

Coakley Middle School Building Committee

**Coakley Middle School Building Committee (MSBC) Meeting
On-line Meeting hosted via ZOOM Platform
Due to COVID-19
January 26, 2023 – 5:00 p.m.**

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

	MSBC Voting members		Vertex (VTX)		WT Rich Construction (WTR)
A	Mr. Slater – Chair	A	Tim Bonfatti – Principal		Jon Rich
	Mr. Matt Lane - Selectman	A	Chase Terrio – Senior Project Manager	A	Bethany King
A	Mr. Paul Riccardi– Director of Town-wide Facilities		Diane Guenther – Project Coordinator		Tim Farrell
A	Ms. Cathy Carney, MCPPO - Purchasing		Anissa Ellis – Project Manager		Steve Koutalakis
	Mr. Bob Donnelly - Selectman				Johnny Rich
A	Dr. David Thomson - Superintendent				Alex Corbett
	Ms. Teresa Stewart – School Committee member			A	Harvey Eskenas
	Mr. Tony Mazzucco – Town Manager		Ai3 Architects (Ai3)		Public Attendees:
A	Mr. David Hiltz – School Committee Member		James Jordan - Principal		Dana Brown – Interim Project Administrator
A	Ms. Diane Ferreira – Principal of Balch Elementary School	A	Justin Thibeault – Sr. Associate	A	Norwood Community Media
	Dr. Ms. Fraczek – Principal of Coakley Middle School		Kristen Kendall - Architect		Charisse Taylor – Norwood Public Schools
A	Mr. Gary Pelletier – Building Inspector		Darren Sawyer - Principal		Jason Adams, - Norwood Finance

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

Meeting is called to order at 6:00 PM

1. Opening Remarks

Mr. Slater welcomed everyone to the January 26, 2023 Middle School Building Committee Meeting at the GSU lecture hall. He thanked the committee members for being present on such short notice.

2. Approval of Minutes from December 12, 2022

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 12, meeting.

MOTION: by Mr. Riccardi to approve the previous minutes

SECOND: by Mr. Hiltz

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

3. Approval of Vendor Invoice Package

Mr. Slater requested approval of the Vendor Invoice Package for December.

MOTION: by Mr. Riccardi to approve the Vendor Invoice Package.

SECOND: by Mr. Hiltz

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

4. Project Design, Schedule, and Construction Estimate Update

Mr. Thibeault reviewed the overall project schedule and noted we are at the 90% MSBA submission which is due tomorrow (January 27). He also reviewed the early bid packages (site, civil, structural, and ground improvements) that are going out on February 1, 2023, the remainder of the documents will be issued on March 15, 2023. Construction starting in June 2023 and the building will be occupied in fall 2025.

Mr. Terrio also noted that the team is progressing with the contractor prequalification and there have been over 90 respondents to the request for qualifications. The team will provide a list of recommended contractors at next months MSBC meeting.

Mr. Terrio stated the project estimates were received and reconciled earlier this month and both were just under budget by approximately \$8,000 so the team is calling the project on budget for the MSBA submission. The team is adjusting the escalation forecast as the project gets closer to construction. There is no further value engineering required for the next milestone MSBA submission.

Mr. Riccardi asked if the 90% estimate includes the solar panels on the roof.

Mr. Terrio noted it does not have any PV included in the budget due to Norwood Light and Town preference to have a 3rd party PPA agreement for PV.

Mr. Riccardi asked if any of the VE items that were removed in the previous value engineering have been added back into the budget.

Mr. Terrio stated it does not include any items that were previously removed.

Mr. Riccardi stated the solar panels that are no longer in the estimate were worth \$3 million dollars so some of the VE items that were removed previously should be able to be added back in. He is wondering where that money went because now the team is unable to add any of those VE items back into the project.

Mr. Hiltz is concerned the team will have to conduct more VE at the 100% estimates now because the project just ate up another \$3 million.

Mr. Terrio clarified stating that construction costs have increased between the 60% estimates and 90% estimates so there is no room to add items back into the project.

Mr. Eskenas stated the drawings for the 60% are not as detailed as the 90% so as the project progresses, and more detail is included in drawings the subs are able to provide more accurate estimate costs. A good example of that is the food service equipment, the 90% estimate had an estimate from an actual bidder vs. the 60% estimate had a “carry” number which was not from a subcontractor.

Mr. Riccardi stated he would have liked to see these numbers before tonight so the MSBC could evaluate other items that could have been removed to bring other VE items back into the project.

Mr. Terrio stated the team could still look at adjusting scope and VE items.

Mr. Riccardi wants to potentially adjust the VE items that were removed and make some changes prior to the bid packages going out in March.

Mr. Slater noted the committee is meeting again before the packages are released in March.

Mr. Eskenas noted that the items that were removed can be include in the bid documents as alternates and potentially be brought back into the project at bid time if the budget allows. He also stated there is still time to adjust VE items as well if the committee would like to review again.

Ms. Carney stated she thought this meeting was going to be to discuss items to be brought back into the project.

Mr. Hiltz stated the building has lost some of the items that were approved for the long term educational plan and that's a red flag for him.

