

# Coakley Middle School Building Committee

**Coakley Middle School Building Committee (MSBC) Meeting  
On-line Meeting hosted via ZOOM Platform  
Due to COVID-19  
July 18, 2022 – 5:00 p.m.  
Approved Unanimously 8/15/22**

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	Mr. Slater – Chair	A	Ms. Diane Ferreira – Principal of Balch Elementary School		James Jordan - Principal
	Mr. Tom Maloney - Selectman	A	Dr. Ms. Fraczek – Principal of Coakley Middle School	A	Mr. Thibeault – Sr. Associate
A	Mr. Matt Lane - Selectman	A	Mr. David Hiltz – School Committee Member		Kristen Kendall - Architect
	Mr. Matthew Walsh – Building Commissioner		<b>Compass Project Mgmt (CPM)</b>		
A	Mr. Riccardi– Director of Town-wide Facilities	A	Tim Bonfatti – Principal		<b>Public Attendees:</b>
A	Ms. Carney, MCPPO - Purchasing		Mr. Jarvis – Project Director		Dana Brown – Interim Project Administrator
A	Mr. Bob Donnelly - Selectman	A	Chin Lin – Senior Project Manager	A	Norwood Community Media
A	Dr. David Thomson - Superintendent	A	Chase Terrio – Senior Project Manager	A	Charisse Taylor – Norwood Public Schools
A	Ms. Teresa Stewart – School Committee member	A	Diane Guenthner – Project Coordinator		
	Mr. 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 18, 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. Mr. Slater noted there is a quorum present.

**2. Approval of Minutes from July 11, 2022**

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

**MOTION:** by Mr. Riccardi

**SECOND:** by Ms. Carney

**VOTE:** Roll Call – Three affirmative votes and three abstentions. Minutes are approved. 7 – 3 – 0

### **3. Project Update**

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

Mr. Thibeault thanked everyone for attending and participating in the long meeting last week.

Mr. Thibeault provided an overview of the updated Value Engineering (VE) discussion from last week. The target VE reduction was \$6,268,439 and with the revisions based on last week's discussion the new VE total is \$6,362,431. This is roughly \$100,000 more than what is required to get the project back on budget. Mr. Thibeault noted that this is exactly where we want to be at this time.

Mr. Thibeault put his updated slide on the projector and noted that the items with blue stars are modified per last weeks conversation. The modifications include changes to the item description and/or if it was moved from the Accepted column to a Hold or Decline column. Mr. Thibeault opened the floor for questions or discussion noting the design team is looking to vote to accept the estimating leveling category, priority 1 category and priority 2 category updates from the discussion last week.

Mr. Slater asked to clarify if an item is in the hold category is it still in the project.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed. Items in the hold category have not been removed from the project.

Mr. Slater asked the committee if they would like to further discuss this or accept the list as proposed. Ms. Fraczek asked for clarification on the under window cabinets. If they are removed will the cost need to be added to the FF&E budget since they are now moveable bookshelves.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed and stated the FF&E conversation will take place further down the line. The bookshelves and items like the kiln will be part of a conversation scheduled for a year from now.

Mr. Slater asked to discuss items that cannot be brought back into the project at a later date.

Mr. Thibeault stated the first item is reducing the height or the 4th floor noting this item did not have any negative comments or feedback during last weeks discussion. Mr. Thibeault noted the building height will be difficult to change after today. A lot of items are finish based and can be modified at the 60% review this fall.

Mr. Slater asked if we wanted to add tile back in the corridors that can be done later.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed.

Mr. Riccardi noted the steel overhangs are gone and cannot be brought back.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed stating now would be the time. Any structural items would need to be brought back now. Most of the items proposed can come back during at a later date because they are either finish based or amenities. Primarily structural steel cannot be changed after this point

Mr. Donnelly noted there is a list of potential additional items the committee did not approve last week. Those items included reducing square footage of building, specifically the reduction of auditorium seating. The committee would need to act on the items related to square footage now because they will not be available down the line. Mr. Donnelly noted none of the square footage items have been accepted at this time.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed stating anything affecting square footage need to be accepted "now or never."

Mr. Slater requested Ai3 provide the committee with a priority list of items with potential to be brought back into the project should the money become available. Mr. Slater also noted that none of the items being discussed at this time affect programing or education.

Mr. Slater asked for any further questions.

Ms. Stewart requested Ai3 follow up on the playground discussion and provide the committee with some suggestions on what can be provided for students in place of the playground that was eliminated during the VE discussion.

Mr. Thibeault will provide options for review.

Mr. Slater requested further questions or comments.

Mr. Slater noted today's vote requires special language for the MSBA and requested Mr. Lin provide the required language for the committee.

Mr. Lin stated the first vote is to accept the Value Engineering list as presented for a total amount \$6,362,431 before markup which will bring the construction budget, including the photovoltaic alternate to \$119,382,388 which will be within the current budgeted amount.

Mr. Donnelly said before the committee votes on the VE, since we are almost \$100,000 in the black the committee can review possibly bringing something back into the project now.

Mr. Slater confirmed asking if the committee wants to review bringing items back now or waiting until the next estimate round.

Mr. Lin recommends the committee bring back items related to the structural scope and hold off on reviewing the finishes any further since that can be done at a later date during the 60% or 90% estimates. The committee should focus on bringing back items that cannot be revisited in the future.

