

Coakley Middle School Building Committee

**Coakley Middle School Building Committee (MSBC) Meeting
On-line Meeting hosted via ZOOM Platform
Due to COVID-19
July 11, 2022 – 5:00 p.m.
Approved Unanimously 7/18/22**

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

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

	MSBC Voting members		MSBC Voting members		Ai3 Architects (Ai3)
A	Mr. Slater – Chair		Diane Ferreira – Principal of Balch Elementary School		James Jordan - Principal
	Tom Maloney - Selectman	A	Dr. Ms. Fraczek – Principal of Coakley Middle School	A	Mr. Thibeault – Sr. Associate
A	Matt Lane - Selectman		David Hiltz – School Committee Member		Kristen Kendall - Architect
	Matthew Walsh – Building Commissioner		Compass Project Mgmt (CPM)		
A	Mr. Riccardi – Director of Town-wide Facilities		Tim Bonfatti – Principal		Public Attendees:
A	Ms. Carney, MCPPO - Purchasing	A	Mr. Jarvis – Project Director	A	Dana Brown – Interim Project Administrator
A	Bob Donnelly - Selectman		Chin Lin – Senior Project Manager		Norwood Community Media
	Dr. David Thomson - Superintendent		Chase Terrio – Senior Project Manager	A	Charisse Taylor – Norwood Public Schools
A	Teresa Stewart – School Committee member	A	Diane Guenther – Project Coordinator		
	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 July 11, 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. Mr. Slater noted there is quorum in the room and this meeting is particularly important because it will include discussion and action to reduce the cost of construction.

2. Approval of Minutes from June 13:

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 13, 2022, meeting.

MOTION: by Mr. Donnelly

SECOND: by Mr. Lane

VOTE: Roll Call - Unanimous vote to approve #01. 7 – 0 – 0

3. Approval of Vendor Invoice Package.

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

MOTION: by Mr. Donnelly

SECOND: by Mr. Lane

VOTE: Roll Call - Unanimous vote to approve. 7 – 0 – 0

4. Recommendation of IDS as BMS Automation Consultant

Mr. Slater noted the next item is to review the use of IDS as the BMS automation consultant for the new building and turned over the floor to Mr. Jarvis.

Mr. Jarvis noted that since the last meeting IDS provided additional information on the service level and the \$50,000 24-month post occupancy period. All documents were forwarded to the committee prior to the meeting for review. The IDS proposal includes proactive involvement with the building starting with occupancy and continuing for 24 months to capture actual usage data. IDS then uses this data to maximize the building efficiency and as leverage with contractors for any warranty issues. The 24-month period can be adjusted if the committee wants to save some costs. Mr. Jarvis asked Mr. Riccardi for his input on the proposal.

Mr. Riccardi noted that this proposal makes sense however it is adding \$50,000 to already overbudget project. Mr. Jarvis noted that this cost was already accounted for in the budget and is not adding to the project cost. Mr. Riccardi requested clarification because the overall project budget is \$150 million dollars and construction cost is \$113million, so he thinks money saved on soft costs can be applied to the construction budget to allow for less value engineering. Mr. Jarvis stated that to some extent that is possible and further budget management will need to happen as we get closer to construction anyway.

Mr. Riccardi wants to build a building that will “stand the test of time” because the building has a 50-75 year life expectancy. He would also rather save soft cost money if it leads to build a better building. Mr. Riccardi stated he sees the value in IDS and the service they provide, however it’s a lot of money that could be used elsewhere. Ms. Carney asked if the two-year contract for is \$50,000 can the committee proceed with only the first year for \$25,000 and the second year \$25,000 can be taken out of the building’s operating budget.

Mr. Riccardi what period of time is covered by the building warranties. Mr. Jarvis noted that the MSBA will close out the job when the overall job gets to a zero Mr. Slater on the payment application which is typically after the building is occupied and the building warranties can go on for a year. Ms. Carney asked if the warranties start after the acceptance of the building or acceptance of the system. Mr. Jarvis stated that warranties start after acceptance of the building. He clarified that service warranties for the sports fields will not start until those areas are complete and accepted by the Town. So there will be multiple warranty periods for the overall project.

Mr. Riccardi stated he wants to know the extent of building cuts being proposed prior to making a decision on the IDS proposal. Mr. Slater asked Mr. Riccardi if he would like postpone voting on the IDS proposal until the overall cost review has been completed. Mr. Riccardi confirmed.

Mr. Jarvis noted that the committee can proceed with the design development and construction document phase of the IDS proposal and address the remainder of the proposal at a later date. Mr. Slater & Mr. Riccardi agree with this approach. Mr. Slater stated the IDS design phase fee is \$51,000 and construction document phase is \$37,000 coming to a total of \$88,000. Mr. Slater asked if the committee is ok with approving just this portion of the proposal and finalizing the remainder after reviewing overall construction costs. Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve this approach.

MOTION: Mr. Riccardi motioned to approve just the Design & Construction portion of the IDS proposal for \$88,000.

SECOND: by Ms. Carney

No further discussion.

VOTE: Roll Call vote passes unanimously 7 – 0 – 0

5. CM @ Risk Update

Mr. Slater turned the floor over to Mr. Jarvis to provide an update on the CM at Risk process.

Mr. Jarvis stated the team received Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) from 8 firms. The committee reviewed and rated all the SOQ's and narrowed down to a shortlist of 5 firms: Bacon Construction, Consigli Construction, Fontaine Bros., Gilbane Building, and WT Rich. Mr. Jarvis stated the next step in the process is to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) with more project specific details to the shortlist of CM's and then conduct interviews the first week of August. Each CM will submit a technical proposal describing the way they would approach the job including proposed staffing, schedules, etc. The proposals will also include a financial piece with a fee proposal. The selection committee will review and evaluate the proposals and recommended a selected firm to the Building Committee at the August 15 meeting. The committee will then vote to approve the selection and move forward with finalizing a contract so the CM can be involved in the remaining design phase of construction.

Mr. Slater asked if everyone feels comfortable with the 5 shortlisted firms.

Mr. Lane noted that we originally targeted shortlisting only 3 firms but after reviewing all the SOQ's the firms in spots 3-5 rated so closely the committee decided to shortlist the top 5 instead of just 3.

Mr. Riccardi stated that by using a CM vs. a traditional bid the committee is spending about \$5 million.

Mr. Jarvis clarified that a CM at Risk service is approximately a 5% premium added the job.

Mr. Riccardi stated the team needs to agree on \$6.2 million in value engineering cuts and the team does not to have take any of the proposed Category 3 value engineering items. The proposed category 1 and category 2 proposed value engineering items alone will make substantial changes to the life of the building and has asked the committee if they should reconsider moving forward with the CM at risk.

Mr. Riccardi stated that market is unpredictable, and the committee could potentially need to make more value engineering cuts in the future. Ms. Carney asked if the committee could decide to proceed with a design/bid/build vs. a CM at Risk if it will save money.

Mr. Jarvis stated that the committee is only signing up the CM for preconstruction services and those are capped at \$500,000 and that phase will finish filed sub bids in hand. The committee is not contracted for any additional fees until after the design phase and at that point they can reevaluate using the CM at Risk.

