

# Coakley Middle School Building Committee

## Coakley Middle School Building Committee (MSBC) Meeting On-line Meeting hosted via ZOOM Platform

Due to COVID-19

May 23, 2022 – 5:00 p.m.

**Approved Unanimously 6/11/22**

Mr. Slater called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**Attendees: (A= attended meeting; P= attended partial meeting)**

	<b>MSBC Voting members</b>		<b>MSBC Voting members</b>		<b>Ai3 Architects (Ai3)</b>
A	Alan Slater – Chair	A	Diane Ferreira – Principal of Balch Elementary School		James Jordan - Principal
	Tom Maloney - Selectman	A	Dr. Margo Fraczek – Principal of Coakley Middle School	A	Justin Thibeault – Sr. Associate
A	Matt Lane - Selectman	A	David Hiltz – School Committee Member	A	Kristen Kendall - Architect
	Matthew Walsh – Building Commissioner		<b>Compass Project Mgmt (CPM)</b>		
A	Paul Riccardi – Director of Town-wide Facilities		Tim Bonfatti – Principal		<b>Public Attendees:</b>
A	Cathy Carney, MCPPO - Purchasing	A	Bryan Jarvis – Project Director		Dana Brown – Interim Project Administrator
A	Bob Donnelly - Selectman	A	Chin Lin – Senior Project Manager		Norwood Community Media
A	Dr. David Thomson - Superintendent	A	Chase Terrio – Senior Project Manager		
A	Teresa Stewart – School Committee member	A	Diane Guenthner – Project Coordinator		

**Distribution:** MSBC members and other Attendees (A or P);

**1. Opening Remarks**

Mr. Slater welcomed everyone to the May 23rd, Middle School Building Committee Meeting. Mr. Slater informed The Committee that starting next month, the meetings will be a Hybrid.

**2. Introduction of Chase Terrio**

Mr. Jarvis introduced Chase Terrio a new Senior Project Manager with Compass. Chase will be transitioning for Chin over the next several weeks. Chase has a very strong background in the construction industry over the last decade and has also worked for a CM. Mr. Terrio, addressed the Committee, stating he is very excited to join the project. It looks to be a beautiful building and beautiful addition to the Town of Norwood.

**3. Project Schedule for Construction Manager @ Risk Process**

Mr. Terrio updated the Committee explaining after last month’s MSBC meeting, Compass filed our application to use CM@ Risk method with the Inspector General’s office. They have confirmed as received the application on April 27, 2022. On May 20<sup>th</sup> we met with the Selection Subcommittee which was formed at last month’s MSBC meeting to approve the RFQ of bidders and review the timeline of

the response. Mr. Terrio stated we expect to receive 8-10 responses. Once received, we will review and narrow the list to a selected group of those who qualify. Once we have the short list, we will issue a request for proposal to those qualified respondents. Those responses will be due at the end of July 2022, we will then interview each and make a recommendation to The Committee. We would like to align the CM@Risk award with the development of the CD Documents.

Mr. Slater asked if waiting on approval from the IG's office will have any influence on the schedule? Mr. Terrio answered, it is an administrative process with the state, it is not going to drive the schedule from a solicitation standpoint. Mr. Lin added that the IG's office legally has 60 days to review, but we usually receive a response between 30-40 days. We anticipate having the response any day.

Mr. Donnelly asked how is the RFP advertised and how do the bidders find the information for the project? Mr. Terrio replied we post it with the Central Registry and the Town through Combuys. There will also be a legal ad in The Norwood Record as well. We will ask Ms. Carney to post the physical paper copy in the Town Hall. From those notices they direct you to a website called ProjectDog where respondents will go to download the project documents for bidding. Mr. Jarvis added we have already had a lot of interest in this project with CM firms. The Central Register is where they will be looking for that. To clarify, Mr. Donnelly's question mentioned RFP, the RFQ which is open to all potentially qualified Construction Managers, will be distributed through all of the public procurement means. The RFP is sent only to the firms that were shortlisted.

