

An act relative to extending certain COVID-19 measures adopted during the state of emergency was signed by Governor Baker and allows for remote meetings and hearings by public bodies through July 15, 2022.

- I. Call to Order.
- II. Review Previous Meeting Minutes for Approval
 - a. June 16, 2022
- III. OPM Report
 - a. Project Budget
 - i. Draft BRR #2
 - b. Project Schedule
- IV. Design Team Report
 - a. Review Phasing Plans
 - b. Review Civil & Landscape Design
 - c. Review Floor Plans & Elevations
- V. Next Steps
 - a. SD Package to Cost Estimators 7/15
 - b. Cost Estimate Reconciliation Meeting 8/1
 - c. SBC Meeting 8/11
 - d. SBC Meeting 8/25 Vote needed for SD submission
 - e. Schematic Design Submission to MSBA 8/31

Questions and Comments Adjourn

I. Call to Order.

Mr. Pfifferling called the meeting to order at 9:01 am. A roll call was held and the results were the following:

Mr.	Bevilacqua	Present	Mr.	MacDonald	Absent
Mr.	Boucher	Present	Mr.	Pfifferling	Present
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Present	Dr.	Poor	Present
Mr.	DiBurro	Present	Ms.	Sullivan	Present @ 9:08 am
Mr.	Dorrance	Present	Mrs.	Perkins	Present
Ms.	Hernandez-Bailey	Absent	Mr.	Wood	Absent
Dr.	Marotta	Absent	Mayor	Fiorentini	Absent

Also present were:

Craig	DiCarlo, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, MCPPO Project Manager ~ Colliers Project Leaders
Michele	Barbaro-Rogers, AIA, MCPPO Dore+Whittier
Donald	Walter, AIA, MCPPO Dore+Whittier
Melinda	Barrett, City Council Member
Jason	Boone, ALEP, Associate AIA, MCPPO, Senior Associate, Dore+Whittier
John	Bates, AIA, LEED AP, Project Manager ~ Colliers Project Leaders
Christopher	Sicuranza, Mayor's Chief of Staff

II. Review Previous Meeting Minutes for Approval

a. June 16, 2022 <u>Final Edit Consentino School Building Committee Remote Meeting Minutes 06.16.22.pdf.</u>

A motion was made by Mr. Boucher to approve the minutes of June 16, 2022. Mr. Bevilacqua seconded the motion. A roll call vote was requested:

Mr.	Bevilacqua	Yes	Mr.	Dorrance	Yes	



Mr.	Boucher	Yes	Mr.	Pfifferling	Yes
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Yes	Dr.	Poor	Yes
Mr.	DiBurro	Yes	Mrs.	Perkins	Yes

Motion passes

Mr. DiCarlo introduced Mr. John Bates who would be working with him on this project.

Mr. Bates related that he was a registered architect who had worked at Colliers for several years. He had recently completed the Cape Cod Tech Project in Harwich and was also involved in other projects which were in the feasibility and design phase. Mr. Bates was looking forward to working on this project and assisting Craig DiCarlo

- III. OPM Report
 - a. Project Budget
 - i. Draft BRR #2
 - b. Project Schedule

b. Project Schedule - Mr. DiCarlo took the items out of order and reviewed the project schedule highlighting that the project was now is the schematic design phase including the two-week cost estimating exercise which will conclude beginning the week of August 1, 2022. Mr. DiCarlo noted that information would be presented at the SBC meeting on August 11, 2022 with the next step to submit a package for review to the SBC at its August 25, 2022 meeting with a submission to the MSBA for August 31, 2022.

a. Project Budget – Mr. DiCarlo presented the project budget vs. the actual spent to date document to the committee. He referenced the OPM (\$200,000), A&E (\$500,000) along with accounts and commented that at the last meeting approval had been received for additional services (geotechnical, land survey and hazardous materials) ESR #1, ESR #2, ESR #3 and indicated that line item 3 & 4 (environment and site - \$25,000) and other fees - \$25,000 needed to be adjusted in the budget. He noted that a budget revision request was required for the project which included the movement of \$21,200 from the other category to the environmental & site category. Mr. DiCarlo displayed the updated budget categories along with the preamble language:

Category	Updated	Original	
OPM Feasibility	\$200,000.00	\$200,000.00	
AE Feasibility	\$500,000.00	\$500,000.00	
Environmental & Site	\$46,200.00	\$25,000.00	
Other	\$3,800.00	\$25,000.00	

It was noted that a vote would be required for the budget revision requests, however, there were additional costs that would exceed the budget.

Mr. DiCarlo noted that there was a service required for the project entitled cost estimation. He stated that the design team contracts with one cost estimator and the district has another cost estimator secured by the OPM. Mr. DiCarlo reported that three proposals had be solicited for the district: A.M Fogarty & Associates CONSENTINO MIDDLE SCHOOL MSBA FEE - AMF 6 - 22.pdf; Fennessy Consulting Services PNr 22094 Haverhill Consentio.pdf; Rider, Levett & Bucknall RLB Cost Estimating Proposal for Consentino Middle School.pdf.



