

Minutes

Project Name:	Wilmington Wildwood Early Childhood Center	Project Number:	22127
RE:	School Building Committee	Meeting Date:	04/15/2025
Prepared by:	Sarah A. Traniello	Meeting No:	32
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	Remote
Gregory B. Bendel	Present	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	Remote	Christine Prendergast	Remote	Dore+Whittier Architects	
Michael Camoscio	Remote	Paul J. Melaragni	Present	Donald Walter, Principal-In Charge	Remote
Justin Cusce	Present	David A. Ragsdale	Present	Lee P. Dore, Principal, Designer	Absent
Marianne Gallezzo	Absent	Paul Ruggiero	Present	Rani Philip, Project Manager	Present
Nicholas Golden	Absent	Stacey Scott	Remote	Bryce Taft, Designer	Absent
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	Remote	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 at 6:30 PM. Roll Call of the School Building Committee was performed by J. Leduc 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. During roll call to open meeting M. Gallezzo, N. Golden, J. Holloway, C. Prendergast and V. Varbedian did not respond. M. Gallezzo, N. Golden,

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		and J. Holloway did not announce their presence during the meeting and were absent for the entire meeting however C. Prendergast and V. Varbedian arrived via remote participation after roll call was conducted. All other members were present in person or through remote participation.
32.02	Record	Approval of Minutes G. Brand advised that there are 3 sets of draft minutes for approval with the March 25, 2025 School Building Committee Meeting, March 31, 2025 School Building Committee Meeting and the April 3, 2025 School Building Committee. G. Bendel made the motion to approval all 3 sets of meeting minutes with E. Slagle seconding the motion to approve. S. Turner asked the question about whether or not it is possible to vote for the approval of the minutes is viable if member was not present for one of the meetings the minutes were drafted for. <i>P. Melaragni advised that a member can vote for the minutes if not present for one of the meetings.</i> J. Leduc conducted a roll call for the approval of all 3 sets of meeting minutes was conducted. C. Prendergast joined the meeting just prior. All present remotely and in person approved the meeting minutes and it was accepted unanimously.
32.03	Record	Approval of Invoices G. Brand advised Warrant No. 23 has been submitted for approval that includes Dore+Whittier Architects' invoice of March 31, 2025 for approval in the amount of \$69,589.30. D. Kelley on behalf of the Finance Working Group recommends approval for this invoice in the amount of \$69,589.30 with a second motion of made by G. Bendel to approve. P. Melargani asked why there is a 10 percent charge on these invoices from Nitsch Engineering. R. Philip answered that it is because there is a 10 percent as Nitch Engineering is a subconsultant to Dore+Whittier. P. Melaragni asked if the Traffic Survey was completed and L. Dore advised that the Traffic Survey has been completed and the Town has a copy of the traffic survey for its use and reference. J. Leduc conducted a roll call for the approval of Warrant No. 23 was conducted. All present remotely and in person approved the meeting minutes and it was accepted unanimously. C. Prendergast and V. Varbedian were both present and voted in the affirmative. C. Miner abstained from voting.
32.04	Record	Project Scope and Budget Update R. Philip reviewed the correction of the record for the Schematic Design pricing that is \$1,050 per square foot for the \$173,250,626 Estimated Project Cost as well as on the 3011 Form for the MSBA where the square footage that was used originally was for the Preferred Schematic Report Phase as the square footage increased for the Schematic Design Phase

