

Governor Healey has extended pandemic-related authorizations thereby allowing remote and hybrid meeting options for public bodies through March 31, 2025.

I. Call to Order.

Dr. Marotta, Chairperson Pro tem called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. A roll call was requested with the following results:

Mr.	Bevilacqua	Absent	Mr.	MacDonald	Absent
Mr.	Boucher	Present	Mr.	Pfifferling	Present
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Present	Dr.	Poor	Present
Mr.	DiBurro	Present	Ms.	Sullivan	Absent
Mr.	Dorrance	Present	Mrs	. Perkins	Present
Ms.	Hernandez-Bailey	Absent	May	or Fiorentini	Absent
Dr.	Marotta	Present			

Also present were:

A. Michael	Carroll MCPPO, Senior Project Manager - Colliers Project Leaders
Michele	Rogers, AIA, MCPPO, Senior Associate, Dore+Whittier
Suzanne	Yeung, MCPPO, Colliers Project Leaders
Allison	Barnes, Assistant Project Manager - Colliers Project Leaders

II. Review Previous Meeting Minutes for Approval

a. July 17, 2023

A motion was made by Mr. Boucher to approve the minutes as presented. Dr. Poor seconded the motion. A roll call vote was requested with the following results:

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

Motion passes

III. OPM Report

- a. Budget/Invoice
- b. Schedule
- c. MSBA 60% CD Submission
- d. D+W Amendment 5
- e. Colliers Contract Amendment for Code and Structural Consultant
- f. 3rd Party Fire Protection RFP

IV. Building Efficiencies

- a. Ground Source Heat Pumps
- b. Solar Readiness / Additional Scope
- c. Composting Update

V. Design Team Report

a. Design Overview

VI. Existing Proprietary Items Vote

VII. Next Steps

a. Next SBC meeting to be held Monday August 28th, standard time of 9:00 am.

VIII. Questions and Comments



IX. Adjourn

III. OPM Report.

Mr. Carroll stated there was no new information on invoices from both Colliers and Dore+Whittier and that the project remains within budget. He related that there were no new information and a general update. Mr. Carroll provided a schedule review to the 60% CD phase with bidding beginning early next year. He reviewed the project's "60% estimate schedule for the next month phase":

07/27/23	Thursday	Release 60% documents
08/16/23	Wednesday	Estimates due back (3 weeks)
08/22/23	Tuesday	Reconciliation and Creation of the VE LOG (all should be thinking VE prior to this)
08/23/23	Wednesday	VE Pricing back from estimators by the end of day
08/24/23	Thursday	Colliers & Dore+Whittier review VE and finalize list (may be some questions back to the estimators)
08/25/23	Friday	Colliers & Dore+Whittier review with Haverhill Leadership Team
08/28/23	Monday	Haverhill SBC Meeting (approval to submit the 60%)
08/31/23	Thursday	Submission to the MSBA

Mr. Carroll commented that the 60% submission would be a similar to the previous one with a very prescriptive format.

Ms. Rogers acknowledged that her team was working diligently to complete binder for the 60% submission and would have further details later in the meeting.

Ms. Yeung provided an overview of amendment 5 along with documentation (i.e., surveys).

Ms. Rogers noted that additional survey work was needed for a complete survey of the Consentino side of the property.

Mr. Carroll related that a line item in the budget was needed for reimbursables (\$15,000 allowance).

There were no questions on these items.

Mr. Carroll reported that these requests were within the overall budget and asked for an approval vote.

A motion was made by Mr. Pfifferling to approve D+W Amendment 5. Mr. Boucher seconded the motion. A roll call vote was requested with the following results:

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

Motion passes

Regarding Colliers Contract Amendment for Code and Structural Consultant, Ms. Yeung explained that proposals were obtained, reviewed and these were the companies that were recommended for each of these undertakings (in the amount of \$10,000 and \$4,800).



