



SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Project: Tri-County Vocational High School
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting No. 15
 Location: ZOOM
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: MP20-28
 Meeting Date: 10/27/2022
 Time: 4:00 PM
 Prepared By: E. Grijalva

Present	Name	Affiliation	Pres	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
	Michael Procaccini*	Principal		Mike Cox	DWMP
x	Jonathon Dowse*	SBC Member	x	Elias Grijalva	DWMP
x	Brendan Bowen*	SBC Member		Charlie Lyons	DWMP
	Stanley Widak Jr.*	SBC/SC Member		Aiden Place	DWMP
x	Harry Takesian*	Facilities Manager	x	Carl Franceschi	DRA
	Jane Hardin*	SBC Member		Vladimir Lyubetsky	DRA
x	Tracey Stewart	School Committee			
	Lloyd "Gus" Brown*	Bldg Cm			
X	Bob Foley*	Adult Ed Dir.			

* SBC Voting Member

* Approved added Members

Item No.	Description	Action
16.1	<p>Call to Order & number of voting member present: 4:06pm meeting was called to order by SBC Chair, Brian Mushnick with 7 of 11 voting members in attendance.</p> <p>Bob Foley joined the meeting late.</p>	Record
16.2	<p>Previous Topics & Approval of September 22nd, 2022, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the September 22, 2022, meeting minutes as submitted made by B. Mushnick and seconded by B. Bowen.</p> <p>Discussion: None. Vote: All in favor</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: B. Mushnick (Y), K. Maguire (Y), D. Hayes (Y), J. Dowse, (Y), B. Bowen(Y), H. Takesian (Y), B. Foley(Y)</p> <p>Motion passes, September 22,2022 meeting minutes are certified as approved.</p>	Record
16.3	<p>Invoices and Commitments for Approval:</p> <p>C. Dell Angelo states we have two invoices for approval and one amendment from DRA. Let's start with the invoices first. First Invoice is from Dore and Whitter and second is from DRA, both invoices are for the month of September.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DWMP September Invoice No. 11, in the amount of \$10,000.00 ➤ DRA September Invoice No. 8 in the amount of \$22,800.00 <p>A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by K. Maguire for the approval of the invoices</p> <p>Discussion: None.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: B. Mushnick (Y), K. Maguire (Y), D. Hayes (Y), J. Dowse, (Y), B. Bowen(Y), H. Takesian (Y),</p> <p>Motion passes, invoices are approved for payment.</p> <p>C. Dell Angelo reviews DRA Amendment No. 3, which is for the Geotechnical Study defined by O'Reilly, Talbot and Oaken (OTO), and the proposal is dated October 19, 2022. The work is for the test pits and boring we've been discussing for</p>	Record

	<p>investigative work on site, and they will be providing a geotechnical report to us following the testing.</p> <p>C. Dell Angelo states she spoke with the current solar panel company yesterday on the phone and they were able to provide us with some geotechnical and topographic information that was performed specifically in the solar panel area of the site back in 2014 prior to the installation of the solar panel.</p> <p>The existing reports were sent to OTO for review, they will let us know whether we can reduce the amount of test pits and borings based off what their original proposal that was provided.</p> <p>T. Elmore explains that we will ask for approval of the amendment as a not to exceed value of \$4,950.00. At the last meeting, the SBC approved \$6,000.00 to bring a boring machine and excavator to the site on November 3rd for OTO to perform the work. DWMP has asked OTO to revise their boring and test pit marked plan based on the changes discussed. Once complete OTO will provide soil samples for testing as well as a final geotechnical report. The revised number of borings and test pits will result in a credit with a revised amendment.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">➤ DRA Amendment No. 3 in the amount of \$4,950.00</p> <p>A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by B. Bowen for the approval of the amendment No.3 and not to exceed the amount of \$4,950.00</p> <p>Discussion: None.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: B. Mushnick (Y), K. Maguire (Y), D. Hayes (Y), J. Dowse, (Y), B. Bowen(Y), H. Takesian (Y),</p> <p>Motion passes, amendment No.3 is approved.</p>	
16.4	<p>Preferred Solution Presentation:</p> <p>C. Franceschi starts his presentation talks further into each preferred solution option.</p> <p>A/R (Addition / Renovation) 3.1.1</p> <p>This option proposes a two-story addition to the west of the Gym and the full renovation of the existing school. The addition would house the new Auditorium & support spaces, such as Cosmetology, and the post-graduate nursing & cosmetology spaces. A portion of the addition would be constructed above the existing Boys Locker Rooms (which will be gutted and renovated) and be connected to the first- floor level. A new two-story lobby would be constructed at the lower level and serve as the events entrance to the Auditorium and Gymnasium, as well as the post- graduate programs.</p>	Record

The phased renovation of the existing building will include the relocation of the culinary art program and the creation of a new customer entrance to provide public access. The relocation of these programs will allow the subsequent renovation and expansion of several CTE programs that require additional space, including Computer Information Services, Legal & Protective Services, Dental, and Health Careers.

