



MEETING MINUTES

Project: Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical HS
Subject: School Building Committee Meeting No. 2
Location: Tri-County Conference Room
Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No:
Meeting Date: 10/28/2021
Time: 4:00 PM
Prepared By: R. Donner

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 Donner	DWMP
✓	Brendan Bowen*	SBC Member		Charlie Lyons	DWMP
	Stanley Widak Jr.*	SBC/SC Member			
✓	Harry Takesian*	Facilities Manager			

* SBC Voting Member

Item No.	Description	Action
2.1	Call to Order: 4:08 pm meeting was called to order by SBC Chair B. Mushnick with 7 of 8 voting members in attendance.	Record
2.2	Previous Topics & Approval of September 23, 2021, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 9/23/2021 meeting minutes as submitted made by J. Dowse and seconded by B. Bowen. Discussion: None. Abstentions: All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
2.3	Invoices and Commitments for Approval: A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by D. Haynes for the approval of DWMP Invoice No. 1 in the amount of \$10,000.00 Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor, motion passes.	Record
2.4	<p>Designer Selection Process/RFS Update:</p> <p><u>Dates:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Designer Walk Through 10/28 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Dell Angelo shares today we had our designer walkthrough. We had a good group of people. We have several firms who are interested which is good. Also, there are firms that have technical high school experience which is helpful as well. ➤ Proposals Due 11/17 ➤ Proposals Review 12/6-12/10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Dell Angelo mentions after the proposals are due, we want to as a group, go through and evaluate the proposals. We can go through the criteria we have outlined for previous projects. This is typically the same information from project to project with some tweaking depending on vocational high school versus elementary school etc. We plan to meet between 12/6 and 12/10 to go through the criteria and get your input on what architect you are leaning more towards based on the point system. That will be very helpful for the three members who are going to the DSP because your opinion does matter. You will have 2 points that will go towards their total and that counts. T. Elmore suggests it makes sense to distribute our scoring sheet at the next SBC meeting. ➤ DSP Review 12/14 ➤ DSP Interview and Selection 1/11 <p><u>Designer Selection Committee:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 3 Representatives to represent the District at the MSBA Designer Selection Panel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes 1 member designated by SC, Superintendent or his/her designee, CEO of the City or Town or his/her designee 	Record

- K. Maguire, B. Mushnick and D. Haynes

Discussion:

- B. Mushnick asks, do you think people who did not take the tour will be interested? T. Elmore responds yes. The walkthrough was not mandatory. Of the firms who attended, we recognized that two have vocational high school experience, DRA and KBA.
- B. Mushnick asks will the firms who did not attend go straight off the RFS? T. Elmore explains the RFS included the KBA study which was done in 2016 and there was a lot of information within that. The people who attended today wanted to show their interest. We did not get nearly the number of firms to attend the walkthrough as firms that requested for the RFS. We will have to wait and see what proposals we receive. We are hopeful we will receive 6-8 proposals. If we get less than 3 proposals, we will have a different meeting on November 18th since there will be a different process we will have to go through. Proposals are due on November 17th. C. Dell Angelo comments we can also reach out to the architects who go to the walkthrough but downloaded and ask if they are interested in this project. We want to make sure we receive a good number of proposals. T. Elmore mentions Perkins Eastman called prior to the RFS going out and they let me know that they would be chasing the job. Perkins Eastman just did Essex Agricultural & Technical Institute in Hathorne, MA. They have Vocational Technical experience, but they did not attend the walkthrough. C. Dell Angelo also mentions another reason why a firm may not submit a proposal is how much work they have in their pipeline.
- B. Mushnick asks when reviewing the proposals, do we use your scoring sheet or is it a state mandated scoring sheet? T. Elmore explains typically, the owner does not have independent group score. However, on every project the other SBC members would like to give the three people who are going to the DSP some of their input. We came up with this scoring system. It does not mean that the individuals going to the MSBA must follow it, but they always do. This gives an indication from the rest of the committee what is important. We look at this as an additional step for the overall group so that everybody's opinion becomes known as a collective. Each member will have the ability to submit their individual scores.
- B. Mushnick asks is there a reason why a firm would not want our project? Is it too small for some? T. Elmore responds no, it is a good-sized project. It has a lot of variables. This is attractive because of the size of the building. 285,000 square feet is a big project. It has attractiveness there. There is another component that the MSBA is only putting out so many projects a year. They are somewhat handcuffed by sales tax amounts so there is that unsure piece in the marketplace right now. C. Dell Angelo mentions also the DSP tries to make it as fair as

