

# Coakley Middle School Building Committee

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

Due to COVID-19

June 13, 2022 – 5:00 p.m.

**Approved Unanimously 7/11/22**

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		Diane Ferreira – Principal of Balch Elementary School		James Jordan - Principal
	Tom Maloney - Selectman		Dr. Margo Fraczek – Principal of Coakley Middle School	A	Justin Thibeault – Sr. Associate
A	Matt Lane - Selectman	A	David Hiltz – School Committee Member		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	A	Dana Brown – Interim Project Administrator
A	Bob Donnelly - Selectman		Chin Lin – Senior Project Manager		Norwood Community Media
A	Dr. David Thomson - Superintendent	A	Chase Terrio – Senior Project Manager	A	Charisse Taylor – Norwood Public Schools
A	Teresa Stewart – School Committee member	A	Diane Guenther – Project Coordinator		
A	Tony Mazzucco – Building Committee	A	Anissa Ellis – Project Manager		

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

**1. Opening Remarks**

Mr. Slater welcomed everyone to the June 13, 2022 Middle School Building Committee Meeting. Mr. Slater noted that this meeting is taking place in the Finance Committee room at Town Hall (room 24) and via Zoom.

**2. Construction CM at Risk Selection Process Update:**

Compass Project Management (CPM) posted the CM at Risk Request for Qualifications (RFQ) publicly on June 1 and Ms. Carney posted the plan holders list on the Town website. Mr. Terrio noted that there has been great interest. There has been one question so far from a respondent requesting clarification regarding length of proposal. An Addenda was issued addressing this question to allow us to accept larger response proposals. Ms. Carney requested a copy of the addenda so she can post it on the Town Website along with the plan holders list.

Schedule Review: Responses are due Thursday 6/16/22 and the selection committee will meet next week. The goal is to have a short list of prequalified CM's by the 7/11/22 MSBC meeting. Request for Proposal (RFP) will go out 7/11/22 and will be due 7/27/22 the interview process will follow, dates TBD. Selection committee needs to interview all respondents to the RFP. Mr. Slater asked if there are further questions, there are none.

**3. Project and Project Update Schedule (Ai3 Slide Presentation):**

Mr. Thibeault reviewed the project schedule explaining that we are nearing the end of DD and targeting submission to MSBA on July 20. Following the 100% DD Phase there will also be a 60% CD submission in the fall, 90% CD submission in January, 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.

**Slide Review – Project Schedule Design Development:**

Completed items include Phase 2 Geotech with 10 additional boring done on site. There was also some additional hazmat testing around the existing building foundation. And additional scope coordination meetings with 4 different groups within the building to confirm the estimators are providing accurate cost estimates. Forthcoming Items include a second round safety and security meeting, currently scheduled for next week. Estimates are due back to Ai3 June 24, and the estimate reconciliation is scheduled for June 28. The reconciliation is the review of the Compass Project Management estimator and the Ai3 Estimators to review and align scopes. The outcome of this meeting becomes the cost of the project.

**Question:** Mr. Riccardi wants clarification on when the CM gets to review plans and verify the constructability etc. and if we will have to make decisions based on the reconciliation without the CM.

**Answer:** Mr. Thibeault replied we will need to make decisions without the CM based on the estimate reconciliation.

**Discussion:** Mr. Riccardi noted this seemed “backwards” and the CM should be on board before we make any cuts to the project as they are taking on all the risk. Mr. Jarvis clarified that the CM is not taking all the risk, they are sharing the risk and assisting in the design phase. When they put together the final GMP they are assuming risk because they are not entitled to any additional compensation if they go over the final GMP amount. Mr. Thibeault explained that we need to submit an estimate and documents that reflects that estimate to the MSBA by 7/20 if we waited for the CM to be on board it would push the schedule out.

Right now we are not working off construction documents and the CM will be working off the Construction documents when they provide their GMP. Mr. Slater noted that it's easier to make reductions now than it will be in the future.

Mr. Slater asked if we anticipate value engineering after the estimate reconciliation. Mr. Thibeault replied yes, there will be value engineering after the estimate reconciliation based on the current market and other recent bids. There is value engineering at all stages, as the plans become more developed there will be less value engineering required. Mr. Jarvis noted that the value engineering items can be reintroduced if the budget allows. Mr. Thibeault noted the CM will be on board prior to the 60% and 90% documents and the CM is involved in those estimates.

Mr. Thibeault noted we will probably need 2 meetings in July to review V/E. Currently suggesting 7/11 and 7/18 for meeting dates with the committee voting on V/E at the 7/18 meeting so Ai3 can submit to MSBA on 7/20. All documents for V/E review will be distributed prior the meetings for review by the committee.

**Slides Review– Auditorium**

A question regarding access to the front bank of seating was asked at the last meeting.

The current auditorium configuration is 607 seats with an upper and lower section and 2 center aisles in each section, similar to the high school. There was a question about adding 2 more aisles on the sides of the lower section. This would remove 48 seats and leave a total of 559 seats.

**Question:** Mr. Slater asked about additional aisles on the upper seats in the Auditorium as none are shown on the slides. **Answer:** Mr. Thibeault replied adding more aisles will eliminate more seats similar to the scenario on the lower section.

**Discussion:** Option #01 is to remain as designed, this is the most efficient layout for the auditorium and meets all codes. Option #02 adds aisles on the sides of the lower section and reduces the number of overall seats.

Mr. Slater asked how difficult it would be to go to MSBA to increase the size of the auditorium and thus the building, so they can have the 607 seats and the extra aisles.

