

**SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE / SCHOOL COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**



Project: Tri-County Vocational High School  
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting No. 26  
 Location: TCRVTHS- Library Media Center  
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: MP20-28  
 Meeting Date: 06/15/2023  
 Time: 4:00 PM  
 Prepared By: E. Grijalva

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
X	Brian Mushnick*	SBC Chair		Mike Burton	DWMP
X	Karen Maguire*	Superintendent	X	Trip Elmore	DWMP
X	Dan Haynes*	Business Admin.	X	Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
X	Michael Procaccini*	Principal		Mike Cox	DWMP
X	Jonathon Dowse*	SBC Member	X	Rachel Rincon	DWMP
X	Brendan Bowen*	SBC Member	X	Elias Grijalva	DWMP
X	Stanley Widak Jr.*	SBC/SC Member	X	Charlie Lyons	DWMP
X	Harry Takesian*	Facilities		Aidan Place	DWMP
X	Jane Hardin*	SBC Member	X	Carl Franceschi	DRA
X	Bob Foley*	Adult Ed. Dir	X	Vladimir Lyubetsky	DRA
	Lloyd "Gus" Brown*	Bldg. CM.		Sara Carda	DRA
	Jeanne Terrell	Admin		Ray Vincent	Sub-Consultant
	Michael F. Galasso	SC Member		Wayne Mattson	Sub Consultant
X	Jennifer D, Angelo	SC Member	X	Kristy Lyons	Consigli
	Gerald Lafleur	SC Member	X	Steve Johnson	Consigli
	Gregory St. Lawrence	SC Member		Jeffrey Navin	Consigli
X	Tracy Steward	SC Member	X	Lynn Foster-Welsh	Unibank
	John Lee	SC Member			
X	John Rose	SC Member			
	Steve Sullivan	SC Member			
	Patrick Moran	SC Member			
	Peter Wiernicki	SC Member			
	Sherri Minch	Public			

26.1	Call to order: 4:17 PM meeting was called to order by SBC Chair B. Mushnick with 10 of 11 voting members in attendance.	Record
26.2	<p><b>Previous Topics &amp; Approval of May 17<sup>th</sup>, of 2023, Meeting Minutes:</b>  A motion to approve the May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023, meeting minutes as submitted was made by J. Dowse and seconded by H. Takesian  <b>Discussion:</b> None  <b>Abstentions:</b> None  All in favor. Motion passes, to approve May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023, meeting minutes.</p>	Record
26.3.1	<p><b>Invoices and Commitments for Approval:</b>  <b>Invoice 1:</b> DWMP May Invoice No. 019, in the amount of <u>\$15,000.00</u>.</p> <p>B. Mushnick calls for a motion to approve DWMP Invoice No. 019</p> <p>A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by M. Procaccini for the approval of DWMP Invoice No. 019</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None.  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p> <p>Motion passes to approve DWMP Invoice No. 019 for payment.</p>	Record
26.3.2	<p><b>Invoices and Commitments for Approval:</b>  <b>Invoice 2:</b> DRA May Invoice No. 016, in the amount of <u>\$85,000.00</u></p> <p>B. Mushnick calls for a motion to approve DRA Invoice No. 016.</p> <p>A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by H. Takesian for the approval of DRA Invoice No. 016</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None.  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p> <p>Motion passes to approve DRA Invoice No. 016 for payment.</p>	Record
26.3.3	<p><b>Invoices and Commitments for Approval:</b>  <b>Invoice 3:</b> DRA PSS Invoice No. 002, Amendment No. 5 in the amount of <u>\$9,350.00</u></p> <p>B. Mushnick calls for a motion to approve DRA PSS Invoice No. 002.</p> <p>A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by S. Widak for the approval of DRA PSS Invoice No. 002.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None.  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p>	Record

