was made by S. Creighton and seconded by A. Zaiger to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: None. Vote: Unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 9:12 pm.	Record

Attached:

SBC Meeting Agenda, Sign In Sheet, SBC Meeting No. 18 1/22/18 Meeting Minutes, Manchester Memorial Elementary School Presentation 2/1/18, Cost Review Sheet

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.