

SMMA
1000 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02138

Minutes

Project Name:	Wilmington Wildwood Early Childhood Center	Project Number:	22127
RE:	School Building Committee	Meeting Date:	11/19/2024
Prepared by:	Sarah A. Traniello	Meeting No:	23
Location:	Hybrid: In Person at Wilmington High School, 159 Church Street, Wilmington, and Remote Participation via Zoom (recording posted on Wildwood Building Project website, WCTV and YouTube)		
Distribution:	School Building Committee		

Attendees

Wildwood School Building Committee		SMMA OPM
Diane M. Allan	Dennis Kelley	Julie Leduc, Director, OPM Services and Project Manager
Gregory B. Bendel	Craig Miner Remote	Sarah Traniello, Assistant Project Manager
Kate Bissell Remote	Christine Murray* Absent	
Dr. Glenn Brand, Chair	Judith O'Connell	
Kevin A. Caira	Christine Prendergast	
Michael Camoscio Remote	Paul J. Melaragni	
Justin Cusce	David A. Ragsdale	
Marianne Gallezzo Remote	Paul Ruggiero	
Nicholas Golden	Stacey Scott	
Christine Holloran Remote	R. Eric Slagel	
John C. Holloway* Absent	Stephen Turner	
	Vivian Varbedian, Vice Chair	
		Dore+Whittier Architects
		Donald Walter, Principal-In-Charge
		Lee P. Dore, Principal, Designer
		Rani Philip, Project Manager

Item No.	Action	Discussion
23.01	Record	Chair, Glenn Brand, called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. Roll Call of the School Building Committee was performed to account for all of those who are present through remote participation on Zoom. The attendance based on the roll call can be found on page 1 of these minutes. The majority were present in person with a handful of members through remote access on Zoom Webinar. Slight delay in response from M. Camoscio and C. Miner who were both present online for SBC Meeting. Absent were Christine Murray and John C. Holloway.
23.02	Record	Approval of Minutes V. Varbedian motioned to approve the meeting minutes from the October 21, 2024 School Building Committee meeting, with a second motion by C. Prendergast. Approval of Minutes Roll Call Vote: Affirmatively responded, passed unanimously.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
23.03	Record	Approval of Invoices J. Leduc reviewed Warrant No. 17 containing an invoice for OPM Services for SMMA in the amount of \$3,750 and an invoice for Designer Services for Dore+Whittier Architects in the amount of \$3,000 for Basic Design Services remaining under Feasibility Study for the Preferred Schematic Report and \$38,500 for Basic Design Services in the Schematic Design Phase. D. Kelley made a motion to approve Warrant No. 17 in the amount of \$45,250. K. Caira requested that SMMA and Dore+Whittier's invoices be split out for payment under separate Warrant articles. More specifically, Warrant No. 17 should be SMMA for \$3,750 and Warrant No. 18 should be Dore+Whittier Architects with line items \$3,000 and \$38,500. Committee agreed to move forward with splitting the Warrant into 2 Warrant, namely 17 and 18 for this meeting and separate motions would be made for each Warrant to be approved. D. Kelley rescinded his motion for approval of Warrant No. 17 as requested. D. Kelley made a motion to approve Warrant No. 17 with SMMA's invoice in the amount of \$3,750 and a total of \$3,750. Seconded by V. Varbedian. Warrant No. 17 Roll Call Vote: Warrant No. 17 affirmatively by passed by majority. 20 Affirmative: 1 Negative (K. Caira) – 2 members absent (J. Holloway/C. Murray) D. Kelley made a motion to approve Warrant No. 18 with Dore+Whittier Architect's invoice in the amount of \$3,000 for remaining Base Fee under Feasibility Study and \$38,500 for Base Fee under Schematic Design Phase for a total of \$41,500. Seconded by V. Varbedian. Warrant No. 18 Roll Call Vote: Affirmatively responded unanimously.
23.04	Record	Design Update R. Philip provided update to the School Building Committee relating to the latest developments for the One Preferred Option and the Preferred Schematic Report and the next steps related to the process with the MSBA, their review of the PSR submission, providing comments for further development of updates and development of responses for the submission that will be produced within 14 days. R. Philip provided update to the School Building Committee relating to the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee presentation that was held on November 13, 2024 with the MSBA, reviewing the

