

SMMA
1000 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02138

Minutes

Project Name:

Wilmington Wildwood Early Childhood Center

Project Number:

22127

RE:

School Building Committee

Meeting Date:

10/21/2024

Prepared by:

Sarah A. Traniello

Meeting No:

22

Location:

Remote Participation via Zoom

(recording posted on Wildwood Building Project website, WCTV and YouTube)

Distribution:

School Building Committee

Attendees		
Wildwood School Building Committee	SMMA	Dore+Whittier Architects
Diane M. Allan	Julie Leduc, Director, OPM Services and Project Manager	Donald Walter, Principal-In-Charge
Gregory B. Bendel	Sarah Traniello, Assistant Project Manager	Lee P. Dore, Principal, Designer
Kate Bissell		Rani Philip, Project Manager
Dr. Glenn Brand, <i>Chair</i>		
Kevin A. Caira		
Michael Camoscio		
Justin Cusce		
Marianne Gallezzo		
Nicholas Golden		
Christine Holloran		
John C. Holloway	Absent	Please note that this meeting is fully remote, so all participants are present unless indicated as Absent.
Dennis Kelley		
Craig Miner		
Christine Murray		
Judith O'Connell		
Christine Prendergast		
Paul J. Melaragni		
David A. Ragsdale		
Paul Ruggiero		
Stacey Scott		
R. Eric Slagel		
Stephen Turner		
Vivian Varbedian, <i>Vice Chair</i>		

Item No.	Action	Discussion
22.01	Record	Vice Chair, Vivian Varbedian, 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.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		The attendance based on the roll call can be found on page 1 of these minutes. All were present in the Zoom Webinar except for John Holloway who was not in attendance.
22.02	Record	Approval of Minutes G. Bendel asked for the correction of an error on the agenda as it should state October 8, 2024 minutes for approval instead of stating September 17, 2024 minutes for approval. V. Varbedian motioned to approve the meeting minutes from the October 8, 2024 School Building Committee meeting, with a second motion by C. Prendergast. V. Varbedian asked for the record to show the M. Gallezzo has joined the meeting. Roll Call Vote: Affirmatively responded unanimously.
22.03	Record	Approval of the Preferred Schematic Report – R. Philip gathers all of the information for the Wildwood project to date and incorporates all of the feedback from the MSBA to date under the Introduction section of the Preferred Schematic Report. In the Evaluation of Existing Conditions, there is the review of the conditions of each existing school and their conditions and systems as evaluated – 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.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		– 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: ○ 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

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		October 8, 2024 meeting for PreK-5. The motion passed unanimously by Roll Call vote.
22.04	Record	Design-Bid-Build vs. Construction Manager at Risk Construction Delivery Methods Informational Presentation – J. Leduc presented an informational presentation to the School Building Committee comparing the Design-Bid-Build Construction Delivery Method with the Construction Manager at Risk Construction Delivery Method in order to assist the Committee in their next decision that will need to be made at the November meeting relating to which method to choose for proceeding with for this school construction project. – DBB vs. CMR – DBB is the process that is best suited to projects with straightforward designs and CMR is the contracting process that is best suited to projects with complicated designs and/or strict schedule limitations. ○ C. Prendergast asked if this project is thought to have a straightforward design or a complicated one? <i>L. Dore advised that the school is not designed yet but to put it into context this is a large project of 164,000 sf consisting of lots of tens of thousands of dollars so it is pretty complex. L. Dore advised that time is money and if there is anywhere to pick up on the schedule, it would be with CMR. Yes, there is a premium paid for Construction Management at Risk where a fee is paid. However, at the same time with the way legislation has worked, CMR can have the construction process start before the Design is complete. J. Leduc alluded to this happening where early packages could be issued for site enabling and mobilization work could lead to more flexibility in scheduling with respect to tonnage when you start and stop the process vs. the general contractor method.</i> ○ S. Turner advised that on DBB it mentions fixed price under advantages but under disadvantages it notes change orders are more likely. Personally, change orders scare me because they mean open cost concern. So, is it fixed price or is it more often you get