#### **4. Project Update and Schedule**

Mr. Thibeault explained we will go over schedules and then renderings along with Ms. Kendall. For the project schedule, right now we are in the middle of Design Development phase. We are still on track to submit the 100% DD Documents and report to the MSBA on July 20<sup>th</sup>. There are other submission documents following that which are 60% Construction Documents (CDs), 90% CDs and 100% Bid Documents will be submitted on March 15<sup>th</sup> 2023. Construction is to begin Spring of 2023 with occupancy of the new building Fall 2025. Wrapping up site work 2026 all are weather dependent. The overall project schedule has not changed that much. Mr. Thibeault informed the Committee of meetings that have taken place and upcoming meetings all of the information from these meetings will go into the documents. Today was the first day with Geotech Borings on-site, there are five days for Borings. May 27<sup>th</sup> there will be Haz-Mat testing on-site. Scope confirmation meetings are scheduled for next week. Mr. Thibeault explained for June there will be safety/security round #2 meeting, June 8<sup>th</sup> documents are going out for estimating and commissioning agent review. There will be a follow up meeting with safety/security middle of June including Police and Fire. June 24<sup>th</sup> estimates are due we will be receiving estimates from Ai3 estimators as well as, from Compass's estimators. June 28<sup>th</sup> we will do estimate reconciliation to ensure that appropriate scope was carried on both estimates. We will have an idea of what the actual cost of the project is based on these estimates. In July there is a MSBC meeting on July 11<sup>th</sup>, we are targeting July 20<sup>th</sup> for the MSBA Submission of DD Phase. We may need to have a MSBC meeting on July 18<sup>th</sup> this meeting is in case the estimates come in significantly higher than the budget, we will need to do a value engineering process to keep the project on budget. Mr. Jarvis added that with the volatility of the market, although we have escalation and inflation accounted for we should anticipate needing some sort of value engineering. We will be working with the district and working group ahead of time to come up with some recommendations. Mr. Thibeault continued with the next scheduling item is the Permitting Schedule. We are required to submit two permits, one to the Planning Board and one to the Zoning Board. Planning for section 10.5 Site Plan Approval, October 7<sup>th</sup> we will submit for the site plan review, there will be follow up hearings and on November 21<sup>st</sup> a hearing and assume approval. August 26<sup>th</sup> we will submit documents for Zoning Review, for alteration of the non-conforming structure. There will be follow up hearings and on November 8<sup>th</sup> a hearing and assume approval.

Mr. Slater added that we did have discussions with the Planning Director and Town Council. This is their recommendation.

Mr. Riccardi asked to discuss the Geotech Boring this morning. Facilities was expecting a walk-through to identify the 10 sites. When we got there at 7:30 am, the machine was already there. There was miscommunication. Mr. Thibeault confirmed communication will be clear moving forward.

## **5. Interior and Exterior Renderings**

Ms. Kendall began by describing the interior 600 seat Auditorium, the design uses darker neutral colors in hues of blue which will be a common theme throughout the school. A lot of wood veneer is used. There is a performance technology studio also. The Student Commons has a neutral tile for durability along the walls. There will be mixed seating styles with varying colors. The Auditorium entrance is located to the left. The Gymnasium has seating for 275 and 1.5 full size courts with drop down divider curtains creating three half court zones. There is a dedicated sound system for this space and direct access to the outdoors. School branding is prevalent throughout. There are 36 typical classrooms each classroom is associated with an academic team and has a color associated with it. There is the blue team, the green team and the gold team this is to create a sense of identity.

Ms. Carney commented that in the Auditorium it is difficult to have a wall at the end of each of the rows. Is there a way to make it more accessible? Mr. Thibeault replied that the biggest concern with that is the amount of space that would take up. We would have to lose multiple seats on each side to provide an aisle. Mr. Slater asked if Mr. Thibeault could provide some options that would be available for the Committee to make a decision. Mr. Thibeault confirmed we could do that.

