



## MEETING MINUTES

Project: Peabody Welch Elementary School  
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting  
 Location: Zoom Conference Call  
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: MP17-114  
 Meeting Date: 11/05/2020  
 Time: 9:30 AM  
 Prepared By: R. Donner

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
✓	Edward Bettencourt*	Mayor	✓	Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Joseph Scanlon	Business Manager	✓	Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Beverley Ann Dunne*	SBC Chair	✓	Mike Cox	DWMP
✓	Josh Vadala*	Superintendent		Terry Hartford	DWMP
✓	Jarrold Hochman*	SBC Member	✓	Rachel Donner	DWMP
	James Hafey*	SBC Member	✓	Donna DiNisco	DiNisco
✓	Peter McGinn*	SBC Member		Ken DiNisco	DiNisco
	Ryan Melville*	SBC Member	✓	Vivian Low	DiNisco
✓	Michelle Massa*	Welch Principal	✓	Jeff Oxsalida	DiNisco
	Kara Migliozi*	SBC Member		Jim Shuttlesworth	DiNisco
	Michael Gingras	SBC Member			
✓	Edward Colbert*	SBC Member			
	Albert Talarico	SBC Member			
✓	Jillian Gonzalez*	SBC Member			
	Kelly Hidalgo*	SBC Member			
✓	Elizabeth McGivern*	SBC Member			
✓	Daniel Doucette	SBC Member			
	Thomas Griffin	SBC Member			
✓	Christopher Lord	SBC Member			

\* SBC Voting  
 Member

Item No.	Description	Action
8.1	<b>Call to Order:</b> 9:34 am meeting was called to order by SBC Chair B. Dunne with 9 of 14 voting members in attendance.	Record
8.2	<b>Previous Topics &amp; Approval of October 8, 2020 Meeting Minutes:</b> A motion to approve the 10/8/2020 meeting minutes as submitted made by J. Scanlon and seconded by E. McGivern. Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
8.3	<p><b>Design Bid Build vs. Construction Manager at Risk Deliver Method:</b>          M. Burton shares a presentation with the SBC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ M. Burton explains there are 2 delivery types of construction used in Massachusetts</li> <li>➤ M. Burton shares there are always project requirements and considerations.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budget</li> <li>○ Design</li> <li>○ Schedule</li> <li>○ Risk Assessment (repair project, lack of swing space, impact to School),</li> <li>○ Owners Expertise</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ MGL 149: Design – Bid- Build             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ You are purchasing a building in accordance with plans and specifications</li> <li>○ Selection is bid/price based (lowest bidder wins)</li> <li>○ Design is finished, then the bid to GC and subcontractors (After MSBA PFA) – You will not know the number until after.</li> <li>○ Traditional Massachusetts project delivery method</li> <li>○ Sealed bid, fixed price</li> <li>○ Contract value based on a “lump sum” amount</li> <li>○ “Closed Book” construction budget accounting</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ MGL Chapter 149a: CM at Risk             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ You are hiring a professional service firm that manages the construction of buildings and provides input during design process. They will help estimate the project and review the drawings. They are part of the team.</li> <li>○ Selection is qualifications and cost based</li> <li>○ CM provides pre-construction (Prior to MSBA PFA) &amp; construction services. – This option costs a little more but it is helpful when creating our budget. They will have more input on schedule, phasing, and logistics.</li> <li>○ CM participates in the sub-contractor prequalification process</li> <li>○ Option for early release bid packages or “fast-track” schedules – If the design is finishing in October and we want to start construction the following summer, we have an option to do an</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>early release package for site work, abatement, demolition, etc. This allows work to start earlier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Contract value based on a “Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)” Cost of work + General Conditions + negotiated CM Fee</li><li>○ GMP Assembled with assumptions and allowances for phasing/ logistics (during schematic design – potential for additional reimbursement for unforeseen items.</li><li>○ “Open Book” construction budget accounting.</li></ul> <p>➤ DBB: Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Familiar delivery method</li><li>○ Simple procurement process to manage</li><li>○ Lowest price proposed &amp; accepted</li><li>○ Simple accounting (GC/GR)</li></ul> <p>➤ CMR: Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Qualifications based selection</li><li>○ The builder assists with budgeting, logistics and constructability</li><li>○ Schematic Design Estimate (reconciled) set budget (Prior to MSBA PFA)</li><li>○ Fast track scheduling allows use of Early Release Packages (ERP)</li><li>○ CM joins the “Team” during design phase and provides input as documents are developed</li><li>○ Negotiations and “Team” atmosphere reduces likelihood of claims and schedule extension</li><li>○ CM assumes risk for project cost and schedule</li></ul> <p>➤ DBB: Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Linear process: may mean longer schedule durations</li><li>○ Construction cost not known until bids received; may require re-design/rebid (AFTER PFA)</li><li>○ Designer must develop project phasing and schedule approach</li><li>○ GC project management, safety, and field supervision is minimal</li><li>○ Increased probability of disputes/claims</li><li>○ No GC input in design, planning, constructability or budgeting</li><li>○ Full costs not realized until completion</li></ul> <p>➤ CMR: Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Requires OPM/Design team to be familiar with GMP model</li><li>○ Two-step procurement process takes time</li><li>○ Additional CM costs related to preconstruction services</li></ul> <p>➤ Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ DBB is best suited for less complicated/complex projects with a straightforward design</li><li>○ CMR is best suited for complicated/complex project design, phasing, logistics and schedule management challenges, or strict schedule limitation</li></ul> <p>➤ M. Burton presents the timeline options for CMR and DBB</p>	
--	--	--