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		comments that came forth from the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee relating to the Preferred Schematic Report. FAS advised that consolidation was the right way to proceed, with the right site selection and initial design layouts being well received. Emphasized providing professional development for staff well ahead of the building project so that the spaces will be well utilized, integration of STEM learning into general classrooms for younger students, Special Education and extended learning areas are nicely integrated. The cost per square foot was well received for new build and considered reasonable an on par with others also in the program currently. Consider schedule impacts of supply chain issues if pursuing Design-Bid-Build as the Construction Delivery Method. ○ C. Prendergast asked who is the FAS? J. Leduc advised that the FAS is the Facility Assessment Subcommittee and is with the MSBA. L. Dore further advised the FAS is a subset of the Board of Directors of the MSBA. The meeting is an informal opportunity for that subset to provide to the Leadership and the Designer and OPM guidance about what guidance that is able to be provided by learning what is on the minds, what is being seen in the marketplace with other projects. V. Varbedian advised the FAS had genuinely thoughtfully reviewed the drawings and documents together with all that was laid out as a committee and their questions were thoughtfully presented. – R. Philip reviewed the Schematic Design Review Schedule and what Dore+Whittier Architects will be sharing in November and December. ○ November will be the User Group Meetings occurring with the results of the User Group Meetings and the Site Investigation being shared with the School Building Committee. Schematic Design is being kicked off with this meeting tonight, November 19, 2024. ○ December will be Design Updates to approve the concept to move forward; Exterior and Interior Vision / Imagery; Building Systems and Sustainability will be explored further. During this session, it will be conducted in person so that each board of the Exterior and Interior Vision/Imagery can be explored. Each member of the SBC

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		will be provided with red dots and green dots that they will adhere to the boards indicating what they like and dislike. Red will be for the images disliked and green for the images liked. This gives Dore+Whittier an idea of aesthetics for what the SBC prefers for the interior and exterior materials, textures, imagery or colors. Tables, chairs and equipment are budgetary items so those will not be chosen just yet. ○ Dore+Whittier is working to building upon feedback from every meeting of decisions with the SBC that are made, information presented to the SBC with ongoing design and plan development, with the goal to progress the design. Dore+Whittier will provide ongoing updates as soon available for each concept is developed and reports are generated with milestones achieved and submitted to MSBA. ○ For December, there are 2 SBC meetings that will be held, December 3, 2024 and December 17, 2024. The MSBA Board Meeting will be on December 13, 2024 to approve the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) so the project will move officially into Schematic Design. ○ January and February will be further design updates and working with the Sustainability Working Group to develop that side of the project and bring progress updates to the SBC. ○ February into March will be Cost Estimating and soon April will be upon us and the Schematic Design package will be submitted to the MSBA. It is a quick and rigorous yet very important process as there is a lot of detail that MSBA will be asking for so Dore+Whittier will be asking for a lot of feedback from the SBC so that the right information is being put into the documentation that the cost estimates will be based upon. The Project Scope and Budget is set based on this information as this is your agreement with the MSBA on what the final cost of the project will be and locks the project in on the pricing. This is very important as this is the culmination of the Feasibility Study. ○ For interiors, is this tables and chairs? <i>R. Phillips advised that no, tables and chairs are</i>