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		and it is indicated within the area circled in red. The square footage was updated in SD and the number has been incorporated into this Project Scope and Budget document. It did not have any impact on the project cost or construction cost because those amounts were based on the Schematic Design square footage. However, it did impact the soft costs because it made more of the soft costs available for reimbursement which works in favor for the District. The impact was about \$57,000 more that will be eligible for reimbursement that was shown initially. It did not change the bottom line as it was just an adjustment for what is eligible and ineligible. There is a meeting on Thursday to review this form to review this document and an update will come forth from that meeting. P. Melaragni asked what the original square footage was for record. R. Philip advised of the square footage and advised that the amount of square footage was a couple thousand square feet and with the Art Room being added back into the program plus 2 office spaces. These spaces were in the plan but during the transfer of information it was account for as 2 offices but the actual need was 4 offices and there was a reduction from 6 to 3 of wellness rooms that were associated with the teacher collaboration spaces. It was a few thousand square feet. P. Melaragni advised that it was a difference of 1,472 square feet.
32.05	Record	Schematic Design Package R. Philip reviewed the Schematic Design Package that was sent out to the School Building Committee for their perusal with the contents that will be submitted to the MSBA updated them on where the Project stands in this process. There are 4 part of this submission with the first part being a submission of what was submitted to the Department of Education and gives idea of what has been prepared for Special Education. DESE will need to approve this as a part of this process. This will come back from DESE with their approval before the Schematic Design can be approved by the MSBA. The second part of the submission is the Schematic Design Binder with any design changes that have happened with the cost and approvals to date. Also included will the Schematic Design Project Manual containing the outline specifications and the Schematic Design Drawings containing the Site/Civil, Building Floor Plans, Roof Plans and the Interior and Exterior Elevations. These will show all of the materials and systems that go into the new building and it is what the recent cost estimate was based upon. J. O'Connell asked what the hot spots are within the Schematic Design Submission that the SBC members should be reading and/or reviewing first as it has been broken out into components for ease of reviewing instead of as 1 large volume like the PSR was distributed for their digestion. <i>R. Philip advised that it will need to be reviewed at the user group level. It is broken out into sections so that it can easily be reviewed piece by piece. For example, the Sustainability Working Group might be more interested in specific sections vs. sections the Public Relations Working Group might be interested in reviewing or the Site/Landscape Working Group might be interested in reviewing, etc. Feel free to start with the Introduction and then</i>

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		continue to sections of interest. The report contains information that has been reviewed with the Committee by Dore+Whittier and SMMA prior to the submission. D. Allan asked if the Schematic Design Report contains the cost of the 12,000 sf gymnasium? D. Allan further asked where the estimate for the cost of the 12,000 sf gymnasium vs, the 6,000 sf gymnasium can be found in the Schematic Design report? R. Philip advised that a cost estimate for the 6,000 sf gymnasium would not be found in the Schematic Design Report. It would not be found in the report since the School Building Committee elected to proceed with the 12,000 sf gymnasium before entering into Schematic Design phase. Therefore, the 12,000 sf gymnasium was what Schematic Design cost estimate pricing was based upon. D. Allan asked how much exactly will the 12,000 sf gymnasium cost? L. Dore advised that just before the School Building Committee decided to move forward with the 12,000 sf gymnasium, an estimate was generated to show the local share for what it would cost and it was around \$8Million. Once that was established, the gymnasium placement, its design and the cost estimate, were based upon that decision. L. Dore advised that the Preferred Schematic Report would need to be referred back to see what the final verdict would be on the MSBA side of things related to reimbursement. The reimbursement discussion will come this Thursday when we meet with the MSBA and have a conversation related to reimbursement. S. Turner mentioned having attended a Yes for Wilmington Schools event on Sunday. He advised that there is an item within the DESE section, in the first document, that was felt to be very helpful not just for this subject but also for the PR Working Group. It showed the lower grades in the building in pink, the upper grades in purple, and public spaces in green. It was a very simple view but good visualization of how the building functions. It is something to have available when speaking with the community about how the building operates and it was a unique and different view from anything that had been put together before. When we were doing the space planning for the programming, there were areas that were really tiny but this view would be really helpful to those who need something tactile to visualize how the building will function.
32.06	Record	Next Steps R. Philip reviewed the Schematic Design next steps once the School Building Committee approves the Schematic Design submission that has been under review with the hyperlink provided to the documents. There will be a Project Scope and Budget Review with the MSBA, MSBA Review Comments from the Schematic Design Report submission will come forth. Dore+Whittier and SMMA will continue to work with the Leadership Working Group on the responses to said MSBA SD Comments in preparation for the MSBA Board of Directors