- M. Burton explains the CM would begin prior to the PFA. The design will not be complete until August 2022. This allows for an early release package. The DBB model shows the GC would not join the project until January 2023.

**Discussion:**

- D. DiNisco comments the DBB process goes through a prequal process. GC's do have to submit qualifications but typically we do not get to interview them based on other relevant projects. If we have a GC that we feel is not qualified, we can disqualify them. Both DBB and CMR have construction contingency. If the documents omit something either the GC or CM will have the ability to ask for more money for the change order. There will be change orders regardless. The most recent GC experience was with the Higgins project. It went well. We were able to build the school next to the existing so there was little disruption. Welch is going to be a phased/occupied school so there is a lot more complexity.
- B. Dunne comments the ultimate decision will rest with the building committee.
- P. McGinn asks how involved is the preapproval process with the OIG's office for CMR? C. Dell Angelo responds there is a lot of information we must gather and present to the OIG office. We have never had a problem submitting. We have a great relationship with the OIG office. It is a lot of work on our end but it is a straight forward process. M. Burton comments it is a little bit of a lift but we are happy to do that. We personally feel there are advantages using CMR for this project because it is complex.
- D. DiNisco mentions applying for the CM method does not mean we have to do it. This just gives us the flexibility to pick the method we want to go with.
- B. Dunne shares based on the this, it sounds like it would make sense to start that process. We are not bound by applying for CM. We want this to be an aggressive timeline.
- M. Burton comments as it relates to the timeline, we all know escalation goes up every year. We are seeing construction costs rising 3-5%. This year may be different with COVID but lets assume we are looking at 3%. If we are starting a year earlier, we are saving 3-5%. Using a CM is an advantage.
- C. Dell Angelo shares we can start the process, but we will need a certificate of approval from the SBC. We need this in order to submit to the OIG office for consideration and approval. B. Dunne asks can that vote take place at our next meeting? C. Dell Angelo responds we can get approval at a future meeting, but we can start the process now. D. DiNisco comments this is done through the OIG's office not the MSBA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ D. DiNisco mentions the method decision depends on the project. This project is a unique situation. We will not be using steel, foundations etc. We support CM for this project.</li> <li>➤ M. Burton comments given what we think the project may be at this point, issuing an early release package may be more complex. We can take advantage of anything outside such as site work, abatement, early release window package, elevator etc. We have not defined the scope yet, but this provides options</li> <li>➤ D. Doucette comments a CM will be helpful with certain subs and we may be able to prepurchase and keep our schedule on track. The earlier you buy, the lower the price.</li> <li>➤ D. DiNisco mentions we have to be cautious in how we procure. DiNisco supports going with CM given the complexities of the project and it being fully occupied. This will allow us to do the right thing at the right time.</li> <li>➤ B. Dunne shares when DWMP did their presentation, they mentioned 2 phased elementary school projects that were similar to the Welch. M. Burton confirms we used CMR on that project and we did use Agostini Bacon.</li> <li>➤ C. Dell Angelo comments when it comes to CMR, it is a 2-step process. We do prequalification's and interviews. We can review the proposals based on previous experience. We would want a CM with previous experience that is familiar with our challenges. It adds more value as far as the interview process for CMR.</li> <li>➤ M. Burton mentions we will reshare the updated presentation. This will be an agenda topic at our next meeting. In the meantime, we will move forward in collecting the information needed.</li> </ul>	
8.4	<p><b>Schedule Update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ M. Burton shares a brief schedule update.</li> <li>➤ M. Burton mentions module 4 has changed. We originally had schematic completion scheduled a month or 2 earlier. Based on the direction we think we are going in, the originally schedule was probably too aggressive. Schematic is now going to be moved to the October 2021 board meeting.</li> <li>➤ M. Burton notes we do not need the SBC's approval for the PDP. That is a mistake on the calendar. M. Burton will resend the schedule.</li> <li>➤ D. DiNisco notes once we submit the PDP to the MSBA it is public. We can do some community outreach to show what we are considering and what the options are. We still want to have a community meeting.</li> <li>➤ C. Dell Angelo mentions we can discuss this with the executive working group and how we would like to set up our community meeting.</li> </ul>	
8.5	<p><b>Design Update:</b></p> <p>J. Oxsalida shares a design update.</p>	