Mr. Slater asked if Mr. Donnelley has something specific in mind

Mr. Donnelly stated he does not, he was just curious if should be reviewed now or later.

Mr. Slater asks for a motion to approve the VE as stated by Mr. Lin.

**Alan asked for further discussion, none so vote**

**MOTION:** by Mr. Donnelly to approve the VE submission of \$6,362,341

**SECOND:** by Mr. Lane

Mr. Slater asks for further discussion. There is none.

**VOTE:** Roll Call - Unanimous vote to approve. 9 – 0 – 0 (Mr. Hilltz did not cast a vote)

Mr. Lin requested the committee vote a second time to approve submission of the design development package to MSBA as presented by Ai3. Mr. Lin noted the link for the submission package was sent to the committee members last Friday via email.

Mr. Thibeault explains the DD submission includes a report of about 500 pages with narratives, estimates, and reports, etc. It also includes drawings, approximately 430 sheets from the architect and consultants. It also includes 2 volumes of specifications.

Mr. Slater asked if the MSBA formally reviews the documents.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed stating that once we submit the MSBA has a 3 week window to review, make comments, and note any questions/concerns. The design team then has 2 weeks to respond to their comments. Part of the submission is providing answers to previous submissions questions.

Mr. Lin noted the reason the committee hasn't see many responses to review questions is because the submissions to date have been very thorough and the MSBA comments have been very minor.

Mr. Riccardi asked if this submission will take out the \$6 million VE the committee agreed upon.

Mr. Thibeault confirmed the submission will include the VE list with a note confirming the submission has been approved by the MSBC. Mr. Thibeault noted that going forward all design documents will be updated to reflect the accepted VE items. The design documents will not be updated to reflect the accepted VE by Wednesday but the narrative statement with VE clarification is acceptable to the MSBA

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve the submission.

**MOTION:** by Ms. Carney to approve the MSBA submission as noted by Mr. Lin.

**SECOND:** by Mr. Riccardi

Mr. Slater asked for any further questions. There are none.

**VOTE:** Roll Call - Unanimous vote to approve. 9 – 0 – 0 (Note. Mr. Hilltz did not cast a vote)

Mr. Slater asked for any further comments.

Mr. Terrio noted the next meeting on August 15 will be to review CM Proposal submissions.

Mr. Slater requested an update on the CM @ Risk schedule.

Mr. Terrio stated the RFP was issued to all shortlisted respondents and Compass has received some questions which will be forwarded to Mr. Slater and Ms. Fraczek for review. Mr. Terrio noted the CM's are looking for clarification on site usage during construction and the answers will be used for their planning an logistics. The CM @ Risk process is on track and the team will formalize an interview schedule for August 3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> which will take place at the Savage Center. Mr. Terrio noted there is a site walk through with bidders this Wednesday and noted the CM's will be require access to the interior of the building and this meeting is more for site logistics.

Mr. Riccardi noted it is very important that the CM's understand the field running by the tennis court needs to remain open throughout construction.

Mr. Terrio noted he will bring a set of plans and review limits of work with all the CM's. The next big milestone for the CM @ Risk process is the interviews.

Mr. Slater reminded the committee that he and Ms. Fraczek will attend the interviews to listen in however they will not take part in the reviews.

Mr. Terrio asked the committee if they have any specific questions they would like to ask the bidders and if so please let him know. The team intends to publish the list of questions to the CM's next week.

Ms. Carney asked if all five CM's have confirmed for Wednesday.

Mr. Terrio noted he is unsure, some have responded but not all have.

Ms. Carney requested Compass confirm with the CM's and make sure they are all aware of the interview dates.

Mr. Line noted he will send a reminder and request confirmation from CM's.

Mr. Terrio noted the interviews can be adjusted in case someone or a CM cannot attend.

Mr. Lin noted that this is an attractive project to the CM's and all firms are capable of doing the job and Compass will confirm they are all still interested.

Mr. Slater stated his main concern is that the committee would not get firms capable of doing the job and the committee is comfortable with.

Ms. Carney noted there were some firms that were close to their DCAM limits and requested the committee ask for clarification on the limits during the interview. Specifically if they feel they will still stay within the DCAM limits based on current project timing and what will be falling off their schedules. She noted the committee is spending a lot of time reviewing proposals and if the CM won't have capacity the committee should not be spending time reviewing the proposals. Ms. Carney noted this applied to two of the firms and the committee should ask them to give assurance or a schedule with what projects will drop off their DCAM Statement by the time this project starts.

Mr. Terrio noted we can certainly request that.

Mr. Lin noted that question can be addressed to just those two firms specifically.

Ms. Carney noted this is a way to determine if there are 5 firms or maybe just 3 in the running.

Mr. Slater asked if the committee be comfortable with just 3 firms in the end if it comes to that

Ms. Carney noted she would be comfortable with that outcome.

Mr. Lin noted that by regulation the committee has to have 3 firms in the running. But in reality all 8 firms that submitted are capable of doing the job.

**4. Adjourn**

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to adjourn

**MOTION:** Ms. Carney

**SECOND:** by Mr. Lane

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

Respectfully submitted,

Anissa Ellis  
Project Manager  
Compass Project Management

**Attachments:**

Ai3 Presentation dated 07-18-2022