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		change orders with DBB? L. Dore advised that it is fixed price based on what is included in the Contract Documents. If a General Contractor feels there is any ambiguity or omissions in the documents on which they bid on they will seek relief through a change order. There are good change orders and bad change orders. Sometimes Owners want to add scope to the project as a benefit and sometimes the General Contractor is trying to make themselves whole as they think something was missing in the drawings. It is a fixed price for what is in the drawings. S. Turner advised that seems like a pretty strong risk. S. Turner advised that he like CMR because it is beneficial to be able to shrink the schedule as the longer it goes the more it costs. S. Turner advised that he would be very curious for the next meeting to get D. Allan, P. Melaragni, K. Caira, G. Bendel, and P. Ruggiero who worked on the high school project and also from D. Allan and P. Melaragni to learn the Town's general practices and preferences over the last 10 years or so with a few projects and learn why they are preferred with the good, bad and otherwise with all of those projects. [More discussion can be found 36:00] ○ G. Brand asked if this is a decision that must be voted upon at the November 19, 2024 School Building Committee Meeting in light of the concerns raised by M. Gallezzo and others. ○ L. Dore advised of the options that the project has relating to having a CM on board during the Schematic Design phase, etc. and further advised that the CM could be retained after the vote occurs but the benefit to the Town is bringing them into the Schematic Design phase early and working with Dore+Whittier as go through this process as the development and live movement on value engineering to reduce costs, the CM will perform the cost estimate along with the Design Team and the OPM and they will all be reconciled. Providing the

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		cost estimate from the CM shows that there is skin in the game before going to Town Meeting as the next crucial decision the Committee will make will be approving the budget. This is a crucial piece and this is what the CMs do every single day and it is valued during the Schematic Design phase. This process is what sets CMR apart from Design-Bid-Build because it provides the comfort level to be able to see and mitigate as much of the risk ahead of time before the budget is set and a fixed price is set. ○ D. Kelley advised that the Town currently has 2 projects with one being CMR and the other as DBB and the difference was shown in the sitework with the unforeseen items where there were less controls. 2 Great contractors but you can see that in the DBB there were more things found as we went along opposed to on the Town Hall things were talked about before things were discovered. It is the same OPM so the OPM is fighting for means and methods instead of change orders and sometimes it is a means and method of how they get the job done. Someone fighting for you helps control those change costs. D. Kelley sees a value in both but in a larger project his leaning would be towards CMR because you want to go in with the best price and the time table that J. Leduc one way September can be hit for an opening and the other way it can be different as the transition is after school started. ○ Procurement process for the CMR is a 2-3 month period and it would be desired to have them onboard for January. ○ V. Varbedian advised that having PM&C and A.M. Fogarty onboard to perform the cost estimates in addition to the Construction Manager, it may not be essential to have the 3 estimates and potentially have just 2 estimates instead as at least 1 of the aforementioned 2 firms will suffice with the CM's estimate.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
22.05	Record	Public Comments – None
22.06	Record	Discussion and Committee Questions – G. Brand addressed the subject of the renaming of the Wildwood School Building Project and not a rebranding of the School Building. V. Varbedian was in agreement as it would assist in the rebranding of the project for identifying with the project as it is being referenced in the Wilmington community. S. Turner advised that there is potential survey fatigue and C. Prendergast advised it was for the SBC. It will be further explored at the November 19, 2024 SBC Meeting.
22.07	Record	Correspondence – One item was shared with the Committee members.
22.08	Record	Next Meeting: November 19, 2024 at 6:30pm Wilmington High School, Large Group Instruction Room and Remote Participation via Zoom
22.09	Record	Adjourn G. Brand thanked the committee for their efforts and invited a motion to adjourn. V. Varbedian motioned to adjourn. S. Turner 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.