

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: 11/14/2017
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
8.8	P. Beaudoin/JCJ/DWMP	Choose date for tour; Contact schools schedule tour
9.3	JCJ	Revised Samiotes proposal
13.9.2	MEP WG	Schedule MEP WG Meeting

* 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
13.1	<u>Call to Order:</u> 7:04 pm meeting was called to order by the SBC Co-Chair Ann Cameron with 14 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
13.2.1	<u>Previous Topics & Approval of November 6, 2017 Meeting Minutes:</u> S. Brown explains and reviews the five previous items requiring action. A review of those items is noted below.	Record
7.11	<p><u>Site Understanding:</u> L. Braren reviews site understanding slides included in the JCJ presentation. There are 5 slides total that indicate degraded areas, resource areas, FEMA flood map zone, zone 1 and 2 extents, and property line setbacks. The SBC ask many questions regarding buffer zones, height regulations, zoning restrictions, storm water runoff, and setbacks. The SBC asked whether it might be an option to tear down the building and rebuild exactly where the building is now to avoid any issues. This would mean that during construction, the students would need to be relocated to either another location. P. Beaudoin stated she would contact some other districts to see if they might have a vacant site that might be a consideration. P. Beaudoin to report findings.</p> <p>9/12/17: P. Beaudoin states that she has asked surrounding districts, and has confirmed that Rockport and Beverly do not have anything available. P. Beaudoin is still waiting to hear from Gloucester, Hamilton and Wenham. Once a response received, will report back to the SBC.</p> <p>9/26/17: P. Beaudoin states that she has 3 leads from schools and sites within 10 miles of MMES. Waiting to hear back from the 3 leads and she will report updates to the SBC once information is received.</p> <p>10/24/17: No update at this time. Continuing.</p> <p>11/06/2017: P. Beaudoin provided the SBC with an update of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ P. Beaudoin and A. Urbas have a meeting with the mayor of Beverly next week to discuss possibly using the Briscoe school. ➤ Penguin Hall will not meet the habitable needs for MMES, no longer an option. ➤ There is one catholic school in Gloucester, and another in Beverly still waiting to hear back from. Have left several messages with no answer. ➤ Possible option to connect with a real estate agent. <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>	Open/P. Beaudoin
8.8	<u>Educational Planning:</u> D. Stephen provides a brief recap of the Ed. Planning presentation that was presented to the Leadership team back in August. A copy of the slides are attached in the backup. D. Stephen advises that the team should plan when they would like to visit other school sites that have recently gone through the process. The schools requested include Haverhill, Marblehead, and Andover. P. Beaudoin to provide dates in December that will work for the group.	

	<p>9/26/17: P. Beaudoin states that she sent out a scheduling doodle for potential dates to the SBC. Three dates worked best for the group, 12/8, 12/14, 12/18. P. Beaudoin to send another doodle with these dates to confirm which will be best. P. Beaudoin to confirm best date at next meeting.</p> <p>10/24/17: No update at this time. Continuing.</p> <p>11/06/2017: P. Beaudoin will evaluate schedule doodle and select an open date that worked best for the SBC. S. Brown recommended taking a tour of Hunkings School in Haverhill, West Parish in Gloucester, and a Renovation/Addition School. P. Beaudoin to communicate with DWMP and schedule dates for tours.</p> <p>11/14/2017: S. Brown states that he has reached out to the West Parish School in Gloucester to coordinate a walk through. S. Brown is waiting to hear back with some potential dates and times. D. Ruiz states that he reached out to the Hunking School in Haverhill and is waiting to hear back dates and times. Once both DWMP and JCJ have some potential dates and times they will report back to the SBC.</p>	DWMP/JCJ
9.3	<p>Revised Samiotes Proposal: S. Brown states that originally a BRR had been planned for approval this evening. The request will be moved till the tennis court existing survey is reviewed by Samiotes. The report that was just received could be reviewed and used as existing information that the surveyor will no longer need to test for, therefore lowering the cost of the proposal. JCJ to report back to DWMP with any additional cost savings from Samiotes.</p> <p>10/24/17: No update at this time. Continuing.</p> <p>11/6/2017: No update at this time. Continuing.</p> <p>11/14/2017: No update at this time. Continuing.</p>	Open/Record
12.10	<p>Cost Review: After the discussion of the space summary items and decisions made by the SBC (see 12.8.2 above), M. Burton reflects the sf of these spaces into a PDP Options worksheet and forecasts the costs for each scheme and option that will be included in the PDP submission. The sheet provides a conceptual budget cost for: escalation, soft costs, construction costs, district share, total project costs, and overall effective reimbursement. After reviewing the worksheet, M. Burton shares the MSBA's historical cost data from their website; including a chart that displays construction costs for school projects as bid from FY 09 through FY 17, as well as projected construction cost/sf at preferred schematic and at schematic design for projects recently approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A. Cameron recommends that SBC members that are industry professionals review costs and the sheet developed. The recommended members include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G. Brewster • G. Scharfe • T. Virden • A. Oldeman • R. Breuker • C. Hay ➤ The overall total project cost must be included for each option in the PDP submission, even though some of the options do not fit the educational program. ➤ DWMP will share the sheet with the member recommended by A. Cameron. <p>DWMP will present any updates at the PDP approval meeting on 11/14.</p>	