Mr. Riccardi stated the committee is "going public" with the proposed building cuts that will affect the quality of the building. He is worried that the citizens of Norwood can potentially look negatively at the project due to the proposed value engineering. Mr. Riccardi is concerned with public perception and wants to make sure the committee is building the best possible building and proposing \$5 million in value engineering is not building the best possible building. Ms. Carney noted that Mr. Riccardi was on the receiving end of the cuts made to the High School job and neither she nor Mr. Riccardi want that to happen again.

Mr. Slater stated the CM at risk process affords the town the opportunity to select the contractor they want for the project. The risk of proceeding design/bid/build is that there may not be many bidders, or the low bidder may be a difficult contractor. Mr. Slater noted the committee has the the ability to drop the CM at Risk later in the process if needed.

Mr. Riccardi asked if value engineering is finalized next week how it affects the CM at Risk process.

Mr. Jarvis noted it only delays things by a week; the CM would still be on board for the 60% CD's and the job doesn't have any early release packages. However, if we value engineering is completed today or next week it doesn't change the fact that the committee needs to make a decision. Mr. Jarvis noted that other towns are in the same boat. The town of Westwood just did design/bid/build and they are still \$3 million over budget going through the same process as Norwood.

Mr. Slater noted that this process is not unusual.

Mr. Jarvis noted that jobs with CM's allow them to get into the budget earlier and potentially release trades early and lock in pricing to save money if pricing increases over time.

Mr. Slater noted that many of the value engineering items proposed can be brought back into the project at a later date if things change. Mr. Jarvis agreed stating if the market changes and allows, there is potential to bring some items those back into the project. Mr. Thibeault noted that most of the proposed value engineering items do not require building redesign to bring them back. Mr. Slater requested the committee defer making a decision until next week. Mr. Riccardi stated he's ok with contracting a CM for preconstruction services only.

Mr. Jarvis noted that \$5 million for the CM premium is a difficult number to define. The Town is paying for a service that will result with a better run job. Also, the committee can dictate the level of service they wish to receive and that can potentially lower overall cost of the premium. Mr. Riccardi stated that lowering the service level results in not getting the service that the Town is paying for.

Mr. Slater asked if there are fewer change orders with CM at risk. Mr. Jarvis stated that generally yes, the CM is looking to lower the potential for change orders. They also build in their own contingency and if they exceed that contingency then it's their risk. Mr. Slater noted that if they are involved in design, they should pick up those items early to eliminate changes in the future. Mr. Jarvis agreed and noted the CM will also be more aware of the market conditions and can plan accordingly. Mr. Jarvis clarified his previous comment and stated with a CM at risk the Town will still get preconstruction services they would not get with a GC even with fewer services. The committee has control over the level of service.

Ms. Carney noted Town can negotiate with a CM and the job an open book policy so the committee can review and comment on all expenses. Mr. Jarvis noted the amount of staffing and number of hours provided by the CM is also a negotiation. The money held for a contingency fund can be negotiated as well.

Ms. Carny noted that design/bid/build doesn't allow for as much control and requests the committee proceed with the CM at Risk preconstruction services and if the town doesn't feel like they are getting the value then they can reconsider.

Mr. Slater noted all we are asked to do today is approve the short list.

Mr. Jarvis noted the interviews can include questions on how to reduce costs and what the CM proposes to bring the job back in budget.

Mr. Lane asked if anyone has gone back to the MSBA to ask for more money since this is happening all over. Mr. Jarvis noted this is a conversation that is happening behind the scenes at the MSBA, but the issue is they have locked in their funding for the current projects, and they would have to look at what they are doing in the future and take funding for future projects. It's a slow process with the MSBA.

Ms. Carney stated if you can't afford to building the building you were approved for, how does the MSBA approve moving to the next round.

Mr. Slater asked for a vote to approve the short list.

Mr. Donnelly asked for clarification on the criteria used to select the 5 shortlisted CM's.

Mr. Jarvis explained that evaluating the CM's similar projects is a large part of the criteria. The committee considers other school projects and MSBA projects as similar. The committee also looked at the CM's proposed staffing team and experience. All 8 firms that submitted are capable of building buildings however these 5 CMs are a better fit. The committee also reviews the CM's references and legal history.

Mr. Donnelly asked if Compass Project Management (CPM) has experience with the shortlisted CM's.

Mr. Jarvis noted that CPM has worked with all of them and are currently working with a few right now.

MOTION: by Mr. Donnelly to approve the short list.

SECOND: by Mr. Lane

No further discussion

VOTE: Roll Call - Unanimous vote to approve. 7 – 0 – 0

6. **Project Update**

Mr. Slater turned over the floor to Mr. Thibeault to provide a project update.

Overall Schedule:

Mr. Thibeault stated the team is finishing the Design Development (DD) phase and will submit the DD documents to the MSBA on 7/20. Construction is scheduled to start in spring 2023 and building completion scheduled for summer 2025. Once the building is complete demolition of the existing building and site work can start and will be complete in the spring 2026.

Mr. Thibeault reviewed the detailed schedule: Design Development documents including drawings, specifications, and a report will be submitted to the MSBA on 7/20. Mr. Thibeault will distribute the report to the committee for review. He noted this report becomes shorter as the design becomes more detailed. One final meeting on safety/security is scheduled for July 22, 2022.

Mr. Thibeault asked for questions/comments.

There are none.

Detailed Schedule:

Mr. Thibeault moves on to a presentation on "Color Theory."

The intent of design is to provide a color palette appropriate for a school environment. He noted 90% of people's time is spent indoors which makes interior color selection even more important. The human brain seeks visual b

Mr. Slater within color and the natural environment to produce a pleasing effect. Studies have shown people's moods improve when they are outside which is why buildings contain windows.

Mr. Thibeault noted that blue is the color of trust and is calming. Fortunately, blue is a Norwood color and is selected as part of the building color palette. The slide shows that as part of the academic team structure each team gets a different color: Blue, gold, and green. The saturated main colors (blue, gold, green) are used to create secondary support colors of similar hues and there are also lots of neutral colors to keep the space calm. The saturated colors become accents, so they don't overpower the academic spaces.

The auditorium uses a blue palette with more of the dark neutrals because the function of the space is to be dark. The gymnasium provides more color saturation and Ai3 proposes more saturated blue than light neutral colors. This is the general framework for the building, and this is only a preliminary review of colors. Once materials (flooring, paints, cabinetry, etc.) are being selected the team will revisit this discussion.

Question: Ms. Carney asked if there will be any Gold in the gym because the blue alone does not signify the gym belongs to Norwood.

Answer: Mr. Thibeault noted that yes there will be more gold incorporated into the gym.

Mr. Thibeault asked for questions/comments. He noted there will be additional discussion once there are physical finish samples to review.

Question: Mr. Donnelly asked how this differs from the high school color scheme.

Answer: Mr. Thibeault stated this is similar but the high school's palette is more of a yellowish/white. We are using a warm white that is not as yellow. But overall, it is the same base color scheme as the high school.

Question: Mr. Lane asked if there is a cost saving if the school uses fewer colors and all neutrals.

Answer: Mr. Thibeault stated cost is driven by material not by color. And this project is not going to propose using any custom colors.

Budget Update

Mr. Jarvis provided an overview of the budget. The MSBA approved a schematic design construction value of \$113,847,205. Based on the DD estimate we have to reduce the construction cost by approximately \$6.2 which is part of the Value Engineering (VE) effort. The next steps with the MSBA is the committee has to take the current estimate and get it back to the approved budget through value engineering. The team will then provide the MSBA with the approved VE list, drawings, and estimates. This is typical and happening all over the state. Mr. Jarvis shared some examples of projects in Lowell and Worcester that are extremely over budget which is what we are trying to avoid by proceeding with

the VE discussion. CPM is currently going through the same process with other projects in Westwood, Walpole, and Ashland.