Mr. Carroll explained that local officials had requested a third-party code review and also a fire protection one which was currently in process and would be submitted for approval at a forthcoming building committee meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Boucher to approve the Colliers Contract Amendment for Code and Structural Consultant. Mr. Pfifferling seconded the motion. Dr. Marotta, Chairperson Pro tem requested a roll call vote was requested with the following results:

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

Motion passes

Mr. Carroll noted the next item would be Building Efficiencies which included the following three (3) groups:

- 1) Ground Source Heat Pumps
- 2) Solar Readiness/Additional Scope
- 3) Composting Update

Superintendent Marotta informed the building committee that questions continue to arise from several people regarding energy efficiency for this school. She indicated that these topics had been covered previously however, a request had been made for Mr. Carroll and his team to provide a deep dive into the energy efficiency options to avoid missing any opportunities.

Mr. Carroll related that energy efficiency questions were raised surrounding ground source heat pumps and that this option along with others had been explored earlier in the project (1½ years ago). He noted the decision had been made to proceed with the current design option for HVAC etc. Mr. Carroll highlighted the fact that the building project currently exceeded the minimum for energy efficiency according to the codes and there was a possibility of receiving energy credits from Mass Save in the amount of \$225,000 (a very energy efficient building). He emphasized the many factors that went into determining energy efficiency.

Mr. Carroll provided a very detailed report on ground source heat pumps to the committee (reference energy review). He described that due to the number of wells that were needed for the school it would require the relocation of the student population during installation and construction. Mr. Carroll stated that to adjust the design the projected cost would be \$11,473,589. He believed that savings (energy reimbursements) could be achieved after construction in the amount of \$7.8M. Mr. Carroll noted that finding the \$11M would be difficult at this time.

Mr. Boucher indicated that the costs associated with the relocation of students were not included in the \$11.4M.

Mr. Dorrance clarified the loops and vaults (lighting, pumps and pipes) were required for the school and there was a need for accessibility (all vaults will not be covered).

Mr. Carroll reviewed the design team's projected costs and usage for a similar project (Swampscott) for comparison purposes (energy cost, annual maintenance cost and expected equipment replacement cost with no solar). He noted that taking all of these factors (long-term operational costs)



there was a potential for \$68,000/year over life cycle (premium would be \$3.6M/53-year return on investment). Mr. Carroll reported that the equipment would have to be replaced during life cycle and there could be advancements in this field that would be more beneficial technologies than ground source heat pumps. He concluded this option would result in a net increase in project costs.

A conversation was held between Superintendent Marotta and Mr. Carroll regarding occupancy of building (spring/summer 2026). During this discourse, Mr. Carroll proposed that the students would be moved out to alternate location on day 1 of construction and site work. The superintendent acknowledged a site for 1,000 students would be needed by March 2024.

In reference to solar, Mr. Carroll related that it was a solar-ready school building with later installation. He outlined several alternatives with respective costs including the requirement of a full solar study: \$1.3M (installation and city-owned) or installation after school was built with installer (third-party) taking most if not all upfront costs. Mr. Carroll stated an important consideration was in the owner-option the surplus energy could be sold back to the grid, however, the caveat is that transmission costs would still be paid for the energy. He explained that in the third-party option the payment would be to the installation company and not the utility company. Mr. Carroll outlined that solar panels would supply all energy for the building (electric neutral). He noted that with ground source heat pumps, solar energy would assume 70% of the power (solely electric, no gas) and the only way to achieve 100% solar powered building would to add panels over the parking lot (impact on parking at the school).

Mr. Boucher asked about the timeline for decisions, since this option had been discussed at many times. He inquired about value engineering to result in \$1.3M or to seek additional funds.

Mr. Dorrance added that there would be a necessity for a 100% roof and solar panel replacement in approximately 25 years (significant capital project). He offered that it could cost possibly \$25M.