Mr. Thibeault reviewed the exterior of the building showing the front entry with the blue frame around the Library Media Center. The lower commons are on the left and Gymnasium is on the right of the building. Primary entry points are on the left and right of the Library Media Center with the Administrative suites below. The front aerial image shows the branding with the Norwood "N" and Mustang on the stage. Branding on the left corner of the performing arts and on the right for athletics. Mr. Thibeault discussed areas they are looking at and had heard concerns about. The two major items are the signage and the bold blue color around the Library Media Center. There are four options to review. The first option is keeping the same bold blue, the Norwood "N" has been removed from the stage. The blue sign on the left and right as well as, the mustang logo have also been removed. Option 1 is keeping the blue around the Library Media Center. Option 2 is using slate blue around the Library Media Center, it is grey with a hint of blue. Option 3 is light grey around the Library Media Center. All options will keep the blue canopy over the entrance ways to identify the entrance. The 4<sup>th</sup> option is a dark grey around the Library Media Center. Mr. Thibeault asked for The Committee to vote on which option they would like to pursue.

Ms. Ferreira asked why the logos were removed? Mr. Slater answered there had been some comments from people that they did not like the logos for various reasons.

Dr. Thomson added, Norwood has had this branding and the kids are attached to it, he does not see why we would be removing it.

Mr. Slater remarked looking at the aerial view without the logo looks like a big empty space. Dr. Thomson agreed. Mr. Riccardi commented the more you mute the color and take the logos away the more it looks like an apartment complex and not a school. Mr. Riccardi stated he liked the dark blue and the logos. Ms. Ferreira agreed and would vote for the dark blue with the logos.

**MOTION:** Mr. Riccardi motioned to keep the dark blue and the logos.

**SECOND:** by Mr. Hiltz

VOTE: Roll Call Vote was taken 10-0-0

**6. Contract Amendment for Ai3**

Mr. Thibeault explained that the amendment will essentially carry us through the DD phase, Construction Document phase as well as, through the Construction Administration. The MSBA requires the contract to be broken up into two phases. The first phase is through Schematic Design and the second phase is now. Mr. Slater asked Mr. Lin to confirm that Compass has reviewed this and is comfortable with the scope and the numbers. Mr. Lin replied, this has been reviewed and is within the budget. Mr. Lin added for clarification, the original contract with Ai3 was \$900,000 for Feasibility and Design phase. The remaining is from DD to completion will be an additional \$10,723,517. The total contract will be \$11,623,517.

**MOTION:** Ms Carney motioned to approve the Contract Amendment for Ai3.

**SECOND:** by Mr. Donnelly

VOTE: Roll Call Vote was taken 10-0-0

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the April 11, 2022 meeting.

**MOTION:** Ms. Carney motioned to approve the meeting minutes.

**SECOND:** by Dr. Thomson

VOTE: Roll Call Vote was taken 8-0-2

Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Hiltz abstained from voting as they were not at the last meeting.

**7. Vendor Invoice Package for the month of March 2022**

Mr. Lin explained this is for the month of April services. One item for Compass Services \$16,231.75 and a reimbursable from Ai3 for printing for \$768.46 for a total of \$17,000.21

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve the Vendor Invoice Package for March 2022.

**MOTION:** Mr. Lane motioned to approve the Vendor Invoice Package.

**SECOND:** by Dr. Thomson

VOTE: Roll Call Vote was taken 8-0-0

Mr. Riccardi requested that he would like to address The Committee for the energy management system to be sole proprietary having ABS as are in other buildings in town. Mr. Slater asked if that was an option to be sole proprietary. Mr. Lin answered yes, under public bid regulation it is allowed to be proprietary as long as, The Committee approves it and provides a reason. The reason would be that it is a system that is used in other town buildings. Mr. Slater suggested discussing this at the next meeting.

Mr. Slater confirmed the next meeting on June 13, would be a Hybrid meeting.

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION:** Mr. Donnelly motioned to adjourn.

**SECOND:** by Mr. Lane

VOTE: Voice Vote was taken 10-0-0  
quorum

Respectfully submitted,

Chin Lin  
Senior Project Manager  
Compass Project Management

Attachments:  
Compass Presentation dated 05-23-22