Mr. Riccardi asked how far overbudget the Walpole project was.

Mr. Jarvis stated it was about \$5million and they are also a middle school. That project already has the 60% CD estimate and the team anticipates going through the process again due to unpredictable market conditions. The Westwood project has gone through this process multiple times and was within budget and the bids still came in over budget.

Mr. Riccardi stated the project still has another estimate at 60% Construction Documents (CD).

Mr. Jarvis stated there is also a 90% CD estimate as well.

Mr. Riccardi stated we could be in the same spot again with future estimates.

Mr. Jarvis agreed; however, the market could correct itself and the team is trying to be conservative, but this market is atypical.

Mr. Thibeault stated there was a project that had to make cuts after a 90% CD set as well and noted that is not typical.

Mr. Thibeault started the Value Engineering (VE) discussion with a slide showing the difference between the DD estimate (current) and the Schematic Design (SD) estimate and the delta between the two estimates. The design team is aware that the market right now is unpredictable. Yet the design team was still able to decrease some of the construction costs in the DD drawings. However, the deducts were not enough to offset the overall increase in the construction cost. The added cost is mostly seen in Steel, metal studs, roofing membrane, metal piping, HVAC systems, Electrical Systems, and diesel fuel costs. The fuel costs directly affect the site work numbers and also secondarily affects everything because shipping and manufacturing costs have increased. To summarize, the overall cost of the construction has increased 10.3%

Mr. Riccardi asked about the metal costs and if it is caused by supply chain issues or scarcity of metal. Mr. Thibeault stated it is a little of both. Anything that requires energy to make the product has seen an unheard-of increase.

Mr. Jarvis stated that the cost of drywall increased 30% in just a month and the extreme cost increases being seen in this market cannot be accounted for in the estimates.

Mr. Lane asked how the design was able to realize a cost savings in some line items.

Mr. Thibeault stated it was in windows and overall systems used, changes in quantities, further definition of ceiling heights, etc.

Ms. Carney asked if the window types were changed.

Mr. Thibeault stated the windows did change a little, but the rating remained the same.

Mr. Jarvis stated the committee can begin reviewing the slides that were sent to the team earlier. The big picture is targeting priority 1 and 2 categories to realize the \$6,273,439 needed in cost savings. Priority 1 and 2 are items for discussion today.

Mr. Slater stated that nothing is off the table for discussion.

Mr. Thibeault stated the leveling category includes internal tweaks and drawing clarification and therefore those savings have already been accounted for in the plans.

Ms. Carney asked if using the sole source BMS affects the project cost. And if so, can the design team avoid using proprietary materials and systems to see cost savings. Ms. Carney noted it may be hard to define exactly how much savings would be seen by changing systems.

Mr. Jarvis agreed there would be a cost savings if the systems specified are the most expensive.

Generally contractors carry the least expensive system they can in their bid if they are not required to use a specific system or material.

Ms. Carney stated that is another source of reduction to be added to the list.

Mr. Jarvis stated that is also Mr. Slater against the maintenance of the buildings.

Ms. Carney asked if the committee reduces the cost by not using a proprietary specification, down the road when the High School gets retrofitted to match this system it could also save costs. Can the committee look into that?

Mr. Jarvis stated that is something that can be reviewed at the next estimate round.

Ms. Carney stated that just because there is a specific system in the High School doesn't mean we have to match that same system in the Middle School.

Mr. Riccardi noted that the police and fire station are up for new HVAC systems, and it is not beneficial to the town to have 3 different systems in all the buildings. But that said, it may be worth looking at as a potential savings.

Ms. Carney stated the police and fire have not had new HVAC systems yet and those specifications can be made to match the system installed in the Middle School.

Mr. Thibeault stated he will review this issue with the engineers to get an idea on how the cost of the proprietary system proposed for the middle school compares to other similar systems.

Ms. Carney stated she just wants to know the cost before making a decision about changing the specification.

Moving on, Mr. Jarvis stated team can do an overall review of the category 1 items and if anyone has specific items to discuss the team can discuss, this is instead of going line by line.

Mr. Slater agrees to go by groups instead of line item by item. Mr. Thibeault starts the review of Priority 1 items. Mr. Slater asked if there is any item of note prior to starting the review.

Mr. Thibeault stated reducing the height of the 4th floor is a large number and Ai3 supports proceeding with that item. Initially the 4th floor ceiling height was 16' to allow for ducts and steel sizes. Now that those items have been coordinated taking 2' off the 4th floor ceiling height does not affect interior ceiling heights and also saves a significant amount.

Mr. Riccardi requests clarification on the 1st page items. Mr. Jarvis stated those are the leveling items. Mr. Riccardi stated that from a maintenance standpoint when you start reducing roof screens the roofs start taking on snow and this is a maintenance issue. Mr. Thibeault clarified that the items on the first page are reductions because originally the team included too many roof screens. Once the updated DD set went out for review, the engineers realized the number of roof screens could be reduced and still have the same intent.

Mr. Ricciardi asked for clarification on roof overhang. Mr. Thibeault stated the change in roof overhang was achieved by cleaning up dimensions of steel and review of constructability. The has no impact on the overall operation of the building. Wall types changed based on the acoustic report. In the original design all of the interior walls were the most expensive designation (metal stud with 2 layers of drywall on each side). However, after review of the acoustic report it was noted that this rating is not required in specific locations based on the room activities and locations. So, throughout those areas the design team eliminated a layer of drywall. Mr. Riccardi asked for clarification on which locations are now only receiving the 1 layer of drywall. Mr. Thibeault stated it is primarily on the interior walls between classrooms and the corridor walls. The corridor walls have tile down low and are full of lockers.

Mr. Riccardi stated it's hard to look at the list of leveling because Mr. Thibeault has more information about those items than what is on the list and therefore wants to review the VE line by line. Mr. Thibeault continued with corridor clarification.

Ms. Carney requested clarification on the acid waste piping. Mr. Riccardi stated it should never have been included because the acid waste system never gets used.

Mr. Riccardi stated the last two items in the leveling category are not actually savings because they are just moving the costs to FF&E. Mr. Thibeault clarified that those items that were owned in two locations in the estimate so it's removing the extra cost, not moving it. Mr. Riccardi stated this whole page gets accepted.

Mr. Slater started the discussion with Priority 1 first page.

Mr. Thibeault started with ITEM #10 & 11– remove sunshades at classrooms and band/choral areas.

Ms. Carney asked what direction the media center faces where the sunshades removal is proposed. Mr.

Thibeault stated it faces South. All the spaces have interior shades with the exception of the gym. The exterior sunshades are being removed everywhere except the gym because the other spaces have interior shades. Mr. Riccardi asked why the sunshades were included in the first place. Mr. Thibeault stated that with the interior blinds down you will not have sight of the exterior. The exterior sunshades are like a roof hang to provide the same effect as blinds and also allowing unobstructed sight of the windows. Ms. Fraczek asked how the removal of sunshades affects interior building heat. Mr. Thibeault stated very minimally because if there is a glare condition the interior shades are down anyway and the glazing itself eliminates heat. Ms. Carney stated if the rooms are south facing, they will get very hot, and she worries about removal of the sunshades.