Mr. Boucher referenced that the mayor indicated that he would be consulting with Orlando Pacheco regarding solar panels (action item). He inquired about the third-party installation and if it could be part of building project. Mr. Boucher wanted to avoid repeated history, i.e., extensive debate on the high school roof replacement and solar panel installation matter proposed several years ago that resulted in the city paying the total cost of a new high school roof.

Mr. Carroll offered some possibilities including solar panels included in bid (January 2024) along with an accelerated solar panel study process. He stated that the decision would need to be made very quickly to avoid delays and associated escalation costs. Mr. Carroll indicated that there was another option for change order.

Ms. Rogers commented that solar panels were not included in the cost estimates/budget and there would need to be an explanation for this change to MSBA.

- Mr. Boucher advocated for the solar panel installation and finding a way to accomplish this option.
- Dr. Marotta questioned whether MSBA would assume the \$1.3M cost.
- Mr. Carroll responded that MSBA would not approve since we were at the 80% reimbursement level.



- Dr. Marotta asked how realistic it was to value engineered \$1.3M in this project. She asked if it was possible to plan for solar panels included in the construction process.
- Mr. Carroll advised making the decision within a short timeframe since the project was already on a tight schedule. He asked Ms. Rogers about costs of a solar study.
- Ms. Rogers inquired whether the committee would approve a cost not to exceed for the solar study or prefer the study cost proposals be brought to the committee at the next meeting.
- Mr. Carroll believed having the numbers available to evaluate options was a good approach.
- Mr. Pfifferling advised against proceeding with the ground source heat source but strongly encouraged installation of solar panels (owning not leasing). He noted solar panel technology could advance in 25 years resulting in alternative methods. Mr. Pfifferling questioned if the city could bond the installation cost and could be done outside the school building project.
- Mr. Carroll counseled doing the installation outside the project and consultation with MSBA.
- Ms. Rogers suggested coordination with design team.
- Mr. Boucher strongly encouraged that the solar panel installation be part of the school building project due to the political climate and the many changes in Haverhill politics. His opinion was it is the right thing to do for the students and the community.
- Mr. Pfifferling would support a motion.
- Mr. Boucher made a motion to add solar panels to the budget and start a solar study with a maximum allocation of \$100,000 to be accomplished as soon as possible.

Superintendent Marotta asked if additions could be made to the budget.

Mr. Carroll replied that if the motion was relative to changes in designer fees could be taken out of project contingencies, however, the \$1.3M construction cost figure quoted was not a firm number. He offered it would depend on the adding to the budget or achieving the funds through value engineering.

In reference to Dr. Marotta's comment on school building committee authority to increase the budget, Mr. Carroll replied that MSBA would have to be apprised on the changes and provide funding sources.

- Dr. Marotta suggested that the study could be authorized with a funding cap on the study including a deadline for reviewing the results.
- Mr. Boucher recommended value engineering be conducted on the solar panels along conducting solar study.
- Mr. Carroll would ask the estimators for pricing with a value engineering option with a negative value.
- Mr. Dorrance commented that solar panels could not be paid through value engineering exercises. He believed that the committee had been very prudent with this project. Mr. Dorrance offered that early in



the project the mayor had advised that there was only a certain amount of money and decisions were then made based on those assumptions. He stated that both ground source heat pumps and solar panels had been ruled in/out based on the mayor's guidance and experience. Mr. Dorrance advised against retrospective decisions and would vote against the study based on the cost and delay of the project.

Ms. Yeung offered that IRA and IRS had recently instituted tax credits/incentives for municipalities and/or school districts to offset the cost solar panel installation.

Mr. Boucher appreciated Mr. Dorrance's opinion and expertise, however, the school building committee had not had these conversations regarding these types of energy efficiencies.

Mr. Boucher made a motion to do a solar study with a cap of \$100,000 along with conducting a value engineering study to cover the estimated \$1.3M cost as well as determining the cost from a design perspective.