He offered that Colliers had worked with all three companies and all were qualified to perform the work, however, A.M. Fogarty & Associates had the lowest bid. Mr. DiCarlo reviewed the proposal costs:

Schematic Cost Estimate	\$17,250
Design Development	\$19,500
60% Construction Document	\$16,000
90% Construction Document	\$14,250

Mr. DiCarlo reported that total schematic cost estimate cost could not be covered in the other category for the project (\$3,800 was budgeted) and the resulting \$13,450 would not be reimbursable from MSBA and would be funded by the district. He stated that they would submit a request for reimbursement, but there was no guarantee that it would receive approval. Mr. DiCarlo explained a cost escalation in the industry was the reason even though the district had aggressively negotiated all contracts.

In response to Mr. Pfifferling's question regarding any other unexpected "budget busters", Mr. DiCarlo did not anticipate any other significant increased costs.

Mr. DiCarlo related that the vote on the budget revision would be delayed at the August 11, 2022, meeting in order for a review by MSBA.

- IV. Design Team Report 2022-07-14 SBC.pdf.
 - a. Review Phasing Plans
 - b. Review Civil & Landscape Design
 - c. Review Floor Plans & Elevations

Ms. Rogers began the presentation with a review: Schedule Update, Review of Site Plan & Phasing Diagram; Floor Plan Update and Elevations Update. Regarding the schedule, she outlined the following dates:

```
7/11/22 Working Group: Final Plan Review Prior to issuing to Cost Estimators
7/14/22 SBC Meeting: Final Plan Review Prior to issuing to Cost Estimators
7/15/22: Issue to Cost Estimators
8/01/22: Cost Reconciliation
8/08/22 Working Group Meeting: Reconciled Cost Estimates & VE Review
8/11/22: SBC Meeting: Reconciled Cost Estimates & VE Review
8/22/22 Working Group: Final Cost and Plan Review
8/25/22 SBC Meeting: VOTE to approve submission to MSBA
8/26/22: Draft Meeting Minutes
8/29/22: D+W will submit to OPM
8/31/22: OPM will submit to MSBA
```

Mr. Walter emphasized the importance of the next steps regarding the commitment to the project.

Ms. Rogers reviewed the site plan and phasing diagram. She mentioned the separation of the construction site from the regular operations of the school.

City Councilor Barrett asked about sound buffering/dust control for neighbors during construction.

Ms. Rogers responded that these issues would be addressed by the construction company.



Ms. Barrett expressed the need for sensitivity to the neighbors including construction hours.

Ms. Rogers noted the (civil documents update) stormwater management (ground water observed at 10 ft.) along with utility access and site control.

Ms. Sullivan inquired about site security.

Ms. Rogers answered that the entire site would be fenced along with usually cameras around trailers and sites.

Ms. Sullivan wanted assurances that security cameras would be installed at the construction site along with posted signs.

Ms. Rogers related that managing security was a very important matter for the contractors.

In regards to landscaping, Ms. Rogers highlighted: parking, landscaping buffers, trees in parking areas, and landscape amenities (benches, racks, basketball court, athletic surface painted area, greenhouse canopies, flagpole, seat walls and retaining walls.

Mr. Dorrance recommended EV charging stations.

Ms. Rogers responded there were six (6) stations.

Ms. Rogers reviewed the updated floor plans with the committee noting the adjustments to back of house, kitchen area, along with PE, basketball court, office and storage spaces. She related that green and/or red areas were additional space for MSBA

Ms. Rogers referred to the target gross square feet as outlined below:

```
PDP = 221,633 GSF
PSR = 188,903 GSF
SD = +/-183,000 GSF
```

Mr. Bevilacqua reiterated that the project needed to be funded without a debt exclusion.

Ms. Rogers replied that it was of foremost consideration.

Mr. Sicuranza asked about distribution of information regarding the project, i.e., project page.

Mr. DiCarlo answered that materials were distributed by Mrs. McGillicuddy to the SBC and that the district's IT had developed a webpage for the project where relative materials and updates were posted for the public.

Ms. Rogers provided a detailed description of the elevations. She highlighted that the proposed building was primarily masonry, with 4-stories of classrooms, day lit classrooms along with stairwells with ample daylight.

Mr. Walter noted this phase was schematic design and there would be more refinement (capturing scope) as the project hopefully proceeds into next phase.

Mr. Boucher asked if it was an accurate representation of the slope in back of the site.



Ms. Rogers responded that the plans had not been fully coordinated as of this date.

Mr. Walter added that the retaining wall was being minimized by keeping the new and previous schools closer together during construction.

Mr. DiCarlo commented was pleased with the progress. He stated again the upcoming timeline:

- SD Package to Cost Estimators 7/15
- Cost Estimate Reconciliation Meeting 8/1
- SBC Meeting 8/11
- SBC Meeting 8/25 Vote needed for SD submission
- Schematic Design Submission to MSBA 8/31

In response to Mr. Boucher's inquiry about cost estimates, Mr. DiCarlo replied that the next meeting would be devoted to this topic. He indicated that part of the study was to evaluate options for cost-savings if there was a need as part of this project.

Mr. Walter emphasized the construction price increases over the past year and the implementation of a construction escalation feature in the budget.

Mr. Pfifferling asked for any final comments.

A motion was made by Mr. Bouche3 to adjourn the meeting (9:50 am). Ms. Sullivan seconded the motion. A roll call vote was requested:

Mr.	Bevilacqua	Yes	Mr.	Pfifferling	Yes
Mr.	Boucher	Yes	Dr.	Poor	Yes
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Yes	Mrs.	Perkins	Yes
Mr.	Dorrance	Yes	Ms.	Sullivan	Yes