Other interior improvements would be distributed student support services and separate the district offices from the High School Administration.

The second- floor classroom wings of the building would be reconfigured to provide needed smaller group rooms, breakout areas, and distributed Teacher Planning Spaces.

A/R (Addition/ Renovation) 4

This option proposes the construction of a major new wing to house the Auditorium, Transportation cluster, post graduate programs and academic classrooms on two stories to the rear(east) of the school. This addition would connect to the second floor of the existing building with an at-grade entrance from sloping uphill portion of the site.

Once completed and occupied, the new wing could provide swing space to renovate portions of the existing school scheduled to remain. This would include the re-configuration / renovation of several programs such as Legal & Protective Services, Computer Information Services and Dental. The second-floor north classroom wing of the building would be reconfigured to provide needed small group rooms, breakout areas, and distributed Teacher Planning spaces. Other interior improvements would distribute student services.

Eventually the south wing of the existing school would be demolished, and a new public entrance would be created for the district office and consumer services cluster. New parking areas and drop off lanes would be constructed along with finish sitework.

NC (New Construction) 3

This new construction option proposes siting a new 280,000 square foot school primarily on the upper parking lot and solar panel field, identified as Site D in the preliminary study of possible building zones. The three-story courtyard building is configured with the large assembly areas and student commons at the north and the academic spaces south organized around an exterior courtyard. The high bay shops are at the rear of the main level and access by a perimeter service drive at the elevation of the existing solar field. The Consumer Services programs are also on the main level with a separate public entrance. The remaining career clusters are located on the upper floor. Each level has academic classrooms

	<p>across the corridor from CTE spaces to provide the desired integration as described in the Education program.</p>	
<p>16.5</p>	<p>CM at Risk delivery method and potential vote:</p> <p>C. Angelo talks about Construction Manager at Risk (CMR). We’ve talked about CM at Risk versus Design Bid Build (DBB) a few times in the past. We wanted to start the discussion on the different methods and explain some pros/ cons and ultimately get your feedback tonight regarding the construction delivery methods.</p> <p>C. Angelo explains the project owner requirements and considerations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Budget ➤ Design ➤ Schedule ➤ Risk Assessment (repair project, lack of swing space, impact to School), ➤ Owners Expertise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ MGL 149: Design – Bid- Build <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ You are purchasing a building in accordance with plans and specifications ○ Selection is bid/price based (lowest bidder wins) ○ Design is finished, then the bid to GC and subcontractors (After MSBA PFA) – You will not know the number until after. ○ Traditional Massachusetts project delivery method ○ Sealed bid, fixed price ○ Contract value based on a “lump sum” amount ○ “Closed Book” construction budget accounting ➤ MGL Chapter 149a: CM at Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ You are hiring a construction manager firm that manages the construction of buildings and provides input during design process. They will help estimate the project and review the drawings. They are part of the team. ○ Selection is qualifications and cost based ○ CM provides pre-construction (Prior to MSBA PFA) & construction services. – This option costs a little more but it is helpful when creating our budget. They will have more input on schedule, phasing, and logistics. ○ CM participates in the sub-contractor prequalification process ○ Option for early release bid packages or “fast-track” schedules – If the design is finishing in October and we want to start construction the following summer, we have an option to do an early release 	<p>Record</p>

- package for site work, abatement, demolition, etc. This allows work to start earlier.
- Contract value based on a “Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)” Cost of work + General Conditions + negotiated CM Fee
- GMP Assembled with assumptions and allowances for phasing/ logistics (during schematic design – potential for additional reimbursement for unforeseen items.
- “Open Book” construction budget accounting.
- DBB: Advantages
 - Familiar delivery method
 - Simple procurement process to manage
 - Lowest price proposed & accepted
 - Simple accounting (GC/GR)
- CMR: Advantages
 - Qualifications based selection
 - The builder assists with budgeting, logistics and constructability
 - Schematic Design Estimate (reconciled) set budget (Prior to MSBA PFA)
 - Fast track scheduling allows use of Early Release Packages (ERP)
 - CM joins the “Team” during design phase and provides input as documents are developed
 - Negotiations and “Team” atmosphere reduces likelihood of claims and schedule extension
 - CM assumes risk for project cost and schedule
- DBB: Disadvantages
 - Linear process: may mean longer schedule durations
 - Construction cost not known until bids received; may require re-design/rebid (AFTER PFA)
 - Designer must develop project phasing and schedule approach
 - GC project management, safety, and field supervision is minimal
 - Increased probability of disputes/claims
 - No GC input in design, planning, constructability or budgeting
 - Full costs not realized until completion
- CMR: Disadvantages
 - Requires OPM/Design team to be familiar with GMP model
 - Two-step procurement process takes time
 - Additional CM costs related to preconstruction services