Mr. Thibeault moved on stating ITEM 12, the 4th floor height reduction was already talked about.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEMS 13 & 14, propose using fiber cement instead of exterior metal panels at entrance canopies and media. Both materials are blue in color.

Mr. Donnelly asked what impact that change has on durability. Mr. Thibeault stated the fiber cement is not as durable, but these locations are on the 2nd-4th floor and not subject to individuals walking against it or touching it. Ms. Carney asked to see the locations on the plans. Mr. Riccardi asked if the metal panels are painted. Mr. Thibeault stated it is a painted surface but it's a hardened surface.

<Mr. Thibeault showed a plan to the room with locations of panels>

Mr. Ricciardi stated the fiber cement color will fade faster than the metal panels. Mr. Thibeault agreed. Ms. Carney asked if the panels can be repainted at any point. Mr. Thibeault stated yes, they can be repainted. Certain colors fade faster than others but will generally last 15 years before they need to be repainted. Also, the material will not crack, fiber cement is a very hard board similar to a hardi-plank seen on houses, it is made from composite materials. Ms. Carney asked for a comparison on durability. Mr. Thibeault stated durability isn't the concern, color fading is more of a concern.

Mr. Riccardi asked how the panels are installed. Mr. Thibeault stated the panels have an open rain screen system to allow it to breathe without condensation in the wall.

Mr. Lane stated painting that much area in 10-15 years is going to be expensive. Ms. Carney stated you can try and build it into your capital expenses. Ms. Carney & Mr. Riccardi stated we should keep the metal panels. Mr. Slater asked if they want to keep the metal at the media center or the entrance or both. Mr. Riccardi stated he would like to keep metal panels in both places.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the next ITEMS 15 & 16 - remove exterior building envelope fiber cement and brick above 2nd floor.

<Mr. Thibeault showed the room plans of the proposed removal>

Mr. Thibeault stated the building pushes in where the envelope was removed. Ms. Carney asked if overhang is removed. Mr. Thibeault stated the overhang is not there and this proposes removal of dead space within the building that did not have a specified purpose.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the next ITEM 17 - reduce slab insulation to just the perimeter.

Mr. Thibeault stated this change is made because the building does not have to provide 100% insulation to meet energy code. The code only requires 2' of insulation at the perimeter.

Mr. Riccardi asked if there are buildings that have done this in the past. Mr. Thibeault stated yes, they have done this in the past without any problems. There will be a moisture barrier under the slab and under the flooring will have admixture to reduce the moisture penetration. Mr. Riccardi asked if the floor will be VCT tile. Mr. Thibeault stated in some locations it will be VCT.

Mr. Donnelly inquired about the benefits of doing 100% insulation. Mr. Thibeault stated one theory is it reduces heating loads and other theory is the differential in temperature will be minimized as it moves from the exterior through the soil to the interior.

Mr. Slater summarized and would like to take out the changes to the exterior metal panel and accept the other changes.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEM 18 - remove transoms at interior classroom entries. This includes removing the windows above doors/sidelites throughout the building.

Ms. Carney asked what will replace the windows. Mr. Thibeault stated they will be replaced with drywall.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEMS 19 & 20 – use ACT instead of painted drywall ceilings at toilet rooms and locker rooms.

Mr. Thibeault stated what is typically see is clean ACT or drywall in other buildings. The bathroom ACT would also have clips so it cannot be popped up. This is only proposed in middle and elementary schools. Not in high schools. Ms. Fraczek is ok with the change.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEMS 21 & 22 - remove the drywall soffits in classrooms and provide ACT all the way to the walls. And remove drywall soffits in corridor above lockers.

<Mr. Thibeault shows drawings of proposed changes>

Mr. Riccardi also suggested eliminating pendant lighting. Mr. Thibeault said yes, the lighting is a priority 3 item. The proposed ACT change does not change the character of the room and the look will be similar to the original intent. Ms. Fraczek asked if there is space above the cabinets once the soffit is removed. Mr. Thibeault stated yes, there is about 2' feet of space. Ms. Fraczek stated that space now allows teachers to display items.

Mr. Riccardi stated a bigger savings is in the removal of the lighting. Mr. Thibeault agrees, and states removal of the lighting also changes the look of the building.

Mr. Jarvis asked about the entry soffit. Mr. Thibeault stated the entry soffit will remain.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEMS 23 & 24 - reducing the size of the accordion folding fire door and replacing 5 accordion doors with double swing doors.

<Mr. Thibeault showed a plan with locations of doors by floor>

Mr. Riccardi asked what the hold open is for doors. Mr. Thibeault stated it's a magnetic hold open that will drop under certain circumstance. By eliminating the accordion doors, the corridor size is reduced by approx. 2 feet but will still be 8' wide and meet code.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEM 25 - reduce climbing wall at gym to match existing building climbing wall. Mr. Thibeault asked if the current size meet the district needs? Ms. Fraczek stated that the current size is fine and gets used a lot during gym class. Also, if the wanted to add panels in the future is that a possibility. Mr. Thibeault stated yes, panels can be added by removing some of the wall pads and installing climbing wall.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEM 26 - remove sliding marker boards and provide fixed marker board instead at maker spaces on the 1st and 3rd floors.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEM 27 - modify railing design at the auditorium. Mr. Thibeault stated this is just simplifying the railing design.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to ITEM 28 - remove wood wall panels at media center and replace with fabric panels.

<Mr. Thibeault showed a plan for the room to review>

Mr. Thibeault indicated the wood is perforated to provide acoustic properties and will be replaced with more economical fabric panels that accomplish the same thing. The fabric panels can be modified by color, pattern, and texture. Mr. Riccardi asked if it provides a different look. Mr. Thibeault stated yes it will change the look. The wood was only on the upper part of the projection and the lower part is drywall. So basically, this only changes the upper part of the room. Ms. Faczek asked if it will impact the acoustic properties of the room. Mr. Thibeault clarified it will not change.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 29 & 30 - move kiln and student commons trash to FF&E. Mr. Riccardi stated this is where we are reducing Ms. Fraczek's FF&E budget by \$30,000. Mr. Slater stated this just kicks the decision down the road. Ms. Carney asked if the trash should have been in the FF&E to start. Mr. Thibeault stated yes, they are usually an FF&E item, however initially they were shown as built-in trash cans, now they would be portable. This item is really removal of built-in trash. Mr. Slater asked if they really need to be removable. Mr. Jarvis clarified that this is just a cabinet for a trash can. Mr. Slater asked why we are taking them out here. Mr. Thibeault stated the trash cans themselves are not what we are talking about, it's the cabinets housing the trash cans. The actual trash cans were always part of the FF&E budget.

Question about what is in the high school. Mr. Riccardi stated the high school just has portable trash cans. Ms. Carney asked if there is a need for built in cabinets for trash cans. Ms. Fraczek stated there is not. Mr. Slater clarified stating the conversation is about eliminating the item not moving it. However, he still has the same comment about the kiln. Mr. Jarvis stated the kiln is usually provided by the departments so they can pick out what they want instead of the contractor supplying it. Mr. Slater agrees the kiln is better as an FF&E item.

Ms. Carney asked if there is a separate bid for FF&E and if Ai3 has a special designer for that scope. Mr. Jarvis confirmed that is correct.

Next item Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 31 through 35: wall tile reductions broken out into 2 categories: single use toilets and multi fixture bathrooms.