	<p>possible. They do not want to award to a firm that they just gave another project to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire asks how many came to the walkthrough today? T. Elmore responds the sign in sheet had approximately 15 people but there were about 8 firms. Of the firms, two have vocational experience. There was a local architect out of Franklin who attended. Also, W.T. Rich attended who is a builder along with some other engineering firms. K. Maguire asks was there anyone you did not know other than the Franklin architect? T. Elmore shares I was not familiar with a couple of the engineering firms, but these engineering firms are joining with the architectural firms. They were either viewing for another firm or they are going to market themselves to a firm because this is going to be a big plumbing and piping job if it is a renovation. 	
2.5	<p>Communication Protocols and Goals Update:</p> <p><u>Project Website:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Dell Angelo shares we have developed our first project website draft. There is a desktop and mobile version. It is user friendly and a great platform that we started using within our company to develop these project websites. We reviewed this with D. Haynes today and he provided some comments. D. Haynes will also provide us with additional comments once he is able to go over it with K. Maguire. We also plan to send this to Sarah. We want to have this website ready to go by the time we have our designer on board and by the time we have our first community meeting. It is important once the designer comes on board that we are scheduling these quarterly community meetings. We want to get the word out and be as transparent as possibly with the communities making sure we are telling people where we are in the process, what the process looks like and what our goal is. At our next SBC meeting we will have a draft version for all members to review and we can go over project website names. This is an important piece to the communication aspect as far as communicating with the district as well as all the communities. <p><u>Questionnaire Feedback:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Electronic mostly preferred ➤ Goals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Modern facility ○ Updated building envelope ○ Efficiency, Safety, ADA ○ MEP's ○ Plan for the future, not just for today ○ 21st century learning ○ Maximized accessibility 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fiscally responsible ➤ C. Dell Angelo will send M. Procaccini and H. Takesian the goals questionnaire. <p><u>SBC Meetings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SBC No. 2 – October 28, 2021-Arch update, goal review, work group formation ➤ SBC No. 3 - November 18, 2021-Arch update/proposal review, goal summary, work group update, OPM work plan summary ➤ SBC No. 4 - December 16, 2021-DSP update, final goal statement, work group update, budget review ➤ SBC No. 5 – January 13, 2022-Arch contract approval, arch intro, work group report ➤ SBC No. 6 – January 27, 2022-Arch/OPM/SBC Kick off, Arch work plan and meeting schedule, budget update, overall schedule review <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ D. Haynes comments the initial view of the project website was very impressive. ➤ T. Elmore shares if we do not have to interview, the architects contract approval could be moved up to December 16th. It is unlikely to happen, but it is a possibility. B. Bowen asks when would we not interview? T. Elmore explains the DSP will have to vote to go to interview. If they think one firm stands out and it is your recommendation as well, they more forego an interview. Interviews are not mandatory. It is a possibility to go from proposal, to contract, to vote. If one firm has recently done a vocational technical project and you have other firms that have never done a vocational technical project it may be a landslide if they have the availability and the right team. The DSP does recognize these facilities as being different and having uniqueness which is benefitted by a firm who has done a project like this. ➤ K. Maguire asks is the DSP the same group of people we met with to appoint D+W? T. Elmore responds no, that was the OPM selection committee. I will send you a link of the DSP members. 	
2.6	<p>Timeline Review:</p> <p>T. Elmore shares a milestone schedule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hire the Architect <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ RFS Issued – 10/20/21 ○ Designer Walk Thru – 10/28/21 ○ Proposals Received – 11/17/21 ○ District review of Arch Proposals (Mtg date TBD) – 12/6/21-12/10/21 ○ DSP Proposal review – 12/14/21 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DSP Interview and Selection – 1/11/22 ➤ Districts Education Plan Development – 3/10/22 ➤ Feasibility Study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing Conditions – 5/12/22 ○ Option Development – 8/4/22 ○ MSBA Preliminary Design Program (PDP) – 8/26/22 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (First Formal submission to MSBA) ○ MSBA Review – 10/4/22 ○ Development of the Preferred Option – 12/30/22 ○ MSBA Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) – 1/16/23 ○ MSBA Review – 2/22/23 ○ MSBA Board Meeting to enter Schematic Design – 3/9/23 ➤ Schematic Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DESE Submission – 4/6/23 ○ Schematic Design – 6/2/23 ○ MSBA Schematic Design Review – 7/14/23 ○ MSBA Board Meeting Approval – 8/25/23 ➤ Local Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ District has 120 days to get local funding approved. 	
2.7	<p>Working Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Dell Angelo shares from the questionnaires, this is an update on the working groups and the people who want to be part of these different working groups. It is good to have this list because once we get the designer on board we are going to kick off with a lot of these meetings. <p><u>Educational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire ➤ B. Mushnick <p><u>Facilities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire ➤ B. Mushnick ➤ J. Dowse ➤ B. Bowen <p><u>Executive:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire ➤ B. Mushnick <p><u>Public Relations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire ➤ B. Mushnick ➤ J. Dowse 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ D. Haynes <p><u>Financial and Bonding:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire ➤ D. Haynes <p><u>Design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire ➤ B. Bowen <p><u>Sustainability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Maguire ➤ B. Bowen <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	
2.8	<p>Budget Tracking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Cox provides a budget update. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Cox will send log-in information to all SBC members to access this budget at any time. ○ M. Cox shares the budget system and explains for the first two years this budget will be four lines deep. Right now, we only have our contract listed. We will eventually have to do a budget revision which will move money around from line to line, but we will wait until we get the architect on board. ○ T. Elmore comments just to clarify on the budget revision, the state has a budget system, and their system matches our system. We want to make sure all the money is matching so this is a checks and balances type system. <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ B. Mushnick asks do you offer this budget tracking information to the public? C. Dell Angelo responds we have never been asked to share this level of detail. All the public really cares about is the bottom-line number. 	Record
2.9	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
2.10	<p>Public Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
2.11	<p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SBC Meeting No. 3 - November 18th at 4:00 pm 	Record

2.12	Adjourn: 4:42 pm A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by K. Maguire to adjourn the meeting, Discussion: None.	Record
------	--	--------

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Rachel Donner

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.