Ms. Carney stated that the Town needs to adjust their capital budget to allow for funding the items that have been removed at this time.

Mr. Slater stated he understands the MSBC is not comfortable voting on alternates today. He said the MSBC can adjust the VE and vote in February.

Mr. Bonfatti stated the benefit of a CM is that these items can be reviewed again with their input and pricing. He also stated the market seems to be stabilizing and that will help when the project goes out for pricing for the GMP.

Mr. Slater stated Mr. Riccardi was concerned about items that were VE'd from the High School which were detrimental to the overall project and he does not want the same thing to happen with the Middle School.

5. Alternate Scope Review:

Mr. Terrio stated the 60% estimate still had the PV included as an alternate in the budget and the roof PV has been moved outside the project budget as a true alternate based on the input from Norwood Light.

Ms. Carney asked if the infrastructure for panels would still remain in the base budget.

Mr. Thibeault stated there are two PV items, the first is the parking canopies and that was removed from the project budget at the 60% estimate. Similarly, now the Roof PV will now be put outside the project budget, the infrastructure (structural, electrical conduits) will be part of the base bid. The panels themselves, mounting brackets, and cabling will be part of the alternate budget.

Ms. Carney asked how this affects the Town of Norwood energy plan and the net zero future plan. She asked if this will affect any building codes in the future.

Mr. Thibeault noted that Norwood Light requested the panels be removed from the project. They do not want to own and maintain the panels as they do not have the manpower or expertise to do so. They want to work with a 3rd party vendor and negotiate a contract that will give Norwood power while ultimately having the panels be owned by someone else.

Mr. Slater stated Norwood Light is proceeding this way at the Landfill.

Ms. Carney just wants to make sure the PV will happen in the near future and not in 5-10 years.

Mr. Thibeault stated Norwood Light can work through a PPA right now so when the building is complete in two years the PV can be installed right away on the roof. There is no need for the town to wait any number of years to install the panels.

Mr. Thibeault stated the project team will continue working with Norwood Light to support and coordinate the PV PPA. He also stated the building is required to be "PV ready." He also stated the PV is being removed at the recommendation of Norwood Light. And this also saves costs that were absorbed by escalation. If the PV was still included in the budget the project would be \$2million over budget right now, but since it was removed the project is no longer over budget.

Mr. Slater stated asked for a vote on the request to remove the PV panels from the project and support a PPA at a future date.

MOTION: by Mr. Riccardi made a motion to remove the PV panels from the project budget.

SECOND: by Ms. Ferriera

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

Mr. Terrio stated the goal for tonight was to identify the priorities items to request WT rich price prior to final bidding. He would like the consensus of the committee to prioritize what will be added back into

the project if budget allows for prior to issuing the 100% bid set. The slide on the screen shows the prioritized list that was created based on previous conversations with the committee.

Mr. Terrio stated that currently the Concessions building is listed as alternate #1, he asked the committee if that is correct.

Mr. Slater stated the Town is still reviewing the possibility of using food trucks and evaluating if that approach makes more sense.

Ms. Carney asked if the vote tonight is not to accept the order of the alternates, just to vote to accept these items as alternates in general.

Mr. Terrio clarified and stated the vote is to put these in order of priority.

Ms. Carney clarified to the committee how bid alternates work. She stated that in order to take alternate #2 you have to also accept alternate #1. You have to take alternates in order. So, you cannot take alternate #6 unless you have taken alternates #1-5 first.

Mr. Riccardi asked why this needs to be done at the 90% Submission.

The committee is not ready to commit to the order of the alternates until they get closer to bid time.

Mr. Slater asked if the committee has to vote today on the order for the purpose of submitting to the MSBA.

Mr. Thibeault stated they do not.

Mr. Slater stated the committee needs to vote on one item that was requested by the Planning Board.

Mr. Thibeault stated the Planning Board had a handful of requests and most of these were rolled into the plans without any real cost implications. However, there is one item they requested be brought back into the project, it was a VE item from back in July. They requested the retaining wall and sidewalk along the back perimeter access road be brought back into the project. What was proposed for VE was removing the retaining wall and sidewalk and adding a crosswalk for walkers to cross over the access road and utilize the sidewalk adjacent to the building, and then cross back over to the walking path via a crosswalk again further down the road. The planning board has strongly recommended that the path be added back in to keep the loop continuous and not require the walkers to cross the access road. The planning board has asked the MSBC to review this again and vote to see if it can be added back into the project. Mr. Thibeault noted the estimators did look at adding that back in and cost is just over \$400,000 for that retaining wall and additional sidewalk.

Mr. Riccardi recommended it be added to the alternate list.

Mr. Bonfatti asked if it will be included in early packages.

Mr. Slater asked if the committee wants to spend \$400,000 on something they already voted as unnecessary.

Mr. Eskenas stated this can be added to the early bid packages since they are non-trade bid and requested as alternate pricing. Then they can present the cost to the committee if the bids are under budget and they can vote it back into the project at that time.

Mr. Slater stated the real question is if the committee wants to even entertain bringing this back since it was something they already deemed unnecessary.