	11/14/2017: S. Brown states the cost sheet was sent to the sub-committee, and we will be discussing this item under agenda item no. 4.	Record/Closed
12.13	<p><u>Public Comment:</u> A member of the public, M. Donohoe was at the meeting and stated that he is an abutter to the school. M. Donohoe is concerned by the wetland that goes through his property and the school's property and how it will be handled during project development. M. Donohoe stated there is a drainage swale along the school's property. Mr. Donahoe states that due to maintenance issues, it causes his yard to flood and has become an issue. M. Donohoe stated that he has met and discussed the issue with the Town of Manchester for some time, and the Town stated that they were aware that the MMES project would be happening soon and to wait till the project starts to fix water issues relating to his yard, the wetlands, and the brook. A. Zaiger and D. Ruiz state that they received an email from M. Donohue after the second community meeting, and have scheduled a meeting with JCJ's civil engineer and wetland scientist to come to M. Donohoe's property to review the issue and setback. D. Ruiz to coordinate with the Civil Engineer and M. Donohue a time to come review his yard.</p> <p>11/14/2017: S. Brown states that this item will be discussed under agenda no. 4, project update.</p>	Record/Closed
13.2.2	<p><u>Previous Topics & Approval of November 6, 2017 Meeting Minutes:</u> A motion to approve the 11/6/2017 meeting minutes as submitted made by G. Scharfe and seconded by C. Weld. Discussion: None. Vote: All in favor w/ C. Hay, R. Breuker, A. Ingaharro, and G. Brewster abstaining. Motion passes, minutes approved.</p>	Record
13.3	<p><u>Construction Delivery Method Review:</u> S. Brown states that this was originally added to the agenda thinking we would have time to cover. It was decided that this evenings meeting's focus was approval of the PDP, therefore pushing the construction delivery method to another time. No discussion at this time.</p>	Record
13.4.1	<p><u>Project Update:</u> JCJ provides the SBC an update about the abutter M. Donohoe, and the outcome with meeting with him, ConCom, and the wetland scientist. It was determined that the swale is part of the wetland right along the property line. There is also a culvert at the corner of the school's property, and the water from the swale and the brook setbacks will need to pay close attention to. The culvert may have some damage to it. The determination of swale being a wetland will affect a few options that were designed in this area. The school project's obligation is to make sure that the wetlands, the culvert, and anything on the school's property is properly dealt with. R. Breuker asked how was C. Bertoni from ConCom? D. Ruiz responded that the discussion was positive and there were no issues. P. Beaudoin asked if there was any danger from the damaged culvert? D. Ruiz responded no, that there is a fence that separates the culvert from the land. Occasionally after a heavy rain the culvert might flood, but that is the extent of it. Next steps include receiving the land survey which will include the official property line survey. D. Ruiz to inform SBC once the report is received.</p>	Record
13.4.2	<p><u>Project Update:</u> JCJ provides the SBC with additional "New" options. The options are labeled as N-8, and N-9. Both N-8 and N-9 would not require any modular classrooms for students, since they suggest phased construction for each option. JCJ suggests to the SBC that these options be included in the PDP submission. An overview of each options is outlined below:</p>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ N-8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Phase 1-build a 2-story classroom wing ○ Phase 2-demolish west wing, and build a second story wing ○ Phase 3-Demolish rest of the wings, and build the core (cafetorium, gymnasium, administration) ➤ N-9: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Build a wing on west side of building, and demolish west wing ○ Build rest of building and demolish rest of building ○ All wings are 2-story <p>The SBC asked the team what is the timing for these options? M. Burton responded that each section can take anywhere from 6-12-14 months depending upon the phases. G. Scharfe made a recommendation to the SBC to include options N-8 and N-9 in the PDP submission. All in favor: no abstentions.</p>	
13.4.3	<p><u>Project Update:</u> JCJ presents the space summary slide. The slide recaps the spaces approved in the last SBC meeting to approve a project total sf of 80,770.</p>	Record
13.5.1	<p><u>PDP Cost Report Update:</u> M. Burton reviews the cost report sheet that is shown in the presentation. An outline of the discussion is listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Formula correction-Soft cost formula corrected to include modular cost ➤ A roll up of the total project cost is what is submitted in the PDP ➤ Modular price was reduced based on current trends and data ➤ Site cost was updated and lowered to \$4.5million ➤ The number of modular classrooms was reduced from 26 to 22, and 14 to 12. ➤ Phasing options reduce the amount of modular classrooms which then rolls the phasing costs into construction cost, which is potentially reimbursable. ➤ Sf updated in AR options 2 & 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Was: 48,347 sf of new / 32,423 sf of renovation ○ Now: 62,244 sf of new / 16,526 sf of renovation <p>G. Brewster pointed out to the SBC that phasing ultimately adds more construction time to the project. If the students were off site completely in modulares, the project would save time in construction therefore not taking as long as phasing. In the end phasing, and modulares potentially could equal the same amount of money. The SBC encouraged the team to consider using modulares on the Essex Elementary School site as a priority for potential options. Essex Elementary could potentially house some grades from MMES, as well as utilize modulares on campus while construction occurs. Additional information is still being gathered regarding off site campuses, and costs associated. All information will be further evaluated in the Preferred Schematic Report phase which will start at the next SBC meeting.</p>	Record
13.5.2	<p><u>PDP Cost Report Update:</u> JCJ and DWMP present the updated options to the SBC including adjusted total project budget costs, and approximate district share costs. The adjustment includes the updated sf that was added and approved by the SBC at our last meeting. The team explains that in our next couple of meetings we will be pairing down the options by providing more details about design and costs. The task of the team and the SBC will be to develop a set of criteria to objectively evaluate the options.</p>	Record