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		moveable furniture and there is a budget for that and it will be more definite under Design Development and Construction Documents. ▪ Right now, interiors is about materials, color schemes, textures, and features that are desired to be in the educational spaces. There will be a Furniture Fixtures and Equipment Budget established for these items and it will be more defined. ▪ Dore+Whittier will use the SBC's suggestions within the context that provisions are made and then create interior design concepts to glean your feedback on what Dore+Whittier think works for Wilmington. ▪ This will result in getting a flavor of what Wilmington's preference will be for the new school's interior and exterior features would be moving forward and direct the honing of the concepts into the next iteration of the design concepts developed. ○ Every bit of feedback provided in the SBC meetings is utilized to further develop the conceptual designs to provide the latest iteration for the SBC and the goal is to produce at the end of this what the MSBA requires for the documentation. ○ December 3, 2024 is going to be HYBRID as well as December 17, 2024. The goal is to always be moving the design forward as we do not want to have to go back to MSBA and ask for more time as it prolongs the schedule which further increases cost. – User Group Meetings were conducted over the course of 3 days, from morning to late afternoon, with the end users to share info of what has been done to date in the development of the design concepts, walk them through the plan and get their feedback. It is important that there is an understanding of where their spaces will be located on the new plan and looking at the adjacencies of what is near and around them. ○ When meeting with the PreK-K, it was important to learn for the students with the smallest feet, what is too far within the

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		building to travel for them i.e. getting to music, art, bathrooms, library. ○ Important to identify any issues if there are any items of feedback that arise and adjust them early on. Nurse, medical staff, admin, guidance, grade groupings, building operations and maintenance, kitchen and food services were all met with including but not limited to Special Education spaces. There was a lot of feedback. There will be one last one with Music and Admin for one last session to close the loop on all of the information, generate minutes and create Schematic Design Room Data Sheets from the information provided. One of the pieces of feedback they received was that the small group rooms should have a door from the corridor not just from the classroom which was helpful to learn as it will provide flexibility for the usage of that small group room without having to enter into the classroom in order to utilize that small group room. – The amount of data mining that is performed in order to do what is needed to make sure each gets what is needed in each one of these spaces i.e. furnishings, technology, outlets, layout. This is also a litmus test of how the Designers did of laying out the original floor plan as it was developed over time, a year now, starting with the Visioning sessions where the adjacencies were closely looked at and evaluated. The Designers then ask does the plan work and stay intact or does the feedback received move all the pieces around? Dore+Whittier was pleasantly surprised how intact the original plan stayed intact during the User Group Meetings as there were only a few little things that were moved i.e. support spaces into the right spot so travelling too far was not an issue. – Overall, there were small edits made and there are decisions that need to be made in order to keep moving the design forward. The feedback from the User Group Meetings and from the SBC about the Gymnasium space, has been utilized to further develop the design placing the Gymnasium on the outer wall as requested with the goal of coming up with solutions that would work and it was a good first pass to see how the adjacencies worked. G. Brand advised that over the course of 3 days, there were over 50 staff members from all 3 schools that came forward [Thank you, K. Bissell, S. Scott, D.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		Carreiro, the 3 Principals] who gave of their time to engage in these meetings. The level of staff involved in these meetings is very high which is awesome to witness. As the Designers are not just taking the information back from the school leaders and administrators but from the actual end users of the spaces being designed and work and know those spaces the most and clearly their feedback is very important. A lot of time but very worthwhile with the amount of engagement in the process from staff and the interest is building. – Introduction provides an overview of what is contained within the report and includes an attachment of any comments that were received from the MSBA after submitting the Preliminary Design Program submission in April and responses. – Evaluation of Existing Conditions provides updated information or further study that has been done for the existing conditions that were made as a part of the Preliminary Design Program submission. – Final Evaluation of Alternatives takes the process from this current phase and describes everything that has been done from the different meetings, plan and site development, evaluation process and the overview of all those pieces and concludes with the estimate and schedule and summarizes the entire process where the project went from the shortlist of options to one preferred solution. Preferred Solution focuses on the one preferred option and how the Town arrived at that vote with any additional information in detail. – Local Actions and Approvals includes the approval and change in the grade configuration to PreK-5 by the School Committee and includes the New School at North Intermediate Site with all of the meeting minutes and Community Forum Presentations that have been done to date. There is also an Appendix with reference materials that are acknowledged during the report. – There is also a presentation that will be done with the MSBA in November to the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee which is a subcommittee to the MSBA Board of Directors to walk through the Preferred Solution with the Team prior to the Board Meeting which is scheduled for December 13, 2024. J. Leduc advised that J. O’Connell has joined the meeting and G. Brand advised that C. Holloran has joined the meeting. – Overall, the Project goes from having 3 Design Enrollments Under Consideration:

