

Minutes

Project Name:	Wilmington Wildwood Early Childhood Center	Project Number:	22127
RE:	School Building Committee	Meeting Date:	03/31/2025
Prepared by:	Sarah A. Traniello	Meeting No:	31
Location:	Hybrid Meeting , Wilmington High School, Large Group Instruction Room, 159 Church Street, Wilmington, Massachusetts and Remote Participation Meeting via Zoom Webinar (recording posted on Wildwood Building Project website, WCTV and YouTube)		
Distribution:	School Building Committee		

Attendees

Wildwood School Building Committee				SMMA OPM	
Diane M. Allan	Remote	Dennis Kelley	Present	Julie Leduc, Director, OPM Services & Project Manager	Present
Gregory B. Bendel	Remote	Craig Miner	Present		
Kate Bissell	Present	Christine Murray	Present	Sarah Traniello, Assistant Project Manager	Absent
Dr. Glenn Brand, Chair	Present	Judith O'Connell	Present		
Kevin A. Caira	Absent	Christine Prendergast	Present	Dore+Whittier Architects	
Michael Camoscio	Present	Paul J. Melaragni	Present	Donald Walter, Principal-In Charge	Remote
Justin Cusce	Present	David A. Ragsdale	Present	Lee P. Dore, Principal, Designer	Present
Marianne Gallezzo	Remote	Paul Ruggiero	Present	Rani Philip, Project Manager	Present
Nicholas Golden	Present	Stacey Scott	Absent	Bryce Taft, Designer	Present
Christine Holloran	Present	R. Eric Slagel	Present	Fontaine Bros.	
John C. Holloway	Absent	Stephen Turner	Present	David Fontaine, Jr., CEO	Absent
		Vivian Varbedian, Vice Chair	Present	Rob Day, Project Executive	Present
				Mark Abdella, VP of CM Services	Present
				Chelsea Mutrie, VP of PreConstruction	Remote
				Chad L'Ecuyer, Project Manager	Present

Item No.	Action	Discussion
32.01	Record	Chair, Glenn Brand, called the meeting to order following Community Forum No. 6. Roll Call of the School Building Committee was performed by V. Varbedian 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. This meeting was conducted through Zoom Webinar as remote participation so those listed as Remote for this meeting were Remote, those Present in Large Group Instruction Room of Wilmington High School are listed as Present and those Absent were not Present via Remote Participation or In Person. K. Caira and S. Scott did not announce their presence during roll call.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
32.02	Record	Approval of Minutes G. Brand advised that the draft minutes of the March 25, 2025 School Building Committee Meeting would be presented at the April 15, 2025 meeting as they were not ready for approval due to the close proximity of this meeting.
32.03	Record	Approval of Project Scope and Budget L. Dore reviewed the Project Scope and Budget history with the Preliminary Design Program having and estimated project cost range of \$194M to 214.5M which equates to \$1,156 to \$1,278 per square foot of school. The Schematic Design Construction Cost Estimate came in at \$137.7M and Dore+Whittier has been working with the Town Manager, SMMA and Fontaine Bros. over the last week on the 3011 Form to come up with the full project cost. This includes the construction costs plus all of the soft costs that include furnishings, technology, design, management fees and contingencies. Estimating is being done out until the start of construction which is about 18 months. As a group, it was important to make sure that the project was risk protected as there is only one bite at the apple to go out to the Wilmington community in order to have the project approved at Town Meeting for appropriation and Ballot Vote to support this school project and this budget. We had looked from the PDP phase which became \$177.6M to \$196.3M by the Preferred Schematic Report phase which is \$1,086 to \$1,200 per square foot and currently at the completion of Schematic Design the Estimated Project budget is \$173,250,626 which is \$1,037 per square foot and this is for a construction cost of approximately 18 months from now. The project is on budget and a concerted effort has been made to keep the project on budget as the project design moved through the phases while incorporating decisions of the SBC during the course of the its development. The project is on the very low end of range of the pricing and it is a good place to be for the school project. It is felt that enough contingency has been added to take care of enough of the unknowns from a design perspective. There is Design Contingency in place to cover the items that Fontaine Bros. has not seen as Dore+Whittier has not drawn them yet at this stage in the design. A good idea of what goes into the design for what is needed to complete the building but there are some unknowns that this contingency will cover. Fontaine also carries contingency within their cost estimating for that same reason. Outside of construction on the owner's side of soft cost contingency there are Owner costs that have been talked about with construction contingency which is hard cost contingency which is 5% of the project cost and there is another soft cost contingency for those parts of the project that could not be expected at this time in the project. It is important to know that money can be moved from one line item to another if it is not being spent as there is risk protection in place. If the risk does not show itself, then the money can be moved within the budget to accommodate. If budget is not expended by the end of the project, the money would go back to the Owner. E. Slagle advised that the time with L. Dore and J. Leduc spend on this 3011 form this week was appreciated in addition to the resource of information pulled down from the MSBA about the soft costs and hard costs have been historically for other

