



MEETING MINUTES

Project: Tri-County Vocational High School
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting No. 10
 Location: Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical High School
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: MP20-28
 Meeting Date: 6/9/2022
 Time: 4:00 PM
 Prepared By: R. Rincon

Present	Name	Affiliation	Prese	Name	Affiliation
✓	Brian Mushnick*	SBC Chair		Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Karen Maguire*	Superintendent	✓	Trip Elmore	DWMP
✓	Dan Haynes*	Business Admin.		Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Michael Procaccini*	Principal		Mike Cox	DWMP
✓	Jonathon Dowse*	SBC Member		Rachel Rincon	DWMP
✓	Brendan Bowen*	SBC Member		Charlie Lyons	DWMP
	Stanley Widak Jr.*	SBC/SC Member	✓	Carl Franceschi	DRA
✓	Harry Takesian*	Facilities Manager	✓	Vladimir Lyubetsky	DRA
✓	Jane Hardin*	SBC Member		Sara Carda	DRA
	Sarah Solomon	Marketing			

* SBC Voting Member

Item No.	Description	Action
10.1	Call to Order: 4:02 pm meeting was called to order by SBC Member J. Dowse with 8 of 9 voting members in attendance.	Record
10.2	Previous Topics & Approval of May 12, 2022, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 5/12/2022 meeting minutes as submitted made by M. Procaccini and seconded by J. Dowse. Rollcall Vote: B. Mushnick, M. Procaccini, D. Haynes, K. Maguire, H. Takesian, J. Dowse, J. Hardin. Discussion: None. Abstentions: B. Bowen. All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
10.3.1	Invoices and Commitments for Approval: A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by M. Procaccini for the approval of DWMP Invoice No. 8 in the amount of \$15,000.00. Rollcall Vote: B. Mushnick, M. Procaccini, D. Haynes, K. Maguire, H. Takesian, J. Dowse, J. Hardin, B. Bowen. Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor, motion passes.	Record
10.3.2	Invoices and Commitments for Approval: A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by D. Haynes for the approval of DRA Invoice No. 4 in the amount of \$14,250.00. Rollcall Vote: B. Mushnick, M. Procaccini, D. Haynes, K. Maguire, H. Takesian, J. Dowse, J. Hardin, B. Bowen. Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor, motion passes.	Record
10.3.3	Budget Update: T Elmore reviewed the current budget and reimbursement summary included in the meeting packet. Currently there is roughly \$69,000 of uncommitted funds still available in the feasibly study phase, the committed funds are inline or slightly behind on billing for the current progress to date. The MSBA reimbursement is staying current, as reimbursement payments usually lag by 4 to 6 weeks depending on the timing in their payment cycle. <u>Discussion:</u> ➤ None	Record
10.4	Existing Conditions Report Update (D&W): T Elmore commented that the SBC had been given a link to the Existing Conditions Report on May 20 th , and again on June 7 th in case someone might have missed the first email link. A bulleted 2-page summary of building deficiencies is included in the meeting packet to highlight those issues that the district will need to address and fix if the building were to remain in its existing configuration and use. I t was stated that these repairs and updates are not intended to address modifications that benefit the educational program or manner in which today's education is delivered in this facility.	Record

	<p>This evaluation step in the process is required by the MSBA to identify the direct facility issues that need to be corrected to maintain the use to the facility, as is currently configured, for the next 50 years. This evaluation becomes a baseline, or Base Repair Option, for comparison as other alternatives are developed. This Base Repair Option scenario would be a series of capital repair projects that, for study purposes, would span over a 10-year period and would be done largely over summer breaks to perform the work. As this work would not be addressing the educational programmatic issues of the facility, it would not meet the MSBA Core Program guidelines and therefore not be part of their Grant Funding Program and costs for these repairs would be a district capital cost. Since the District has recently replaced the roof and boilers, the one area that might be eligible for MSBA Grant funding is exterior window replacement through the MSBA Accelerated Repair Program.</p> <p>This 650+ page document will be included in the Preliminary Design Program submission to the MSBA in August and is a public accessible document.</p>	
10.5	<p>Existing Conditions Base Repair Estimate Summary (DRA and D+W):</p> <p>T. Elmore reviewed the Base Repair Option cost estimate summary included in the meeting packet. He explained the two components of the estimate, construction costs and soft costs.</p> <p>DRA supplied their estimator with the scope of work based on the information gathered in the Existing Conditions Report. DRA's estimator provided a construction conceptual cost estimate for this scope of work which includes the cost for – Contractor & trade material and labor, escalation through 2028, phasing & design contingency, contractor insurance and bonds, and did not include any of the other costs associated with doing the work, typically referred to as “Soft Costs”. The estimated Construction cost for the Base Repair Option are estimated to be \$123,701,000.00.</p> <p>B. Bowen wanted to get more clarity of the scope of the work. DRA commented that the scope given to the estimator is included in the basis of the estimate documentation and it follows the scope identified in the Existing Conditions report. It does not reflect costs to “re-build” the existing building and is reflecting only repair and the building code related upgrades costs.</p> <p>D+W provided a percentage based estimate for the Soft Costs, typically, soft costs are approximately 25% of Construction Costs and include Fees for the Designer and Engineering services, permits, legal, third party testing, Owners’ Project Management, Commissioning Agent, relocation expenses, contingencies etc.. T. Elmore explained that he ran a typical soft cost estimate by individual line items and found that the 25% might be a few percent low,</p>	Record