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		○ PreK-K for 130 students plus PreK ○ PreK-3 for 510 students plus PreK ○ PreK-5 for 755 students plus PreK – Existing Conditions Update – Program and Services Documentation for PreK and Art/Music – Space Necessary to Delivery Educational Program Update: ○ PreK-K: 64,935 GSF ○ PreK-3: 115,293 GSF ○ PreK-5: 163,573 GSF – Evaluation of Alternatives: 9 Alternatives involving Repair Only, Renovation/Addition, New Construction; Pros and Cons of each Alternative for the Wilmington Community – Total Project Costs Ranges: \$27.9M-196.3M – Preferred Solution: PreK-5 New Construction at North Intermediate Site – V. Varbedian made a motion to approve the submission of the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) for MSBA approval to the next phase with a second by C. Prendergast. G. Bendel advised that he was not in favor of this option but will support this as the selection of this Committee. D. Allan advised that this was not her choice for the new school but will support the choice of the Committee at the October 8, 2024 meeting for PreK-5. The motion passed unanimously by Roll Call vote.
23.04	Record	Design-Bid-Build vs. Construction Manager at Risk Construction Delivery Methods Recap Presentation – J. Leduc presented some of the important differences between DBB and CMR Construction Delivery Methods that would be beneficial to the Wildwood School Project including the benefits of the CM's ability to be involved and inform the Design process and facilitate a Cost Estimate in lieu of 3 estimates potentially to provide real construction foresight and into the pursuit of early procurement and early bid packages that would allow for the escalation of the project schedule and provide cost savings where possible. It would also inform all parties proactively of schedule trouble spots that would not be provided with the Design-Bid-Build Construction Delivery Method. – L. Dore advised that it is the manner in which the contracts are written for the Design-Bid-Build (DBB) Construction Delivery Method compared to the Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) Construction Delivery Method that makes it more difficult to mitigate some of the issues that arise ahead of time

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		that the CMR delivery method is better at mitigating i.e. supply issues with steel and prices are expected to climb in the next 6 months. – Under a CM Contract, the steel could be purchased in advance of the escalation by releasing an early steel package, which would not be able to be done in a DBB Contract. It is seen all the time with rooftop units with heating and ventilating units, a PrePurchase package would be released in advance of the escalation and the components that are needed would be purchased along with it so that it comes together at once and it aids the project in avoiding schedule delays that could result from international supply chain issues similar to what was experienced during the COVID Pandemic. Buildings would not be able to open up without the equipment integral to the building systems functioning for heating and ventilation. – The CM project allows the navigation of this process to be the subject of the day and move around that purchase in advance alternatively. With the CM onboard in Design, the CM works collaboratively and is able to learn of the steel member lengths and counts, structural and foundation needs and pieces of equipment, etc. ahead of getting the Notice to Proceed which enables advance planning to be set in motion for procurement. It is a much more difficult process with DBB because the Contractor is not engaged until the project is fully designed and at that point, the clock is running and it is running off into construction. The Designer will be able to work with the Construction Manager to be proactive and able to foresee, estimate, facilitate, and coordinate to plan the procurement of essential purchases. Doing so will identify any potential areas where escalation in schedule through purchases can lead to cost savings. As time passes, costs increase, however, with CMR this has the potential to be alleviated with the right attention in advance. All of which is occurring in advance of the start of construction. – D. Allan advised that the Town Hall and School Department building is Construction Manager @ Risk (CMR) Construction Delivery Method and the Senior Center Project is Design-Bid-Build (DBB). D. Allan advised that delays experienced with the electrical equipment on the Senior Center was not able to be mitigated in advance due to it being DBB. The Town Hall project has been much different as a result of it having been CMR.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		– J. Leduc presented the advantages and disadvantages to the Design-Bid-Building and the Construction Manager at Risk Construction Delivery Methods. Construction Management firms participation in the Design Development phase with the Designer, OPM and the District can prove to be very instrumental in giving guidance in advance on areas where there may be longer than normal lead times and/or insight into escalating costs for specific materials or equipment i.e. steel, HVAC, electrical units. Bringing the CM onboard to perform some of the due diligence in PreConstruction can facilitate cost estimating as well making it necessary for only 2 cost estimates that need to be generated. In the long time, time is money and the CM's incentive is gone to do a change order where as with DBB, incentive is to get change orders to add to their contract cost. – Prequalification Committee is organized to analyze the qualifications using specific questions and criteria parameters in scoring CMs, trade contractors and subcontractors to qualify them for the project. There are some plausible omissions as often times the best references are placed in the qualification packages. References are always checked, some through survey, some through phone calls, depending on which means of contact are able to be validated at the time of outreach. Information is only as good as that provided by the submission and we provide our best effort in good faith in order to get as many of the references as possible for their projects as possible and may reach out to others in order to obtain accurate information to facilitate prequalification. – Dore+Whittier and SMMa provided data on the CMR and DBB projects that they have worked on. – E. Slagle advised that the Finance Committee meets with the Town Manager and Assistant Town Manager on November 20, 2024 for discussion of setting aside funds to finance a fee plus consulting fees under the Designer's contract will be discussed if it is the will of the School Building Committee to pursue Construction Manager at Risk for this project. E. Slagle advocates that CMR is the Construction Delivery Method is going to be preferable to get estimating performed in this phase. With the phased delivery of CMR, J. Leduc advised that an additional advantage is that the CM would work through the challenges of temporary parking that are often experienced as well because of planning in advance, more proactive view and