Mr. Thibeault answered Option 2 is not typical for middle schools and changing the auditorium size affects the MSBA reimbursement rate because the auditorium is not reimbursable. Mr. Thibeault noted the performing arts director wanted to maximize the seat count and prefers Option #01.

**MOTION:** by Mr. Riccardi to approve Option #01.

**SECOND:** by Mr. Donnelly

**VOTE:** Roll Call - Unanimous vote to approve Option #01. 9 – 0 – 0

#### **4. Recommendation of Sole Source Justification of Automated Building Systems:**

Discussion on proprietary specification. Mr. Riccardi noted this is the system they have at the High School and hope to have at the Police and Fire station. The Middle School will be the third location. Mr. Riccardi, as facilities manager, is looking to make this the Town standard. Mr. Terrio noted this will need to be presented to and approved by the MSBA as well as the committee. This is the only proprietary item being proposed at this time. Mr. Thibeault noted other previously discussed and approved proprietary items include keying standards, door closers, and misc. other hardware specs.

**MOTION:** by Ms. Carney motions to accept the proprietary spec.

**SECOND:** by Mr. Hiltz

**VOTE:** Roll Call vote passes unanimously 9 – 0 – 0

#### **5. Recommendation of IDS as BMS Automation Consultant**

Discussion on IDS being recommended as a controls consultant. Mr. Terrio noted this is a consultant we have worked with on other projects and their function is to help facilitate the controls design and engineering specs, equipment, energy goals for the building and ensure all those items work together correctly. IDS starts in the DD phase of the job with specification review and creation. During the construction phase they do submittal reviews and approvals as well as make site visits and provide observations to the team. Once the building is turned over they remain on board for 24 months with quarterly site visits, operational inspections, and assistance with user training to ensure the building is working as designed.

**Question:** Mr. Slater asked if they are available for consultation after the 2 year period ends.

**Answer:** Mr. Terrio assumes they would be available after the two years if requested for an additional fee. **Discussion:** Mr. Riccardi and Mr. Jarvis note the High School building did not have this level of oversight. IDS investigates the project design to make sure the design matches how the town plans to use the building. They make sure the contractor installs everything correctly per the specifications/requirements and then IDS does the in depth commissioning at the end.

Mr. Riccardi explained that there were issues between the ABS subs and the mechanical engineers in a previous project. This commissioning agent streamlines this process.

Mr. Jarvis notes that the controls contractors are subs to the HVAC sub. Sometimes the systems are set up to get custom graphics that the controls people put together but there can be errors with the code and they don't all get flushed out during commissioning, IDS is on board to help eliminate some of this confusion. They are a more in-depth participant for the building controls and will help the owner who does not always have the staff or knowledge to participate in controls specific meetings and design.

**Question:** Mr. Slater asks if IDS is involved in setting up equipment/computers/relays on the head end so staff can review what is happening in different areas of the buildings.

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis noted that yes, IDS will work the contractors to make sure they set up the head end for the owner. They will also review/test the systems in the field and provide in depth training to the owner. They are on board to make sure the building operates as designed and hits all the efficiently goals and operating cost goals.

**Question:** Ms. Carney asked if they are part of the Ai3 Team,

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis noted they are a consultant to the Compass team representing the owner.

**Question:** Ms. Carney asked about experience with the proprietary system approved today.

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis stated IDS has have experience with all the major systems.

**Question:** Paul asked if the IDS fee is included with Compass contract.

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis noted this is above and beyond the CPM contract but there is enough in the project budget to carry this as it was anticipated as something the Town would want to do.

**Question:** Mr. Donnelly asked to review the IDS proposed fee structure again and asked how long a period of time this covers.

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis noted this would start immediately in the design phase through CD's through construction phase plus 2 years of after occupancy support.

**Question:** Mr. Slater asked if they include construction services

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis noted yes it includes construction services including submittal review, start up, and commissioning.

**Question:** Ms. Carney asked if the \$50,000 is high for the ongoing support.

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis stated CPM is trying to clarify if that's a retainer or that's an on-call item. CPM stated that number can be reviewed with IDS.

**Discussion:** Mr. Slater suggests that CPM gets clarification on the \$50,000 amount for the committee to review prior to voting. Mr. Jarvis agrees and states that we should approve this proposal by next meeting so they can review and make comments on the DD documents. Paul notes that ABS, the controls system, will also provide follow up after the building is open and operating. Mr. Jarvis noted that IDS will need to be coordinated with the controls vendor and commissioning agent. IDS will also help with low energy credits and the required trending and logging to prove that the building is operating as designed. **Question:** Mr. Slater asked how much of the IDS fee is involved with the PV

**Answer:** Mr. Jarvis noted that this does not include any PV monitoring.

**Voting is Deferred to the next meeting on 7/11.**

#### **6. Vote to Approve Meeting Minutes from 5/23/22 meeting:**

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve the Meeting Minutes from 5/23/22

**MOTION:** by Mr. Mazzucco

**SECOND:** by Ms. Carney

**VOTE:** Roll Call Vote was taken 9-0-0

#### **7. Vote to Approve Vendor Invoice Package**

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve.

**MOTION:** by Mr. Donnelly

**SECOND:** by Mr. Thompson

VOTE: Voice Vote was taken 9-0-0

**8. Adjourn**

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to adjourn

**MOTION:** by Mr. Mazzucco

**SECOND:** by Ms. Carney

VOTE: Voice Vote was taken 9-0-0

Respectfully submitted,

Anissa Ellis  
Project Manager  
Compass Project Management

Attachments:

Ai3 Presentation dated 05-23-22  
IDS Proposal  
Sole Source Justification of ABS