Items 31 & 32 are for multi fixture bathrooms – Mr. Thibeault stated the bathrooms originally had tile on all 4 walls, floor to ceiling. Item 31 reduces the wall tile to full height on wet wall only and 4' on other walls. Item 32 reduces the wall tile to full height tile on wet walls and no tile on other walls. Tile is replaced with epoxy paint.

Mr. Riccardi recommends keeping the wet wall floor to ceiling and going down to 4' on the remainder of the bathroom walls. He also asked if the bathrooms have 2 layers of drywall for durability. Mr. Slater asked Mr. Riccardi if he wants to keep item 31 but eliminate item 32.

Mr. Thibeault clarified that these items are only reducing tile on the secondary walls, and there is no change to wet wall. Item #31 is dropping to 4' and item 32 is removing tile on secondary walls altogether. Mr. Riccardi stated in the high school the kids destroy bathroom walls. Ms. Fraczek asked if the boys' rooms can be different from the girls' rooms. Mr. Riccardi stated taking item #31 for boys' rooms and item #32 for girls is a good idea. Ms. Fraczek is fine with the reduction of tile all around for the single restrooms.

Mr. Thibeault clarifies that removal of tile down to 4' on non-wet walls in the boys' rooms and all the way to the floor in the girls' rooms for multi-use restrooms only can be done. And for single use restrooms the tile can be provided only on wet walls.

Ms. Carney asked if there are restrictions on who can use the single restrooms. Ms. Fraczek said no but they are mostly staff restrooms, and they don't see issues in the single stall restrooms. Mr. Thibeault stated generally they only see tile to 4' on wet wall in single use bathroom.

Mr. Slater summarized and stated they agree with items 33/34/35.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 36 – reduce tile in student commons everywhere except at 4' tall around columns. Mr. Thibeault stated 4' is the ideal minimum height for tile in these spaces. Mr. Slater asked what is currently in the high school. Mr. Riccardi is unsure. Mr. Jarvis stated it's block. Ms. Fraczek stated there is no tile currently in those areas in the middle school. Mr. Jarvis asked if we can just paint the block. Mr. Thibeault thinks that will be a wash. Ms. Carney asked Ms. Fraczek if she is ok with removal of tile completely. Ms. Fraczek stated she is because the chairs are not separate from the tables in the cafeteria.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 37 - reduce tile in corridor from 4' to 3'. The concern with dropping the tile that low is it will be below backpack height, however middle schoolers are shorter and they don't linger in hallways as much as high schoolers so 3' will still be durable.

Mr. Riccardi asked how much corridor space there is. Mr. Thibeault stated there is not a lot of open corridor space because there are lockers and classroom entries and sidelites. Ms. Fraczek asked for a picture of where the tile will be. Mr. Thibeault stated you still want it on the corners of the entries

<Mr. Thibeault shows locations/pictures to the room of locations>

Mr. Riccardi asked if tile can be provided around classroom entries only. Mr. Thibeault stated they can, however that turns in to what was owned originally. Ms. Carney asked if there is a different material from tile that can be used. Mr. Jarvis asked if there are soffits over the lockers and if we need the return wall. Mr. Thibeault stated he recommends keeping the return wall over the lockers because they want the separation with students coming in and out of the classrooms constantly. Mr. Thibeault stated he can rerun the calculations for keeping tile only at the entries and protruding corners.

Ms. Fraczek agrees with that solution.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 38 - use FRP panels at the custodian closets

Mr. Riccardi stated this one is fine.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 39 - reduce landscape category by 10%

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 40 - reduce safety surface for playground to 30x30

Mr. Slater asked Ms. Stewart if there is anything she wants to add before she has to leave the meeting.

Ms. Stewart asked what the plan is for priority 2 and if its being tabled for next Monday. Mr. Slater requested moving on to Priority 2 if they can because the committee has to make a decision and get a report to MSBA by 7/20. He stated they can discuss further at the working group meeting on Friday for Ms. Stewart and Mr. Hilltz.

Ms. Stewart agrees stating her biggest question is around the playground and what to do with the space if not a playground. Mr. Slater stated they could save a lot of money if the playground and safety surface are removed, also what do other towns do?

Mr. Jarvis stated it is district specific and Natick did not provide a playground for their 5th grade. Mr. Thibeault stated he does not typically see playgrounds in 5-8 schools, but noted it is a district decision.

Mr. Slater asked Ms. Stewart if in her experience the 5th graders use the playground. Ms. Stewart stated that in her experience the 5th graders do not all use playgrounds and all the elementary schools currently don't have the same playground. It's important to have recess and there are other ways to have recess that do not involve a plastic playground structure.

Mr. Slater asked if people have an issue if they eliminate the playground completely to save \$275,000 No one has an issue.

Ms. Stewart asked what can be offered in lieu of the playground in the same space. Mr. Thibeault can chat with landscape architect but anticipates it being mostly lawn kids to run around. Some benches can be moved closer to the area as well, but it will be mostly grass. Ms. Carney asked if we are able to eliminate the playground can the costs be put toward item #9. Mr. Thibeault stated they are unrelated.

Ms. Fraczek asked if a half basketball court for 4 square can be provided instead and what is that cost vs removal of playground. Also, they could provide a gaga ball pit instead. Mr. Slater asked if Ms. Stewart is all set as she has to leave. Ms. Stewart confirmed she's all set.

Ms. Stewart left the Meeting.

Mr. Thibault summarizes the committee is ok removing the playground and play surface and will add in a paved area half basket size.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 42 - remove bollards from electrical site plan. Mr. Thibeault stated this is more leveling because they were double covered in the plans.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 43 - remove low seat wall at exterior and replace with benches – Mr. Thibeault noted this is in the area behind the teams' locations.

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Thibeault noted the location where the cast in place stone wall/seat will be removed and replaced with traditional metal benches.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 44 - change green screen fence to planting buffer

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room> |

The fencing is located by the loading dock. The intent of this change is to replace fence with a planting buffer instead. There will still be a screen hiding the loading dock.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 45 - Remove school entry signs

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Thibeault noted the two signs located at front of the building. Each sign is approximately 2-3 feet tall and 10 feet long with stone and engraved with school name. Mr. Jarvis noted they can be replaced with a wood sign. Mr. Riccardi agrees with the change.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 46 - reduce bench quantity.

Ms. Fraczek requested the benches are not removed from drop off area.

Mr. Riccardi asked if an ornamental bench is different from a regular metal bench. Mr. Thibeault stated that ornamental is just the term used, it's a standard bench.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 47- reduce bike racks from 16 to only 8

Mr. Thibeault asked Ms. Fraczek how many bikers there are currently. Ms. Fraczek stated there are not 16 bike racks worth

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Ms. Fraczek said remove the ones out back and absolutely reduce the overall number but please keep the bike racks at the entrance and fields.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 48-49 - reuse existing equipment soccer goals/athletic benches

Mr. Donnelly asked if the current equipment is adequate and usable. Mr. Riccardi stated this is 4-5 years in the future. Mr. Slater asked why this replacement is the project's responsibility. Ms. Fraczek stated these items are not used as part of the school curriculum. Mr. Lane stated it should be put in another budget.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 50 - remove concrete pavers and replace with brushed concrete

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

The proposal is to remove pavers at entryways to the school in front and back.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 51/52 - change concrete to asphalt walkways and change from granite to bituminous curb

Mr. Riccardi requests moving to asphalt everywhere because it is easier to maintain. Mr. Thibeault stated that change is a priority 2 item.