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		meeting on June 18, 2025. <i>[Note: MSBA Board Meeting was moved from June 25, 2025 to June 18, 2025.]</i> ○ Particular attention will be made to provide the appropriate responses to the items that the MSBA requested to be incorporated in the Schematic Design report to ensure there is a full and thorough report and response. • There are 3 votes that need to happen in order for this project to move forward: ○ MSBA Board Vote of Schematic Design: June 18, 2025 ○ Special Town Meeting: September 13, 2025 ○ Debt Exclusion Ballot Vote: September 16, 2025 After these have been successful, the project will move on to finalize the Project Scope and Budget Agreement with the MSBA. Once this happens, the project will be moving into Design Development, 60% CDs, 90% CDs. There will be cost estimates performed again in the Fall working up to the Special Town Meeting and Ballot Vote by the Town of Wilmington. • P. Melaragni asked what happens if there is a huge disparity in the estimates at that time that are influenced by the tariffs that have been set in place by the Federal Government? <i>R. Philip advised that the dollar amount approved at Town Meeting and the Cost Estimates may have a larger delta than expected as a result. This will be something that is reviewed during the Project Scope and Budget Agreement processing with the MSBA. As discussed on March 31, 2025 within the Project Budget there are contingencies that have been set in place where a certain percentage has been held with the anticipation that there may be tariffs involved. The School Building Committee would be approving that Project Budget and the Project is going into the process with the knowledge that there is the potential for tariffs to be in place and contingencies have been put in place to cover a reasonable amount of tariffs should they be impacting the project. These are some of the unknowns that may be coming in the future and the project is trying to anticipate these unforeseen items that may influence the project budget. The contingencies have been put into place within a reasonable amount so that the project budget is inflated so much that there is a great amount of excess that we are trying to figure out. Discussions were had with L. Dore of Dore+Whittier Architect, J. Leduc of SMMA and the Town Manager, E. Slagle to see what the comfortable amount would be to move forward with and that is what has been included and as a Project we will continue to monitor it as time passes. We also have Fontaine Bros. at the table to help provide additional insight into the estimated amount that are coming in and set some real world perspective with outreach to trades. The function of the interim estimates throughout the process is to ensure that the project is still continuing to stay within budget as set out and enabling the project to look at any potential value</i>

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		engineering (VE) that may need to occur to stay within budget. Value engineering is the function of modifying or eliminating items within the project scope that might bring the project back into alignment with the budget as needed. L. Dore further expounded upon R. Philips description of the process where PM&C will perform an estimate for Dore+Whittier and Fontaine Bros. will do an estimate and then the estimates will be reconciled at each step along the way as the project gets more refined. As this goes along, there will be some check ins with the SBC if the budget costs are going off course and there is a need to do some strategic value engineering. In the early phases, there is the ability to reel it back in but as it is getting more developed there are less opportunities and there have been several items for Value Engineering to be used for in order to bring the budget back inline. It is not desired to go there but it is a possibility that it may be needed and it is built in as a part of that process. The contingencies and the unknowns for the tariffs are being built in to build enough of a safety net to cover the unknowns the are unable to be foreseen in advance. A balance has been achieved. • D. Allan asked when it will be known exactly how much reimbursement the District will get from the MSBA? It is understood that Dore+Whittier will be working with them constantly and going back and forth regarding all of these items justifying whether or not is being included in the project or not. When will the SBC get a good handle on that number? J. Leduc advised that the MSBA Board Meeting is on June 18, 2025 and this is when the Board of Directors will be approving the project and approve the final number. We will have a ballpark number beforehand as we will be working with the MSBA but there are a lot of negotiations that go on with the form that is submitted to the MSBA relating to ineligible costs and eligible costs that we will be working with them on. For the public, a specific number will be able to be provided on June 18, 2025. • G. Brand asked if is customary to have a 2 month period of time between the MSBA Board Meeting and the Special Town Meeting and Ballot Vote. For instance, Wilmington's MSBA Board Meeting is at the end of June and the Special Town Meeting is scheduled for September 13, 2025 and Ballot Vote on September 16, 2025. Is this customarily done like this on other projects you have worked on? L. Dore advised that the Town of Wilmington has a lot of runway between the June MSBA Board of Directors Meeting and the Town Meeting and Ballot Vote to get word out to the community about the elementary school project. L. Dore advised that on another project that is underway the District opted to have the Town Meeting and the Ballot Vote before the MSBA Board Meeting and it is contingent upon the MSBA approval of the project. In the case of this project, we have some of June and through the summer to get the word out to the Wilmington community before bringing it before the Special Town Meeting and to