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		understanding of schedule, and advise of logistics ahead of time. With CMR, there is also the advantage of escalating the timeline of the project so that it is finished earlier resulting in saving money through saving time. – E. Slagle made a recommendation for a motion to move forward with Construction Manager at Risk Construction Delivery Method subject to the Town getting funding by the Finance Committee. G. Bendel made the motion, K. Caira seconded the motion. Roll call vote passes with only one No vote (V. Varbedian). – L. Dore advised that this can be initiated starting with the Inspector General Application and move forward with the process with the procurement process to bring the Construction Manager on board to perform the estimate in February 2025.
23.05	Record	Design Update with Gymnasium Moved to Outside Wall R. Philip and L. Dore presented the options that were explored for the design options that would potentially provide the solutions that the School Building Committee was seeking by bringing the Gymnasium from the location in the PreK-5 location in PSR to a location on an outside wall. Two Alternatives were provided that efforts to maintain and preserve the private and public areas and adjacencies as preferred by the District. – Dore+Whittier's understanding that the SBC's seeking an outside wall location is a potential cost relief valve to remove 6,000 sf of gymnasium space if value engineering was needed at a later time in the project was confirmed with M. Gallezzo. Member discussion of these options have found that the outside wall location is not preferable. In particular the movement would affect moving the OT/PT areas to the second floor instead of them being on the first floor. The gymnasium being on the outside wall landlocked the cafeteria making it have no natural light. – The decision for this was going to be discussed at the SBC on December 3, 2024 but it was elected by the SBC to make a motion to move the design along earlier in the effort of progressing the design by making a decision. D. Ragsdale made a motion to pursue the PSR Option with the placement of the Gymnasium and not pursue the Alternatives. C. Prendergast seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken and passed. M. Gallezzo did not respond as it seemed her all dropped or left the meeting.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
23.06	Record	Working Group Updates • Public Relations Working Group as reviewed by J. Cusce has had some scheduling changes in changing its day of occurrence from Fridays to Mondays weekly, inclusive of Dore+Whittier Architects and SMMA, and holding meetings bi-weekly through the holidays unless there is a need for additional meetings to be held weekly due to ongoing activities. The goals of the Working Group are formulating official documentation for sharing through the approved channels after engaging the review by the Leadership Group. ○ Posters around Town of selected Preferred Option that were placed at the Election Polls will be relocated to the Schools, Library, High School. ○ Press Releases will be generated for distribution to the Town Crier and other newspaper media outlets in addition to the social media, visual, broadcast and printed media. ○ Coordination will be done with the Town Clerk and the Town Moderator to make sure that any signage and/or flyers of information that is provided during the December Town Meeting relating to the Preferred Option follows the rules that is set out by their authority for the information booth in the Lobby Area. ○ Water Bill mailing and Drama Production this weekend with Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Matinee. • Sustainability Working Group – D. Kelley provided update regarding the Green Design walkthrough that was provided of the Westwood School Geothermal and their information and lessons learned about their recommendation to never put Geothermal under the building. Project has solar panels on the roof and it is a much greater cost and all who have it seemed happy to have it.
23.07	Record	Public Comments – None
23.08	Record	Discussion and Committee Questions – G. Brand addressed the subject of the Tuesday, December 3, 2024 being a hybrid meeting and Tuesday, December 17, 2024 potentially being a Fully Remote Participation meeting and asking what