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Slater asked Mr. Riccardi if he is worried about durability with trucks/plows, etc. Mr. Riccardi stated he prefers asphalt because it is easier to repair if it gets destroyed.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 53 - remove asphalt sidewalks at access road
<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Thibeault explained this item refers to the back perimeter road and removal of the sidewalk along the back of the school. Currently there is a sidewalk on the school side of the road and also between the perimeter access road and fields. There is also a sidewalk from access road to field and this item is proposing removing that walkway and sloping the grade along that area to eliminate the retaining wall. The slope will use plantings to stabilize the ground. The negative impact of this item is the track is no longer continuous without crossing the access road. One other note is the access road is only heavily traveled at drop off/pick up times.

Mr. Lane asked for a different rendering of the area for clarification. Mr. Thibeault brought a rendering up on screen for the committee to view. The road will slope down 3-4 feet and the guardrail currently there will be moved to prevent access to the slope. Mr. Riccardi does not think the area requires plantings because there's a guardrail. Mr. Thibeault states the plantings are for erosion control.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 54 & 55 - fencing type changes

Mr. Thibeault states this item includes removal of the ornamental fence at the playground and changing the ornamental fence to wire fencing along the field. Ms. Fraczek asked if the fence around the area where the playground is located will remain if the playground is removed. Mr. Thibeault stated that fence will be removed.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 56 - remove outdoor dining tables and benches

Ms. Fraczek noted the school has 4 brand new tables with seats that can be reused.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 57 - remove power scrubber from lower-level kitchen

Mr. Riccardi spoke with the maintenance personnel, and they are ok with this change. He noted that in other places it's shown as \$25,000 reduction. Mr. Thibeault confirms this pricing is correct and is not double dipped.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 58 & 59 - He stated the classrooms currently have 86" interactive monitors in all teaching spaces, these items reduce the sizes of those monitors 75" in the full-size classroom and half size classrooms to a 65" monitor. This aligns with what is typically seen in other schools. Mr. Slater asked if given size of rooms is 65" or 75" acceptable? Mr. Thibeault stated yes, acceptable and typical.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 60 - reducing digital signage budget – this changes the size of the digital signs for announcements by scaling back quantities and size. Currently this item is noted as an allowance, and this just scales back the allowance amount.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 61 & 62 – portable sound system and assistive listening systems. This equipment that is portable and is typically seen purchased in FFE.

Ms. Fraczek thinks she has 61 that can be reused, and item 62 comes from special education.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 63 - make basketball hoops manual instead of electric, there are 9 total

Mr. Thibeault asked how often they are raised and lowered. Ms. Fraczek said currently never because they don't move. Mr. Riccardi requested to make them manual.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 64 - reduce lighting package by 10% by reviewing light fixtures and reviewing where and how to save costs on overall cost of fixtures.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 65 – aluminum power feeders instead of copper

Mr. Riccardi stated the Norwood light department is ok with this change.

Mr. Slater noted this takes us through priority 1 and the committee is halfway through the list of VE items. He asked if everyone wants to stay and power through everything.

Ms. Carney noted she has to leave in half hour.

The committee decided to keep moving forward.

PRIORITY 2 DISCUSSION

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 66 - moving concessions to an add alternate, total cost is \$410,000

Mr. Slater this line item doesn't eliminate the cost, it just moves it out of this budget into another budget.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed stating if it was moved over to an add alternate, yes. The other thought is it moves over to add alternate above and beyond the project cost that can be pulled back in later. Mr.

Slater asked if we have to do a concession stand, will it get a better price as an add alt.

Mr. Riccardi questions why it is so expensive since it is just a couple bathrooms, a counter and storage.

Mr. Thibeault stated he has had same conversation with the estimators and asked if we could do a different building type or maybe a prefab building. However, this is basically the range of what it costs for that size building.

Ms. Carney asked if we could do a converted trailer instead. Mr. Riccardi noted that Dedham has a container that was converted into bathrooms for their fields. Mr. Slater asked how big the building is.

Mr. Thibeault stated it is about 600 sf. Mr. Donnelly asked if it's the same size as the one there now.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed stating it is very similar in size. Ms. Carney asked if the new one can be the same size as the existing one. Mr. Thibeault said we cannot design the building to be the same size as existing because it needs to be almost twice as large to meet code. It is already similar in size, but it needs to be larger to accommodate the food service portion.

Ms. Carney stated the town is doing feasibility study right now for another project and part of the study is for a concession stand by the ball field. Mr. Jarvis noted this building is priced at trade contractor pricing, maybe the Town can bid this separately after the fact at open shop pricing to save money

Mr. Riccardi asked if there are any options other than a specially designed building to serve the same purpose. Mr. Thibeault stated there are prefab buildings but those don't offer much savings right now.

The big kicker is the square footage. Mr. Riccardi noted the square footage is driven by code. Ms. Carney asked what code this based on. Mr. Thibeault stated it is based on clearances, accessibility, and health code for sinks, and equipment.

Mr. Slater stated that no matter what we do we are left with a certain size building. The only thing we can change are materials for exterior which does not make a bit difference. Mr. Thibeault noted that's what the items on the last page are doing, changing exterior materials and it is about a \$15,000 savings. Mr. Slater asked about putting a fence around existing concession stand so no one can touch it during construction. Mr. Thibeault the new building is going where the concession stand is currently so that will not work.

Mr. Donnelly asked who uses the concession stand. Mr. Slater stated it is used by the soccer and football teams, mostly soccer. Mr. Donnelly noted this isn't the school that uses the concession stand.

Mr. Slater confirmed its youth soccer/football. Mr. Jarvis noted this should move to an alternate outside the budget. That is how it would be listed. It is still in the project budget but outside the 113 number.

Mr. Thibeault clarified that if the project were on budget, it would be more than the 150 budget if fiscally accepted. Mr. Jarvis confirmed the committee would have to manipulate the budget line items to keep it within the 150 but outside the construction costs. It can still be bid as an alternate and if the number works take it and if not, you can look at a different way to fund it. But the committee should take it out of construction to find the \$6 million VE and find another way to pay for it or take it out of the project all together.

Mr. Slater stated if you price it as an add alternate you may get a better price. Ms. Carney is thinking about the high school concession size. Mr. Riccardi stated that the High School concession stand is a lot bigger and has more bathrooms because of stadium. It was also built after the fact. Mr. Thibeault requested direction for this item. Mr. Slater stated we should do it as an add alternate. He also noted that it has to get done for the teams.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 67 - remove overhead doors and install swing doors at the loading dock.

Mr. Riccardi noted all that does is affect the loading dock and the maintenance people use it all the time. He stated this item is not worth the money. Ms. Carney agreed to keep it for convenience.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 68 - PVC roof vs. Fully adhered roof.

Mr. Riccardi asked if the roofer can provide different thicknesses of rubber. Mr. Thibeault stated they can, however the savings may not be the same. Mr. Riccardi stated the roof is a big part of the building and if we still get savings while using a thicker membrane it would be a better trade off. Mr. Thibeault will review and report back with options for thickness levels. Mr. Slater asked if the type of membrane has any impact on the PV panels on the roof. Mr. Thibeault stated it does not. Ms. Carney asked if this would affect the LEED credits. Mr. Thibeault stated it will not affect LEED credits since the color can still be the light gray.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 69 & 70 - reduce curtain wall by 1050 SF and change curtain wall to storefront.