13.6.1	<p><u>PDP Report:</u> JCJ and DWMP provide the SBC with an update and overview of the PDP Report. An outline of the discussion is listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PDP reviewed by sub-committee ➤ All comments received have been updated ➤ Requesting committee approval ➤ The PDP Report includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Introduction ○ Educational program ○ Initial space summary ○ Evaluation of existing conditions ○ Site development requirements ○ Evaluation of the alternatives ○ Local actions and approval ○ Appendix 	Record
13.6.2	<p><u>PDP Report:</u> After presenting the SBC with the revised options slides with total project budget cost and district share cost, the SBC asked several questions regarding the submission. An outline of the discussion is listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Q: What is the total project cost? A: It includes soft costs and construction costs. Construction cost is \$450 a sf. ➤ Q: District share? A: Built on MSBA guideline. Reimbursable vs. non-reimbursable. Discussed the breakdown of costs at our last meeting. Shared the information again with the SBC member. Cap for construction cost with MSBA is \$326 a sf. ➤ Q: If the SBC approves the numbers tonight, does this mean they are approving the budget for the rest of the project? A: No. It is better that we start off by being conservative. There is a lot of room for improvement with design, costs, and additional findings. <p>The team reiterated to the SBC that they are not approving the exact cost, but approving the relative range of options for the PDP submission.</p>	Record
13.6.3	<p><u>PDP Submission Approval:</u> A motion was made by P. Beaudoin and seconded by A. Ingaharro to allow OPM Dore & Whittier Mangement Partners to submit the PDP on behalf of the District to the MSBA as discussed at the 11/14/17 SBC meeting. Discussion: None. Vote: All in favor: No abstentions, motion passes.</p>	Record
13.7	<p><u>PSR Work Plan Update:</u> S. Brown states that JCJ and DWMP will formalize the schedule and provide an update to the SBC at our next meeting.</p>	Record
13.8	<p><u>Next Meetings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11/21/17 SC Meeting • 11/22/17 Submit PDP to MSBA • 11/28/17 SBC Meeting • 12/12/17 SBC Meeting 	Record
13.9.1	<p><u>Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to Meeting:</u> C. Shefferman reviews the Communications WG discussion with the SBC and states there are 6 upcoming events that the team is looking for volunteers from the SBC to attend and participate in. The SBC agreed that C. Shefferman will send a list of the events to the SBC outlining dates and times asking for members to attend. C. Shefferman to send as soon as possible to SBC.</p>	Record

13.9.2	<u>Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to Meeting:</u> The SBC agreed that there should be an MEP working group established. The SBC recommended that R. Breuker, A. Oldeman, T. Virden, G. Sharfe, J. Pagliarulo, and S. Creighton be included in the group. At our next SBC meeting further development will be established.	MEP WG
13.10	<u>Public Comment:</u> None.	Record
13.11	<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 8:22 pm.	Record

Attached:

SBC Meeting Agenda, Sign In Sheet, SBC Meeting No. 12 11/6/17 Meeting Minutes, Manchester Memorial Elementary School Presentation 11/14/17

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.