Mr. Riccardi stated this was removed to preserve the programmatic aspects of the building. And since the latest estimate ate up another \$2 million this retaining wall would potentially take the spot of other higher priority items that should be added back into the project before the retaining wall.

Mr. Slater stated the planning board is meeting on Monday and he and Mr. Thibeault will be attending and can explain the reasoning behind the removal to the board.

MOTION: Mr. Riccardi made a motion for Mr. Thibeault and Mr. Slater to explain the reasoning to the planning board and not bring the retaining wall back into the project.

Ms. Carney asked if the planning board can require us to do this regardless of how the MSBC votes?

Mr. Slater stated they can certainly put it into their permit if they want to.

Ms. Carney asked how this will affect the MSBA submission since it is not included in the 90% submission.

Mr. Bonfatti suggested including it in the early bid package just to get a real cost. There is no commitment at that point and Mr. Slater can explain to the planning board that once pricing is received it will be further reviewed.

Mr. Slater recommends rejecting the request all together. And if the committee decided due to budgetary reasons they cannot provide a retaining wall, he believes the planning board will agree with the committee. He also stated the planning board is aware of the budgetary restrictions on the project. Mr. Thibeault agreed with Mr. Slater and stated the planning board does understand the restrictions and is a reasonable group.

Mr. Thompson agrees with Mr. Slater and stated there are other items that are more important to the building than the retaining wall. He also stated the wall is something the Town can do at a later date if they want to do it. The building is a *school building* for the community and having bleachers for basketball games is more important than having a retaining wall.

SECOND: Mr. Thompson seconds Alans approach to rejecting the request for the retaining wall.

Mr. Hiltz requested a re-reading of the motion on the table.

Mr. Slater stated the motion is to disagree with the planning board request to add the retaining wall and sidewalk at the perimeter access road between the schools and back fields.

Mr. Hiltz clarified that Alan would attend the planning board meeting and provide an explanation of the conversation.

Mr. Slater agreed. He asked for further discussion, there is none.

VOTE: Unanimous vote to approve 7-0-0

Mr. Slater asked if Mr. Riccardi wanted to vote on the alternates, just not the order, at today's meeting.

Mr. Riccardi stated he would like to do that if it's required for the 90% submission.

Mr. Thibeault stated they can be included in the submission and do not required a formal vote.

Mr. Slater confirmed there will be no voting on alternates at this meeting, it can be voted in February.

6. Ai3 Amendment for Soil Disposal Classification Samples and Testing:

Mr. Thibeault stated the contract amendment is an amount not to exceed \$123,420 for testing the topsoil and subsoil behind the existing school so WT Rich and contractors know where to dispose of the soils. That will further assist in narrowing down the scope and bidding. The testing will have to occur whether it's now or during construction. He also noted that the testing was already conducted and there were fewer samples taken than anticipated so the amendment will actually be less than the estimated \$123,420. They targeted providing 30 topsoil samples and only did 28, they targeted 42 subsoil samples and only did 38. They were also on site a day less than anticipated. They do not have a final invoice yet and Mr. Thibeault will forward the final invoice once received.

MOTION: by Mr. Riccardi to approve Ai3 Amendment #3.

SECOND: by Mr. Hiltz

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

7. Proprietary Scope Item Discussion:

Mr. Slater asked for Mr. Riccardi if he reviewed and agrees with the list provided.

Mr. Riccardi does agree.

MOTION: by Mr. Riccardi motions to approve the list of proprietary items.

SECOND: by Mr. Hiltz

Mr. Thibeault stated this vote also needs to be approved by the school committee. So, this vote is for the MSBC to recommend approval of these items to the school committee.

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

8. Vote to Recommend the 90% MSBA Submission:

Mr. Slater asked for a motion to approve the 90% CD Submission to the MSBA.

MOTION: by Mr. Hiltz motioned to approve the 90% CD submission to the MSBA.

SECOND: by Mr. Riccardi

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

9. Public Communication:

Mr. Slater stated the committee has received the email received by Ms. Judith Howard concerning the side aisles in the auditorium as well as a response from the committee to her email.

Mr. Hiltz stated the committee had a meeting about this exact issue over the summer. He stated that while he appreciates the enthusiasm, the committee has already dealt with the issue. He stated this is a very time-lined project and the committee has already taken the time to review this issue, everything is designed to meet code, and the auditorium is sized correctly for the school and community use. He is voicing his frustration that the issue is being raised again as committee has already reviewed and voted on the auditorium.

Mr. Slater clarified that Mr. Hiltz’s motion is to send the response letter to Ms. Howard as is. Mr. Hiltz confirmed.

MOTION: by Mr. Hiltz to send the response letter to Ms. Howard as is.

SECOND: by Mr. Thompson

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

10. Motion to Adjourn:

Mr. Slater asked for any further discussion. There is none, he asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: by Mr. Riccardi to adjourn.

SECOND: by Mr. Hiltz

VOTE: Unanimous adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Anissa Ellis
Project Manager

Compass Project Management

Attachments: Ai3 Presentation dated 12-12-2022
Vendor Invoice Package
Compass/Vertex Amendment #3