Mr. Thibeault stated there are two types of exterior windows, the first is a curtain wall for large expanses of windows. The second is aluminum storefronts which are for the smaller ones. For example, the classrooms windows are storefront, and the media center is curtain wall. Curtainwall is more expensive than storefront, so the design team looked at the size limits of storefront and size limits of curtainwall. If they were close in size the design changed the curtainwall to storefront. It slightly reduces the glazing, and it reduces cost because it is a different system. Some reductions included in this item were spandrel panels, which is opaque glass that hide the systems behind them. So those panels were removed on that portion of curtainwall and changed to fiber cement. So this does not change how much clear panel is provided.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 71 & 72 - reduce roof overhangs by 6" and then further reduce by an additional 6" so if both items are taken, they remove a foot off roof overhang. D

Mr. Thibeault noted this does not affect performance because it is high up on the 4th floor. This does not affect anything on the lower levels either because they are not large enough to stand under to be protected from rain.

Mr. Riccardi asked why they were designed with larger overhangs. Mr. Thibeault explained that the purpose was to create shadow lines and break down the mass of the building by providing a top half piece and capping the building. What this item does is reduces the overhang. Mr. Riccardi noted this is an aesthetic modification only. Mr. Thibeault confirmed stating anywhere there is a door/canopy they are not affected by this change. Mr. Donnelly noted this is an item we can't ever revisit once the change is made. Mr. Thibeault confirmed stating once it's done it's done. Mr. Riccardi asked if this is a reduction in roofing. Mr. Thibeault stated yes, this cost includes roofing, decking, and steel. Mr. Jarvis asked if this is at all the floors. Mr. Thibeault stated it is at the first floor, student commons, and gym. Basically, the overhangs are all over. Mr. Jarvis thinks this could actually move of a savings than noted. Mr. Donnelly asked if Mr. Thibeault can provide a rendering of how the building will look without the overhang. Mr. Jarvis stated the overhang is still there, it's just not as far out. Mr. Thibeault clarified that on the 4th floor you can't tell the difference, it's just slightly less of a shadow. Mr. Riccardi stated there is no lighting on the 4th floor. Mr. Thibeault confirmed, the lighting is only under the entry canopies.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 73 - using floor mounted partitions

Mr. Riccardi stated absolutely not.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 74 - remove acoustic wood slat wall at commons and replace with painted gyp.

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room> w

The wood slat wall will be removed and replaced with painted drywall with reveals. Ms. Fraczek asked if it will still look the same just a different covering. Mr. Thibeault stated that is correct. The volume is still

the same, it just won't be wood. Mr. Riccardi asked if it is wood on the other side. Mr. Thibeault stated those changes are coming up on other items in the VE list.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 76 & 77 - remove the wood soffits and wood wall panels at bulk of the commons

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Thibeault explained this item includes removing the wood at lower and upper commons because those areas have a similar design intent to the lower commons. Items 75-77 would remove all the wood in the Commons. Mr. Riccardi asked how that affects acoustics. Mr. Thibeault stated it does not affect acoustics since the panels here do not add any acoustical value. Mr. Slater asked if this change affects building maintenance since paint touch up could be an issue. Mr. Thibeault clarified that maintenance is not any different considering location b/c it's high up.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 75 - reduce wood panel at auditorium at stage apron

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Thibeault noted the wood around opening and across the front of the stage, this item proposes keeping the wood around opening but removal of the wood in front of stage and replacing it with painted drywall. Mr. Riccardi asked it will be a double layer of drywall. Mr. Thibeault clarified that it will be impact resistant drywall.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 78 - change 2500 sf of interior storefront to hollow metal frames. Mr. Thibeault noted this is again just changing system, not reducing quantity. Hollow Metal is a more economical system.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 79 - reduce bleacher capacity in gym

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Thibeault stated removing bleachers at the secondary court reduces seating capacity from 296 to 218. Mr. Riccardi asked if the floor continues under the bleachers. Mr. Thibeault stated the floor does continue under the bleachers. Ms. Carney asked if the bleachers can be added at a later date.

Mr. Thibeault stated he recommends everything should be installed at the same time so the aisles and seams all match up.

Ms. Fraczek stated she worries that this brings capacity down to less than a grade level. And also wonders about how this will affect community usage. Mr. Slater stated that on the other hand this is an area off to the side. He asked if there is a way to put an additional row in the competition court area. Mr. Thibeault stated it's already tight and they cannot add another row. Ms. Carney asked if there is a purpose to having the seating at the small court if no one watches that court. Ms. Fraczek stated that seating is for school-based usage to hold a whole grade although it doesn't happen often.

Ms. Carney stated we are talking about \$20,000 that can be used elsewhere. Mr. Lane stated if not having the extra seating prevents the school from using the gym the way they want we should keep it.

Mr. Jarvis noted the added floor space can be used for storage. Ms. Fraczek agreed stating the extra space would be used for storage. Mr. Donnelly requested tabling this for a week.

Mr. Slater asked what other use the side seats have other than overflow. Mr. Riccardi asked what average size of a class is. Ms. Fraczek stated it is about 250 students and that is the only thing that cases pause for this item. Mr. Riccardi stated the school could add a rack of folding chairs to store against the wall. Ms. Fraczek stated it is not a major thing because the school does not meet as a grade level often.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 80 - change 300sf of interior curtain wall to interior storefront. This is a systems change and slightly reduces the amount of glazing. At the upper commons there is a large glass curtain wall at the entry and this change adds a strip of solid in the middle of the glass to allow for the system change.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 81 & 82 & 83 - replace ceramic tile at restroom floors with epoxy flooring, locker room floor changes to epoxy, and kitchen tile changes to epoxy flooring.

Mr. Riccardi stated he is ok with all three options.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 84 – provide painted concrete flooring instead of stained concrete in PTS. Basically paint is more economical than stained concrete.
No comments.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 85 - remove open shelving in full size typical classrooms by 50 % for grades 6-8.

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Thibeault explained this item is taking the open bookshelves on exterior wall and reducing the length of cabinetry from 30' to 15' on the exterior wall only. Ms. Carney asked what would go in the blank areas where the cabinets are removed. Mr. Thibeault stated those areas will be open.

Mr. Riccardi stated they could be replaced with bookcases but doesn't think this is a good idea. Ms. Fraczek noted this is a lot of lost storage. Mr. Slater stated that given where were going educationally perhaps the classrooms do not need that much storage space for books. Ms. Fraczek stated it depends on the classroom. The 5th grade needs that much storage however the 8th grade math doesn't need that much storage. Mr. Donnelly noted that the 8th grade math room may not always be the 8th grade math room right, it could change usage at some point. Mr. Lane clarified stating the school may want the option to change the classroom usage at some point. Mr. Jarvis stated this is a question of getting rid of the shelving and moving it to FFE& so shelving can be purchased class by class. Then the school can get one classroom 4 shelves and another classroom 1 shelf, and all the shelving will match.

Ms. Carney agreed stating this is opposed to built-ins. So instead of the committee going room by room right now it can all be deleted and moved to FF&E. Mr. Jarvis stated that as part of FF&E they can match teachers' desk. Mr. Thibeault stated they will come from the same or similar vendors for other furniture. Ms. Carney stated any offset in costs for construction can be moved to FF&E budget.