Conclusions

- DBB is best suited for less complicated/complex projects with a straightforward design
- CMR is best suited for complicated/complex project design, phasing, logistics and schedule management challenges, or strict schedule limitation

Discussion:

C. Dell Angelo points out that the owner chooses the Construction Manager based on a proposal, rather than a General Contractor being awarded the project based on a low bid in DBB. Although the initial cost of CMR can be higher than the initial cost of DBB, it is most likely to be the cheaper option in the long run, as costs can be negotiated with a CM, unlike DBB where they can't. Due to concealed costs and the inability to negotiate with the GC in the DBB method, legal issues are also likely to arise.

The CMR does require us to send an application to the Office of the Inspector General and they will need to review the information. It can be between 60 to 90 days for them to review the application and provide us with approval of the delivery method that is chosen.

J. Dowse states that he likes the CM @ risk model. He likes the idea behind open book knowing what the cost are going to be. He explains he isn't a fan of the Design Bid Build.

K. Maguire asks whether it is true that there is less likelihood of change orders with the CMR?

C. Dell Angelo responds the CMR method you will see change orders, but it is billed within contingencies within the total project budget. With the DBB method it's a lump sum bid and the number you are purchasing is the number and it will never change and the unforeseen condition of a change order, comes out of one contingency bucket. The MSBA caps contingency buckets at 1% for new construction and 2% for addition/renovation projects. Anything beyond those percentages is non-reimbursable. When building your GMP (guaranteed maximum price) with the CMR method, you build holds and allowances within the actual construction budget which are reimbursable. They will be working with us during the schematic design phase, and other substantial phases. Providing the constructability review, reviewing the phasing logistics, providing the best method so the project is on time and within budget.

B. Mushnick reiterates so when we do the CMR method, you are bringing in your construction team earlier. Does that come in at an added cost? Are they billing us for consulting per say?

C. Dell Angelo responds Yes, it's the preconstruction phase that they would bill for. Preconstruction could take up to a year.

C. Franceschi states the reality is we may not truly have a real choice here because the size of the project. CMR firms tend to be the larger construction companies and can bond projects of this size. The General Contractor's/Design

	<p>Bid Build have certain bonding limits and typically in order to do something larger they will have to do a Joint Venture in order to meet those capacity's.</p> <p>T. Elmore states it takes up to sixty plus days to get the application reviewed by the Office of Inspector General. We anticipate it will take a minimum of three to four months to get them on board. Then we want them on board two to three months prior to submittals of schematic design. If we were to vote tonight, we wouldn't have them on board till the beginning of March. Once we bring them on, we put in the contract that they're being hired for a stipend. Usually, around twenty-five to thirty thousand, then we are obligated to pay them that amount to help us get an estimate for the schematic design submission, produce a schedule, and do a phasing plan.</p> <p>That is our exposure. When the project gets voted to move forward by the MSBA and local community, you are now in the position where you have permission to go get additional funds. That's when the Construction Managers preconstruction services would kick in. So, they have a stipend up until the voter approval. Then we'll negotiate a deal for their preconstruction services moving forward.</p> <p>The committee discussed the delivery methods and voted to approve the CM @ Risk construction method for the project.</p> <p>A motion was made by J. Dowse and seconded by K. Maguire for the approval of the Construction Manager at Risk delivery method.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: B. Mushnick (Y), K. Maguire (Y), D. Hayes (Y), J. Dowse, (Y), B. Bowen(Y), H. Takesian (Y)</p> <p>Motion passes, Construction Manager at Risk is approved.</p>	
16.6	<p>Other topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to meeting Discussion: None</p>	Record
16.7	<p>Public Comment: Discussion: None</p>	Record
16.8	<p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ November 16th, 2022 – SBC Meeting No. 17 ➤ November 28th, 2022 – SC & SBC Meeting No. 18 ➤ December 8th, 2022 – Community Meeting No. 3 ➤ December 15th, 2022 – SC & SBC Meeting No. 19 	Record
16.9	<p>Adjourn: 5:56pm pm A motion was made by B. Mushnick and seconded by <u>K. Maguire</u> to adjourn the meeting.</p>	Record

	<p>Roll Call Vote: B. Mushnick (Y), K. Maguire (Y), D. Hayes (Y), J. Dowse, (Y), B. Bowen(Y), H. Takesian (Y),</p> <p>Discussion: None</p>	
--	--	--

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Elias Grijalva

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.