	<p>however for this exercise it should be reasonable and in his opinion is not an over-stated number. The Soft Cost estimated costs are \$30,925,250.00.</p> <p>The Base Repair Estimate for the repair of the building over a 10-year period of time is \$154,626,250.00, and aside from potential exterior windows which are valued at approximately \$2 million, would be a district expense that would not comply with the current agreement for the Core Project MSBA Grant Funding. However, this would need to be verified with the MSBA.</p>	
10.6	<p>MSBA Option Development Review (DRA):</p> <p>DRA provided a slide presentation of building options in the meeting packet, please refer to that presentation for details and concepts presented. In summary, the options presented included 3 renovation/addition options with sub-variations and 3 new building options on the 3 buildable areas on the existing site. These options were developed at the conceptual level as expected at the PDP phase of the project. During the presentation SBC asked a few clarifications questions that lead to productive discussion of the range of the design opportunities identified within the options. The SBC was asked to consider the program use for the Auditorium space. This could be the space suitable for basic School events and functions, or Theater performance-oriented space. A potential for an existing “stump dump” located below the PV installation was mentioned by the SBC. SBC was asked to further consider the options and give the design team feedback and potential ideas in our next meeting. The SBC was asked to consider criteria that could be utilized in evaluation of the options. These evaluation criteria can be discussion topic for the next meeting. School security concerns were mentioned as important criteria, particularly considering the recent events.</p>	Record
10.7	<p>Existing Equipment Survey with Teacher/Student Participation Update (TEAM):</p> <p>T. Elmore updated the SBC members that the Tri-County staff, teachers, and students should be complimented on the job they have done to identify the equipment and services required to operate that equipment in most of the programs. This was an experimental exercise, initiated by an offer by Angela Betts in engineering, to get the school teachers and students involved in the early planning and information gathering stage. The team has been impressed by their willingness to assist and support the project. We thank and compliment the Tri-County community for their assistance. He provided a list of the programs in the meeting packet, included below, that have completed their inventories and the other 2 programs are expected to complete their inventories in the next week or so.</p>	Record

	<p>Programs that have submitted equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Culinary Arts ➤ Auto Tech ➤ Carpentry ➤ CIS ➤ Cosmetology ➤ Plumbing ➤ Medical Assist ➤ Graphics ➤ Engineering ➤ Early Education ➤ Dental ➤ Electrical <p>Programs that have yet to submit equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HVAC ➤ LPS 	
10.8	<p>Overview of the Public Presentation Today at 6 PM (TEAM):</p> <p>T. Elmore introduced the public presentation agenda slide included in the meeting packet, as is outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome & Introductions Project Team & Organization Process & Schedule Educational Goals & Programming Existing Conditions Overview Closing Thoughts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Karen Maguire will be opening the presentation and will introduce the team and organization ➤ Trip Elmore will review the MSBA process and schedule to the regional vote ➤ Carl Franceschi and Vladimir Lyubetsky will review the educational visioning, programming, and existing conditions. ➤ The community will be able to ask questions at the conclusion of the presentation 	Record
10.9	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
10.10	<p>Public Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record

10.11	Next Meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ June 23 at 4PM in person meeting/working session to review the building options and get SBC comments and input on ideas and concepts➤ July 14 at 4 PM remote meeting to review updates on the building options➤ July 28 at 4 PM remote meeting to approve the submission of the Preliminary Design Program by the D+W and DRA to the MSBA	Record
10.12	Adjourn: 4:39 pm A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by M. Procaccini to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: None.	Record

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Trip Elmore

Project Executive

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.