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		elementary school projects in the pipeline since 2014 to have an idea of what should be planned for this project. Analysis of the percentages for these costs and comparing with the project's costs shows that the costs that are captured in this project are reasonable as there is an extra buffer that can help plan for what is in question currently with the tariff issue and other costs that are outside of the control of the project that have the potential to impact. It is good to see that it is all baked into the number and still the project cost is coming in under the range that was projected, is a good place to be on this project. These include the OPM and Designer fees that will be consistent with what other projects that have been done since 2014. • C. Prendergast confirmed that the \$173M amount is the amount before the reimbursement from the MSBA and there will be a portion that the MSBA is reimbursing the District for and the Wilmington community will be responsible for its portion. N. Golden advised that the \$173M amount also includes all of the furnishings, fixtures and equipment and an estimated reimbursement rate that is included. N. Golden asked what this reimbursement rate is based upon? L. Dore explained <i>the Construction Cost will be based upon everything that is in Fontaine Bros. contract and Project Costs are those that are outside of that so it is all of the new furnishings for the new school, the new technology that will go into the new building, Design Fees, OPM Fees, insurance costs and many layers of contingencies make up the difference. The reimbursement rate in this 3011 form is based upon formulas that make up the reimbursement rate that is in fine print that is baked into this workbook that represents incentives, caps, and in there also includes their base reimbursement rate for Wilmington. There is 1 incentive point for Maintenance because the District has done a good job maintaining these buildings over time. The direction of this Committee is that there is a desire for a sustainable building and 4 points were a reasonable cost to collect all 4 available Sustainable Green points. There are 5 extra incentive points in addition to the base rate and MSBA needs to review and come back to agree with these calculations in order to state what the reimbursement rate will be for this project. The MSBA grant will be looked at to see how the cost to the District can be brought down as a local share.</i> • M. Gallezzo asked about the contingencies that are in the amount? L. Dore advised that there is 12% inside of the Construction Cost plus an additional 6.5% outside which is 5% for Owner's Construction Contingency and 1.5% for the Owner's Service contingencies and those that are expended with these Owner Contingencies have decisions that rest with the School Building Committee for the project. J. Leduc advised that there is a hard cost contingency which is where the Change Order decisions approved by the SBC for the construction and purchases for the project will come out of and the Soft Cost

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		Contingencies where consultant service costs that are approved by the SBC will be covered. Both of these contingencies, hard and soft cost, are only exercised through approval decisions made through the School Building Committee. S. Turner asked if 18.5% is enough contingency that is needed so that the children and educational program is not impacted in their needs for the new school. P. Melaragni advised that it is estimated that the reimbursement would be approximately 52.84% for the District which would add up to a \$50M reimbursement which would be a cost of approximately \$113M for Wilmington and it could potentially go even lower with some creative ideas on the Town side. V. Varbedian advised that there will be a portion of the items that will be deemed eligible and ineligible of the costs as also seen on the 3011 form by the MSBA so it will not be an exact 52.84% as it will be on a case-by-case basis. D. Allan asked where the reimbursement rate was derived from? J. Leduc advised that the MSBA has Wilmington's reimbursement rate listed on its website as 47.84% plus the five (5) incentive points would bring the reimbursement rate to 52.84%. D. Allan asked if the 18% contingency takes into account inflation? L. Dore advised that it is an attempt to account for future escalations so that contingencies are built into the project. E. Slagle further advised that the reason why there is no specific reimbursement rate that can be confirmed at this time is because the Schematic Design Report together with the 3011 and the Project Scope and Budget need to be reviewed by the MSBA and confirmed that these are all in agreement and within their scope relating to eligible and ineligible spaces. If these are not in agreement, there will be conversations had to review and work with the MSBA so everyone is on the same page with the goals, needs, and scope for this project. K. Bissell noted that there was a higher than the limit for FFE that is within the 3011 form and acknowledged that it would be based upon the 755 enrollment rate but it does not include the PreK-K population that would be part of that number. Does this additional amount over the cap account for the additional student population that would be the PreK-K? L. Dore advised that yes it does and that is why the number is higher than the cap and it will need to be taken into consideration due to the enrollment being higher to include the PreK-K students population. The budget line item is account for \$2,200 per student for 755 students and the FFE needs over and above that is in line with those that are being seen in the marketplace for PreK-K spaces currently in the process. D. Kelley advised that there is the potential of lowering the cost of FFE as well in the process of the choices of items i.e. lighting. L. Dore advised that Basis of Design products have been chosen for the project that come within the budget that has been set to date and

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		Massachusetts Public Procurement requires the Designer to have 3 equals for every product and that is what Fontaine has based their pricing upon as well. This is the bar that the design has been started with and it is not an extravagant one and a lot of time has gone into this project to determine what these materials and products are as the SBC has been very clear with the priorities to keep this project not extravagant and keep it within the budget cost and watch to make sure that these prices are not fluctuating. This will be done with 3 more estimates performed after the appropriation vote and this will be the check to ensure that the project is still falling within range of the budgeted amount and see how it is going as the design is further developed. This will assist in determining whether there needs to be a change in course for material selection and reprioritize as needed. It is not desired to cut budget that is set out for the educational program D. Allan asked if the fees of the Designer and OPM are standard for the project? E. Slagle advised that the OPM and Designer fees are in alignment with those that are for projects of this type and size in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Having reviewed the data on the MSBA site from the last 10 years has been performed to confirm for elementary schools. V. Varbedian made a motion to submit the Project Scope and Budget to the MSBA as written. N. Golden seconded the motion. Roll call vote resulted in a unanimous vote, motion passes.
32.04	Record	Public Comments – None
32.05	Record	Discussion and Committee Questions – None
32.06	Record	Correspondence – None
32.07	Record	Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 15, 2025
32.08	Record	Adjourn G. Brand thanked the committee for their efforts and invited a motion to adjourn. – E. Slagle motioned to adjourn. C. Prendergast seconded the motion. Roll call vote, 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.