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		<i>Ballot Vote. To have a definitive number of what the MSBA will be providing for reimbursement and being able to communicate that to the Town is important.</i> • The MSBA Board of Directors meeting is June 18, 2025 instead of June 25, 2025 as it was updated by the MSBA not long ago. • M. Camoscio asked whether or not there was a preferred method to respond to the documents that are being reviewed by the SBC. Is it preferred to place the comments in a Excel spreadsheet, Word document, or email and who should they be sent to and how should they be tracked. <i>J. Leduc advised that the responses or questions could be sent to Dore+Whittier Architects and they will be reviewed for integration into the submission as deemed appropriate before submitting to the MSBA for the Schematic Design.</i> • Approval of Schematic Design Authorize SMMA and Dore+Whittier Architects to submit the Schematic Design Report to the MSBA on behalf of the School Building Committee and the Town. ○ Motion made by J. O'Connell and seconded by G. Bendel. Motion passed unanimously with Roll Call vote.
32.04	Record	Public Comments – None
32.05	Record	Discussion and Committee Questions – Upcoming Meeting Schedule ○ Tuesday, May 13, 2025 Abutters Meeting to be held at 6pm at the North Intermediate School Cafetorium. Important to meet with the Abutters to work with them with respect to their feedback especially those whose properties are immediately in contact with the North Intermediate Site including but not limited to those within the neighborhood surrounding the school. ○ P. Melaragni advised that it would be nice to see some of the people invited to be from across Salem Street with the net for Abutter outreach to be a little bit further for this round so that more are included to provide their input. <i>S. Turner advised that the initial set of abutters have not had a chance to see the changes that have come forth in response to their feedback at their last abutters meeting is important to keep in mind. E. Slagle advised that the invitations for this Abutters Meeting will be those attending the first Abutters Meeting and another meeting will be scheduled afterward to broaden the invitation range of households to provide additional input. It is important for those immediately abutting the North Intermediate School site to be able to see first hand what their input resulted in for changes impacting the project so they are aware their input was listened to, amendments to the plan were made and these are the</i>

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		results as the project stands today as we move forward after submitting the Schematic Design Report. P. Melaragni advised that he is ok with this happening as long as a larger pool of abutters are invited with the next abutters meeting to garner their input as well. P. Melaragni advised that it would be unfortunate for people to come forth before the Town Meeting advising that they were abutters and their voice was not heard and they were not invited to the meeting(s) to learn about the project and give their thoughts and concerns. J. O'Connell advised that it is a listing of abutters that comes out from K. Rasche that is put out and signed off by the assessor. The intention is not to belittle any of the intentions set forth by P. Melaragni with his concerns. However, one of the abutters that would be part of the larger net would be the Avalon Apartment rentals that the quantity of people from the development along could potentially overtake those that are direct abutters. The Town is printing, mailing and distributing these through its mail house for these abutter mailings which takes time and funds to get done. It is ultimately the decision of this body to make it happen and there are also Community Forums in addition to the very public process that the abutters to participate in. D. Ragsdale advised that time is limited before the summer months are upon us and it is essential to take advantage of as many means of outreach that are possible and keep in mind the events that people will be able to attend. S. Turner advised that there are a few small streets off of Salem Street that have only 2 or 3 houses on them and are near the building and they should be included in the mailing as they would have some input on the project being so close but maybe outside of the range being reached to for Abutters. S. Turner advised P. Melaragni is on the right path with his thoughts and it is important to keep in mind the expense of these additional steps. J. O'Connell advised that if the outreach gets too large then it does not become the intimate working group that it was intended to be at the start. D. Allan advised that she would be interested in hearing from those who live across from the North Intermediate School site and give their input as well and understand the perspectives of P. Melaragni and J. O'Connell regarding the outreach and quantities of people participating and the objectives of the meetings being established. A lot of these neighbors are going to be interested in the traffic study and seeing how the bus circulation and vehicle circulation will be in and around the site.