	<p>Motion passes to approve DRA PSS Invoice No. 002 for payment.</p>	
<p>26.4</p>	<p><b>Design Update</b></p> <p>C. Franceschi reviews the schematic design submission process.</p> <p><b>Schematic Design Submittal: (Due next week)</b></p> <p>C. Franceschi shares this process nails down three aspects of the project,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope</li> <li>• Budget</li> <li>• Schedule</li> </ul> <p>Components included in the submission,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Submittal           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A form that lists every space that applies to special education.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Schematic Design Binder (Electronic submissions are now recognized.)</li> <li>• Schematic Design Project Manual (Outline Specifications)</li> <li>• Schematic Design Drawings</li> <li>• Space Summary           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MSBA templet that lists every space in the building and its size. Then, the MSBA will determine whether the spaces are eligible for reimbursement or not. This does ultimately affect the bottom line on the reimbursement from the state.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>C. Franceschi reviews the latest drawings with the SBC/SC.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J. Hardin asks how many elevators are there within the building? C. Franceschi responds there are two elevators. One elevator is located near the gym and auditorium while the other elevator is on the opposite side of the building.</li> <li>• S. Widak asks if everything is ADA compliant? C. Franceschi responds yes.</li> <li>• T. Steward asks about the handicap seating in the auditorium. C. Franceschi shares handicap seating is located on both the first and second floor in the auditorium. The elevator is also located right outside of the auditorium making it easily accessible to both floors.</li> <li>• J. Rose asks about the glass on the exterior of the building from an energy standpoint. C. Franceschi responds glass is a critical item. We would love to have natural light in all the educational spaces. There are studies that show rooms with natural light help kids learn but we also care about energy efficiency and cost. A solid wall is more energy efficient and less expensive than glass so we are trying to be strategic on where the glass is located. We are working towards a target to see if we can be even more economical and reduce the amount of</li> </ul>	<p>Record</p>

	glass which will likely save cost and energy going forward. We are keeping that in mind as we advance design and make refinements.																															
26.5	<p><b>Schematic Design Cost Reconciliation and Value Engineering Update</b></p> <p><b>Schematic Design Cost Estimate Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two estimates were developed by the DRA estimator (Ellana) and Consigli Team           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Reconciled within 1%               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ellana <u>\$243,743,282</u> construction cost before value engineering</li> <li>▪ Consigli <u>\$244,660,669</u> construction cost before value engineering</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Value Engineering Options and Budget Impact</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">• SD Budget (Consigli Estimate)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$244.6M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Value Engineering Options Presented</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$18.2M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Value Engineering Options Recommended to Accept</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$11.39M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Updated Construction Budget</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$233.2M</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	• SD Budget (Consigli Estimate)	\$244.6M	• Value Engineering Options Presented	\$18.2M	• Value Engineering Options Recommended to Accept	\$11.39M	• Updated Construction Budget	\$233.2M	Record																						
• SD Budget (Consigli Estimate)	\$244.6M																															
• Value Engineering Options Presented	\$18.2M																															
• Value Engineering Options Recommended to Accept	\$11.39M																															
• Updated Construction Budget	\$233.2M																															
26.6	<p><b>Project Budget Update</b></p> <p><b>Total Project Budget Update:</b>  <u>Budget Category Totals:</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">• Feasibility Study:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1 M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Administration:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7.4 M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Design:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$22,2 M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Construction:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$233.2 M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Misc. &amp; Furniture:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$8.4 M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Contingency</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$11 M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Max Reimbursement:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$79.5M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Project Cost:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$283M</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Schematic Design Value Engineering Recommendation:</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;"><b>1- Structure</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>\$ (344,228.00)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1: STRUCT: 4" SOG in lieu of 5"</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (64,452.00)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45: STRUCT: Reduce roof top screens by 75%</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (279,776.00)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2- Envelope</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>\$ (1,325,434.00)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6: ENVEL: Utilize 60 mil PVC membrane</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (282,701.00)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>38: ENVEL: Façade strategies-Target Value</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (396,856.00)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>53: Reduce horizontal Insulated metal walls panels</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (506,912.00)</td> </tr> </table>	• Feasibility Study:	\$1 M	• Administration:	\$7.4 M	• Design:	\$22,2 M	• Construction:	\$233.2 M	• Misc. & Furniture:	\$8.4 M	• Contingency	\$11 M	• Max Reimbursement:	\$79.5M	• Project Cost:	\$283M	<b>1- Structure</b>	<b>\$ (344,228.00)</b>	1: STRUCT: 4" SOG in lieu of 5"	\$ (64,452.00)	45: STRUCT: Reduce roof top screens by 75%	\$ (279,776.00)	<b>2- Envelope</b>	<b>\$ (1,325,434.00)</b>	6: ENVEL: Utilize 60 mil PVC membrane	\$ (282,701.00)	38: ENVEL: Façade strategies-Target Value	\$ (396,856.00)	53: Reduce horizontal Insulated metal walls panels	\$ (506,912.00)	Record
• Feasibility Study:	\$1 M																															
• Administration:	\$7.4 M																															
• Design:	\$22,2 M																															
• Construction:	\$233.2 M																															
• Misc. & Furniture:	\$8.4 M																															
• Contingency	\$11 M																															
• Max Reimbursement:	\$79.5M																															
• Project Cost:	\$283M																															
<b>1- Structure</b>	<b>\$ (344,228.00)</b>																															
1: STRUCT: 4" SOG in lieu of 5"	\$ (64,452.00)																															
45: STRUCT: Reduce roof top screens by 75%	\$ (279,776.00)																															
<b>2- Envelope</b>	<b>\$ (1,325,434.00)</b>																															
6: ENVEL: Utilize 60 mil PVC membrane	\$ (282,701.00)																															
38: ENVEL: Façade strategies-Target Value	\$ (396,856.00)																															
53: Reduce horizontal Insulated metal walls panels	\$ (506,912.00)																															