➤ SBC Update

- Repair & Add/Reno Pricing Options
  - Repairs (R-Code)
    - MEP Systems Replacement
    - New Sprinkler System
    - Acoustic Ceilings Replacement
    - New Fire Alarm
    - Accessibility Code Upgrades
    - Exterior Windows & Doors Replacement
    - Partial HazMat Abatement
  - Renovations (R-1 & R-2)
    - Repairs Scope, plus:
    - Reconfigure key interior spaces to support and enhance program
    - Create flexible spaces for shared use
    - Kitchen Equipment Replacement
  - Renovation & Addition(s)
    - Renovations Scope, plus:
    - Modest addition(s) to provide dedicated spaces for Educational Program.
- HVAC System Selection
  - Unit Ventilators
  - Fan Coil Units
  - Variable Refrigerant Flow
  - Displacement Ventilation
  - Induction Units
  - The Design Team is currently evaluating a total of 8 system types.
- Educational Program Development
  - Educational and Operational Priorities
    - Better serve the student population with unique needs
    - Support social emotional learning
    - Accommodate developing PPS district-wide programs
    - Maintain or enhance school-specific programs
    - Maximize or provide additional storage space
    - Enhance building security
    - Enhance opportunities for outdoor learning
  - Next Steps
    - Study potential improvements within existing building walls
- Student Storage Considerations
  - Cubbies in Classrooms
  - Lockers in Corridors

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Areas           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ General Classroom, Shared Office, Classroom Considerations               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential layouts are shown.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ V. Low shares we asked our cost estimator to identify components and options. When we look at the whole project, it may not be purely renovated but we may be able to grab options from others. We can create a chopping list to accommodate the educational program and goals where we can.</li> <li>➤ J. Oxsalida mentions we started a matrix that is really detailed. It gets into the aspects of each system.</li> <li>➤ D. Doucette shares the thing to consider is control systems adding that to the mix of cost considerations. Should there be individual classroom controls or central control system. Controls is always an interesting long-term thing for staff.</li> <li>➤ P. McGinn asks are there any thoughts on geothermal? J. Oxsalida responds a major component in geothermal is cost. We have not gone down that road because the cost would be prohibitive.</li> <li>➤ D. DiNisco shares DiNisco has completed two all-electric buildings. Geothermal wells are not being considered because of the cost, understanding other city needs and the projects coming down the line. There would be 80 wells for a school size of 110,000sqft. Since we are thinking of going all electric, we are looking at other opportunities. We have options utilizing other systems. It will come down to operating costs. This project has a limited budget and limited funds. We are looking at unit ventilators but they are not the most energy efficient.</li> </ul>	
8.6	<p><b>Budget Update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ M. Cox provides the monthly budget summary update.</li> <li>➤ This update shows invoices received to date and a snapshot of dashboard is provided.</li> <li>➤ M. Cox explains we have had 6 DWMP invoices processed to date. We wanted to share with the SBC where the budget stands. This will be shared monthly.</li> <li>➤ D. Doucette mentions DiNisco’s amendment #1 is with the school department. C. Dell Angelo shares it needs the owners’ signature. B. Dunne comments she will get that. C. Dell Angelo will resend the amendment and copy Marjorie and Daryl just in case.</li> </ul>	
8.7	<p><b>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None.</li> </ul>	
8.8	<p><b>Public Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None.</li> </ul>	Record

8.9	<b>Next Meetings:</b> ➤ SBC 9 – December 10, 2020 @ 9:30 am	Record
8.10	<b>Adjourn:</b> 11:01 am A motion was made by J. Hochman and seconded by J. Scanlon to adjourn the meeting, Discussion: None.	Record

Sincerely,

**DORE + WHITTIER**

Rachel Donner

Assistant Project Manager

Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.