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		○ J. Leduc reminded the remaining meeting dates need to be approved for the School Building Committee. With the Meeting of June 18, 2025 which replaced June 25, 2025, July 22, 2025, August 19, 2025 and September 23, 2025 need to be approved. ○ J. O'Connell clarified that the June 3, 2025, June 17, 2025 and the June 18, 2025 meeting are still on the calendar with the June 17th as a TBD. J. Leduc advised that the TBD is in case anything needs to be discussed or reviewed prior to the MSBA Board Meeting on June 18, 2025 meeting. ▪ P. Melaragni made the motion to approved these meetings and E. Slagle seconded the motion. Passed unanimously. – PR Working Group ○ G. Bendel advised that during the Working Group discussion he was going to add that it would be helpful to put some of the boards with the dates for the Special Town Meeting in September and the Ballot Vote in September at the Senior Center so that they will be there as reminders of these important dates for the Fall when they need to go to vote and provide their input. It is important to get these things in front of them as soon as possible so that they can be remembered to keep them updated throughout the outreach process. There is a lot of traffic at the Senior Center so G. Bendel would be happy to help with getting that done. J. O'Connell advised about reaching out to DPW to get the electronic messaging boards put into action to remind about the upcoming town meeting and ballot vote and additional information. ○ M. Camoscio advised that the water bill was successfully distributed through J. O'Connell and J. Cusce advised that last year at Town Meeting M. Camoscio and he were outside in the lobby with the boards advertising the project willing to answer any questions and handout any flyers needed to garner information about the project with the public attending that were interested in learning more. It would be helpful to have representation again this year. In addition M. Camoscio advised that there is a need for getting the Fun on the Fourth signup done with SignUpGenius as right now there are only 4 slots that have been filled and for the most part it is for Wednesday, June 25, 2025 and there are several additional slots available to get others to be involved in the outreach for the project. M. Camoscio advised that the Fun on the Fourth event had a lot of people who staffed the table least year that will not be present this year due to being away and participation

Item No.	Action	Discussion
		from members of the Committee will be very helpful and needed to make the event a successful one for outreach on the project. ○ J. O'Connell advised that most everything related to the Town Meeting and Town Elections goes through Beth Lawrenson, Town Clerk, and the Moderator. Anything that is displayed during Town Meeting would need to have their approval so that there is no uncomfortable moments about the contents of poster boards, The same goes for the polling locations as long as it is neutral in nature and not choosing one side over another. ○ G. Brand advised that he will be providing an update at the Town Meeting for the project in addition to scheduled meetings over the next 6 or 7 weeks with all of the PTO Groups for the students at all of the schools. All of the back to school nights have been scheduled for the beginning of school in preparation for the town meeting and ballot vote there will be an opportunity to meet with and discuss for learning about the project during those sessions. ○ The Woburn Street and North Intermediate School will be opened for people to tour and see the status of those schools for themselves. P. Melaragni advised that perhaps for the June 3, 2025 Community Forum it should be held at one of the schools to give the community an idea of the condition of these 2 schools currently so they can see for themselves.
32.06	Record	Correspondence – None
32.07	Record	Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 3, 2025
32.08	Record	Adjourn G. Brand thanked the committee for their efforts and invited a motion to adjourn. – P. Melaragni motioned to adjourn. E. Slagle 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.