<b>3- Interiors</b>	<b>\$ (1,298,170.00)</b>
46: INTER: Provide tile ILO epoxy terrazzo flooring	\$ (282,701.00)
47: INTER: Reduce spacing of aluminum vertical B	\$ (163,240.00)
55: Epoxy flooring in lieu of tile	\$ (156,896.00)
64: Reduce wall tile height in corridors to 4'6"	\$ (122,549.00)
71: Reduce misc. specialties Target	\$ (195,138.00)
73: Reduce Food service Equipment-target value	\$ (331,268.00)
75: Toilet accessories 0 furnished by others	\$ (46,378.00)
<b>4- Services:</b>	<b>\$ (5,035,662.00)</b>
10: PLUMB: Utilize Point of Use Acid Neutralization	\$ (152,128.00)
20: ELEC: Eliminate Temp Fire Alarm Heat Detector	\$ (389,950.00)
21: ELEC: Remove one 800KW Diesel Generator	\$ (1,478,071.00)
22: ELEC: Remove All Empty Conduit for Future	\$ (508,701.00)
29: ELEC: Eliminate shooter Detection System	\$ (223,875.00)
30: ELEC: Utilize Fire Alarm MC Cable in Lieu of E...	\$ (243,522.00)
31: ELEC: Eliminate Vape Detection System	\$ (116,887.00)
34: ELEC: Remove IPTV and Video on Demand	\$ (320,020.00)
44: PLUM: Eliminate Overflow Rainleaner System	\$ (707,727.00)
49: GEOTHERMAL	\$ (771,895 to \$0)
50: GEOTH: Remove Geothermal System	\$ (774,895.00)
50: PLUMB: Eliminate gas in labs	\$ (122,887.00)
<b>5- Sitework</b>	<b>\$ (1,760,887.00)</b>
28: SITE/ELEC: Reduce Quantity of Site CCTV	\$ (444,720.00)
39: SITE: Reduce quantity of 3" -3.5"	\$ (71,554.00)
51: SITE/ELEC: Eliminate sports lighting	\$ (554,281.00)
70: Irrigation	\$ (271,640 - \$0)
70.2: Reduce Irrigation by 100,000 sf	\$ (271,640.00)
72: Remove dugouts - by owner	\$ (299,435.00)
74: Scoreboards - By owner	\$ (119,257.00)
<b>7- Multidisciplinary</b>	<b>\$ (1,628,575.00)</b>
68: Eliminate concession stand	\$ (1,628,575.00)
<b>Total Recommended:</b>	<b>\$11,392,956.00</b>