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		the will is of the SBC for these meetings. December 17, 2024 SBC Meeting would be to provide a summary of the outcome of the information gleaned from the December 3, 2024 SBC Meeting and updating the SBC with the aesthetic information and providing any and all design updates based on said information. ○ <i>J. O'Connell advised that the Finance Committee has not posted their schedule yet for their meetings yet does understand that these meetings will have the potential of being in conflict with the Finance Committee Meetings which would present difficulty for M. Gallezzo, from the Finance Committee, and J. O'Connell, E. Slagle from the Town Manager's office, in addition to potentially P. Ruggiero, D. Kelley, etc.</i> – K. Caira asked if carpet and colors will be chosen in this meeting? <i>L. Dore that it will be big overall aesthetic, architectural styles i.e. modern, and variety of materials and features to see what things are liked about these specific precedents for interiors and exteriors. L. Dore advised that the Interior and Exterior Boards with the red and green dots to be placed would be most informative and easily facilitated with an in-person meeting vs. a remote meeting because of the ability to see and visualize the detail more readily that is on display for critique.</i> – Leadership Working Group with E. Slagle bringing the Finance Committee and Select Board Meeting dates and G. Brand will bring the SBC and School Committee and dates he will be appearing with the Finance Committee, it will be reviewed to set the upcoming meeting dates. School Committee Meeting are already set through the remainder of the year as the Select Board seems to as well. ○ <i>M. Gallezzo advised that the last 2 weeks of January, all of February and the first 2 weeks of March 2025 would be Finance Committee Meetings set on Tuesdays and Thursdays conflicts.</i> – D. Ragsdale advised he prefers the In Person / Hybrid Meetings as it seems to work better with everyone being in person and does not see a reason to move away from that. – E. Slagle asked if there is anyone who has an issue about being present for the December 17, 2024 SBC Meeting? <i>J. O'Connell advised that she will be travelling that day but will dial into the meeting to participate remotely. D. Allan has a prior</i>

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		commitment so she will not be able to attend. G. Bendel will be able to attend the first half hour of the meeting and then will need to leave the meeting as he has another commitment. Format consensus is Hybrid for December 17, 2024. – S. Turner asked that attention be paid to making sure that staying out in front of the abutters to keep them in the loop on what is happening with the project, on the project site, and performing the appropriate due diligence that is needed to ensure that the process is thorough would be appreciated to avoid some of the issues that have been experienced on some of the simultaneous Town projects. Keeping them also informed with Neighborhood Meetings/Abutter Meetings will be done as well through the PR Working Group.
23.09	Record	Correspondence – None
23.10	Record	Next Meeting: December 3, 2024 at 6:30pm Wilmington High School, Large Group Instruction Room and Remote Participation via Zoom
23.11	Record	Adjourn G. Brand thanked the committee for their efforts and invited a motion to adjourn. G. Bendel motioned to adjourn. V. Varbedian seconded the motion. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

The information herein reflects the understanding reached. Please contact the author if you have any questions or are not in agreement with these Project Minutes.