It was recommended to vote on two separate motions.

Mr. Boucher made a motion to do a solar study with a cap of \$100,000. Dr. Poor seconded the motion.

Dr. Marotta, Chair pro tem requested a roll call vote:

Mr.	Boucher	Yes	Dr.	Marotta	Yes
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Absent	Mr.	Pfifferling	Yes
Mr.	DiBurro	Absent	Dr.	Poor	Yes
Mr.	Dorrance	No	Mrs.	Perkins	Yes

Since at the time of the roll call, there was not a quorum of the building committee, the members who had left the meeting (Mr. Bucuzzo and Mr. DiBurro) would be contacted and the vote would be redone once there was a quorum.

Ms. Rogers provided a composting update. She noted that Dore+Whittier would be providing the physical means for composting to include bins, composting stations, signage. Ms. Rogers reported that these receptacles would be placed in the cafeteria, kitchen and staff lunch rooms adjacent to other receptacles and a refrigeration/refrigerated room (trash, recycle and composting room) would be installed to prevent unpleasant odors in the space. She noted that there were two ways of composting either in-house process or outsourcing.

It was clarified that the means for composting was included in the 60%.

Ms. Rogers stated that all storage would be include inside the building. She noted that if in-house composting was chosen decisions would be made at a later date.

Mr. Bucuzzo joined the meeting securing a quorum of the building committee.

Mr. Boucher made a motion to do a solar study with a cap of \$100,000. Mr. Pfifferling seconded the motion.



Dr. Marotta, Chair pro tem requested a roll call vote:

Mr.	Boucher	Yes	Mr.	Pfifferling	Yes
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Yes	Dr.	Poor	Yes
Mr.	Dorrance	No	Mrs.	Perkins	Yes
Dr.	Marotta	Yes			

Motion passes

A motion was made by Mr. Boucher to consider the solar panels as a value engineering option and request project management to confirm the pricing and offer options. Mr. Pfifferling seconded the motion. Dr. Marotta, Chair pro tem requested a roll call vote:

Mr.	Boucher	Yes	Mr.	Pfifferling	Yes	
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Yes	Dr.	Poor	No	
Mr.	Dorrance	No	Mrs.	Perkins	Yes	
Dr.	Marotta	Yes				

Motion passes

Mr. Carroll noted that value engineering results would be on the next agenda.

IV. Design Team Report.

Ms. Rogers presented some renderings of the Consentino School to update the committee. She highlighted the following on the first slide; raising the grade wall height reduced and now has a maximum height of 13" at the center of the retaining wall along with increased parking with the addition of parking spaces in several areas such as, 20 spaces for a total of 105; 15 spaces for a total of 88 for a 193 total parking spaces (handicapped and electric vehicle charging stations). Ms. Rogers continued with a review of several slides showing the choice of materials that took into consideration the design features including maintenance and cost-effective materials. She remarked on the entrance features with distinctive columns.

VII. Next Steps

a. Next SBC meeting to be held Monday August 28th, standard time of 9:00 am.

There was discussion regarding the proposed meeting. Superintendent Marotta indicated that August 28, 2023 was a better date since this was the first week of school.

Mr. Carroll and Ms. Rogers spoke about the potential of omitting the September 7, 2023 meeting with the possibility of a later September meeting.

Mr. Boucher expressed his appreciation to the team.

A motion was made by Mr. Boucher to adjourn the meeting (10:42 am). Mr. Pfifferling seconded the motion. A roll call vote was requested with the following results:

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



Motion passes

Documents referenced:

4. ab. Energy ReviewR2.pdf;

3.a HCMS Monthly OPM Report (June 2023).pdf;

3.b 2023 08-03 Haverhill Excel Full Schedule.pdf;

3.b Schedule view (1).pdf

3.e CPL Amendment 2 2023-08-02.pdf;

3.d 2023 07-20 Amd 05 (1).pdf;