**Vote:**

A motion was made by J. Dowse and S. Widak to accept the budget for the proposed building project as amended with the value engineering options recommended totaling \$11.39 Million. All in favor. Motion Passes.

**District Resident Vote – October 24, 2023**

- Residents in 11 member towns vote for the building project.
- October 24, 2023
  - Polling locations will be determined by the town.

**School Construction Financing**

- Statue allows for up to 30-year financing for school construction projects – chapter 70B (MSBA Grant funded projects)
- Amortization of Bonds can be structured for level principal or level debt
  - While the interest expense on level debt is higher, most issuers elect for level debt.
- Bond Premiums – net premium proceeds must be applied on the day of the sale to reduce the par amount of the Bonds.
  - Cost of Insurance is incorporated into bid specifications- not a budget item.
- Process:
  - Review of project cash flow
  - Insurance of short-term notes (bond anticipated notes-BANs)
  - Bonds
  - Market conditions and impact expectations/timing

**Impact Summary**

- Top Level Analysis- \$200,000,000 School Bonds
  - Likelihood of multiple issuances versus full-cost issuance
  - Final issuance of Project Bonds will occur after the final MSBA audit has been completed.
- Analysis based upon Member Towns' 2023 assessed valuations.
- Takes into consideration Towns with split tax rates.
- Estimated coupon rate of 4.25%- 30- year level debt

<b>Town Impact Analysis (Est.)</b>		
<b>Member</b>	<b>\$ per 1,000 Residential</b>	<b>Tax Impact Per \$100,000 Home -Annual</b>
Franklin	0.29	28.77
Medfield	0.02	2.2
Medway	0.36	36.06
Millis	0.27	27.06
Norfolk	0.22	21.99
North Attleborough	0.57	56.86
Plainville	0.63	63.31
Seekonk	0.28	28.27
Sherborn	0.04	3.98
Walpole	0.18	17.97
Wrentham	0.29	29.26
** Interest Rates, enrollments and valuations are subject to change		
<b>Discussion:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>J. Rose asks how are the contingency numbers decided on? T. Elmore explains the percentages are based on the volume of construction.</li> <li>S. Widak asks if we eliminate the temporary fire alarm, will the insurance rate go up? K Lyons responds it will be under Consigli's insurance during construction only.</li> <li>K. Maguire mentions even though we are eliminating geothermal, we may still be eligible for a grant.</li> <li>B. Mushnick asks when you bond, do you do it before construction? You can.</li> </ul>		
26.7	<b>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:</b> None.	Record
26.8	<b>Public Comment:</b> None.	Record
26.9	<b>Next Meetings:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>06.21.2023</u> Building Committee Meeting – Schematic Design Submission review and approval to MSBA</li> <li><u>07.13.2023</u> Building Committee Meeting – Meeting Minute and Invoices Approval</li> </ul>	Record
26.10	<b>Adjourn:</b> 5:58 PM a motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by H. Takesian to adjourn the meeting. All in favor, Motion Passes.	Record

Project: Tri-County Vocational High School  
Meeting: School Building Committee  
Meeting No. 26 -06/15/2023  
Page: 8

Sincerely,

**DORE + WHITTIER**

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.