Mr. Lane asked if all the shelving is millwork. Mr. Thibeault confirmed, yes, it's all casework. The next rendering shows a different wall within the same room and this wall is all upper and lower cabinets, so the overall storage capacity is still there. Ms. Fraczek asked if we can we keep the shelving in the 5th grade rooms since it looks very elementary and remove it from the 6th-8th grade rooms and just provide any shelving through FF&E.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 86 - change upper wall cabinets to open shelving.

<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

As shown, this will remove the doors from the upper cabinets within the classrooms. Ms. Fraczek asked if this change is proposed for the science rooms as well. Mr. Thibeault clarified this is only for typical classrooms, not the science rooms. Ms. Fraczek asked if the full height cabinet at the end remains as shown with doors. Mr. Thibeault confirmed the end cabinets and cabinets along the bottom remain the same. Remove doors from upper cabinets.

Ms. Fraczek stated it will look weird if we just pull the doors off. Mr. Thibeault clarified it is similar to the open shelving discussed previously so it will change the look a bit. Ms. Carney asked what is being stored in these areas because there are some things that you do not want everyone to see. Ms. Fraczek stated it will be markers, paper, and misc. teaching supplies. Mr. Riccardi stated most of the cabinets would not be used and shelving is a better option. Ms. Fraczek agrees shelving is a better option. As long as the science rooms can still have doors because they do have things to lock up. Mr. Thibeault confirmed the science rooms will not change.

Ms. Carney stated the open shelving it will look less like a kitchen. Ms. Fraczek stated if the need comes up the teachers can lock the lower cabinets with doors. She also requested eliminating the drawers and just make the cabinets bigger. Mr. Thibeault stated they can do that; however, it won't save money. Ms. Fraczek is ok with this change.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 87 - use chemical resistant laminate instead of epoxy tops in spaces listed.

The spaces listed are science labs, art classrooms, and student collab space.

Mr. Riccardi asked how the laminate stands up to abuse compared to epoxy. Mr. Thibeault stated epoxy is indestructible. However, with the chemicals being used there is no need for an epoxy top in these spaces. Mr. Riccardi stated the laminate is a glued on to surface and it will start to peel and fall apart. Mr. Thibeault stated the nosing is almost like a C shaped piece, not like a flat piece of laminate which reduces the chance of peeling. Mr. Riccardi requested putting an asterisk on this one and taking it only if needed.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 88 - remove 9 out of 10 outdoors storage units at the exterior Mr. Riccardi stated this will kill us. Mr. Slater agreed and stated we may need to keep them in the budget.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 89 - remove 20' tall ball control netting at the football field.
<Mr. Thibeault shows location on site plan to room>

Mr. Riccardi asked if the purpose of this meeting is for the Lacrosse games. Mr. Thibeault noted it is for the outdoor fields, at the endzones of the football fields. Mr. Riccardi asked if it includes both endzones for \$90,000. Mr. Jarvis noted this is not for portable netting, it's set in concrete and permanent. Mr. Riccardi stated we should go with portable. Mr. Thibeault on, these are cast in concrete and not portable. Mr. Riccardi would like portable netting.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 91 - use concrete in lieu of pavers at main entry and ITEM 92 - use asphalt in lieu of concrete at main entry

Mr. Thibeault stated these are clustered together so 91 is the first step, 92 is the next step down Mr. Riccardi stated he is ok with both changes.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 93 - use bituminous curbing instead of granite curbing Mr. Riccardi stated he is ok with this change. Mr. Jarvis asked if he is ok with the bituminous curb even at drop off areas. Mr. Riccardi confirmed, he is ok with bituminous curb everywhere. Mr. Jarvis asked if this holds well even for plowing. Mr. Riccardi confirmed.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEM 94 – remove vehicle charging stations, this results in the loss of 1 LEED credit.

Mr. Thibeault noted this removes the actual box that you need to plug in the car. Ms. Carney asked if these can be supplied through a grant or through the town's energy manager. The Town is currently working on several charging station related projects. Mr. Slater stated the committee did talk about this when during the LEED presentation and he would hate to eliminate all of the charging stations. He would like to get the stations somehow through a grant or the committee will have to put them back in. Mr. Riccardi asked how many charging stations there are on the project. Mr. Thibeault stated there are 6. Mr. Slater asked if we can we just keep 2? Mr. Thibeault stated that to meet LEED thresholds the project requires 6 stations, so any reduction results in the loss of the LEED credit.

Mr. Slater asked if we put the infrastructure in now and provide the stations later. Mr. Thibeault confirmed that this item only removes the box, it keeps the conduit and everything in place for future. Mr. Lane asked if the charging stations are installed later does the project still get the LEED credit. Mr. Thibeault stated no, the station needs to be in place. Ms. Carney asked if the stations can be provided through a department grant or if the funding source is different does the project still get the LEED credit? Mr. Slater stated they need to look at what one LEED credit means for the project overall. Mr. Thibeault stated it depends on how close you are to the limits. Right now, the project is at 56 credits which is a 5-6 point buffer to the next level down. Ms. Carney stated the Town has a commitment to electric stations we have to make sure we have those and are showing the infrastructure. Mr. Jarvis stated that from an MSBA standpoint they don't have a LEED silver threshold anymore they just require an efficient building. Mr. Thibeault stated there is a 5 to 6 point buffer right now. Mr. Riccardi stated we should proceed with the item noted here and figure out how to provide stations with Norwood light or grants. We will do infrastructure and hopefully figure out the stations before the end of the job. Mr. Slater stated we can proceed that way with the understanding that if the light department does not have grants, we put them in at the end of the project.

Ms. Carney stated we need the commitment to providing electric charging stations. Mr. Slater stated there doesn't need to be enough for the LEED credit, but the school needs to have them. Ms. Carney stated that by the end of the project the government stipulations will require a certain percentage of vehicles to be electric so why not put them in now to meet the requirement. Mr. Slater noted we have conduits for up to 80 charging units. Mr. Jarvis noted that the cost of the stations will be more economical in a few years also.

Mr. Riccardi stated the committee cannot remove automatic flush toilets from the project.

Mr. Thibeault moved on to the Next ITEMS 96 & 97 are tied together, 96 removes the voice lift system from classrooms and uses a dedicated amp and speaker system instead. The Voicelift is almost like a personal sound system for the staff with a microphone the projects through speakers in ceiling/room. This item would remove the microphone but still provide audio in the room.

Ms. Fraczek stated the school does not need this system.

Mr. Thibeault noted this is the end of the Priority 2 list of VE.

Mr. Riccardi asked if we are tabling Priority 3 for now.

Mr. Thibeault would like to hold on priority 3 and evaluate how close we are with the items reviewed this week. Let's see how it levels out and address and shortfalls next week.

Mr. Slater stated the committee will delay taking a vote until next week. Everyone is in agreement.

Mr. Jarvis requested Mr. Thibeault update the spreadsheet to note the hold items and approved items and distribute to the committee for review prior to next Monday. Mr. Thibeault agrees and will keep a running tally of approved, rejected and hold VE items. Mr. Jarvis stated there will be a rejected, a hold, and approved line items with totals.

Mr. Slater asks for any further comments.

7. **Adjourn**

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to adjourn

MOTION: Mr. Riccardi motions to Adjourn the Meeting.

SECOND: by Ms. Carney

VOTE: Roll Call - Unanimous vote to approve. 7 – 0 – 0

Respectfully submitted,

Anissa Ellis
Project Manager
Compass Project Management

Attachments:

Ai3 Presentation dated 05-23-22
VE Review List

